

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 6, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

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

Hear the words of Psalm 44:

*We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what deeds thou didst perform in their days, in the days of old.*

Gracious God, as You have given direction to the nations in the days past, so we pray for that direction today. May we hear Your words for justice and understanding and may the gift of peace be our treasure and the treasure of all the peoples.

We specially remember this day the families of those whose loved ones face the test of battle. May Your spirit that is with us in all the moments of life and gives comfort in every anxiety, be with them now and evermore. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] to lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOOLITTLE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 348. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to March 18, 1991.

The message also announced that, pursuant to sections 1928a-1928d, of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair on behalf of the Vice President, appoints Mr. ROTH, as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the North Atlantic Assembly during the 102d Congress.

### ELECTION AS MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 56) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

#### H. RES. 56

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives.

Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs: Mr. Arney of Texas, and Mr. Thomas of Wyoming.

Committee on the District of Columbia: Mr. Lowery of California.

Committee on House Administration: Mr. Edwards of Oklahoma, Mr. Livingston of Louisiana, and Mr. Barrett of Nebraska.

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Mr. Hansen of Utah, Mr. Grandy of Iowa, Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut, Mr. Bunning of Kentucky, Mr. Kyl of Arizona, Mr. Goss of Florida, and Mr. Hobson of Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 473(a), the Chair appoints to the Technology Assessment Board the following Members of the House: Mr. UDALL of Arizona; Mr. BROWN of California; Mr. DINGELL of Michigan; Mr. MILLER of Ohio; Mr. SUNDRIST of Tennessee; and Mr. HOUGHTON of New York.

### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE U.S. CAPITOL PRESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 801(b) (6) and (8), of Public Law 100-696, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission: Mr. BENNETT of Florida and Mr. FAZIO of California.

### IMPACT AID CUTS, A CASE OF BAD TIMING

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, President Bush in his fiscal year 1992 budget proposes to reduce impact aid funding

to elementary and secondary schools by \$144.9 million. Despite inflation and increased costs, President Bush is proposing a freeze on available funding for "A" students and the total elimination of funding for "B" students in the fiscal year 1992 budget.

Federally connected students are generally divided into two categories: "A" students, who both live on Federal property and whose parents work on Federal property; and "B" students, whose parents work on nontaxpaying property but live in housing on which taxes are paid.

These proposal cuts come after impact aid has been cut drastically since 1981 while per pupil expenditures for education nationwide have increased an average of 7 percent each of the past 5 years. More and more of the cost of the federally connected student is being picked up by State and local funds.

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. This large military installation creates an influx of residents in the surrounding communities and students in the public schools and reduces local tax revenues, a major source of funding for public education in Nebraska.

The Bellevue School District alone has 5,266 federally connected students which is over 60 percent of the students in the entire district. Of these 5,266 federally connected students, 2,752 are classified as "B" students. Thus, under President Bush's fiscal year 1992 proposal to eliminate "B" student funding, the Bellevue School District would be responsible for educating nearly 3,000 students without the Federal funds needed because of the Federal presence.

In addition to the loss of local property taxes because of the tax-exempt and Federal property, although parents of "B" students pay property taxes on their homes, they often do not pay State taxes because they often shop at the commissary and post exchange, use military doctors, and participate in club activities on the post. Therefore, the money spent at these places does not go to support local schools. Sales made at the base exchange and other retail establishments on Offutt Air Force Base, which would normally be taxable in a community, totaled over \$40 million. Based on the Nebraska sales tax of 5.5 percent, over \$2.2 million in sales taxes would have been col-

□ 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.

lected on these sales if they had been made in the local community.

President Bush's cut of \$144.9 million violates a time-honored commitment to provide assistance to public school districts who carry the burden of Federal activities and lose local taxes because of those activities.

Ultimately, the issue is one of equity. Local governments, legitimately, view federally connected children as a Federal responsibility. The children in these schools are there because of the Federal Government, and neither the parents nor the employer make any contribution to the school systems' revenues through the local tax structures.

The Federal Government has an obligation to provide these students with quality educational opportunity like all other children in the United States. How can the President ask the country to support our soldiers at war and then ignore the needs of those soldiers' children at home?

#### TRIBUTE TO DANNY THOMAS

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

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, before leaving for the Capitol this morning, I heard the news flash that Danny Thomas had passed away. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great and gracious man with his passing. The world will remember him as a wonderful entertainer, but his greatest contribution, I think, has been his tireless work for sick children.

He would not accept the fact that leukemia had to be fatal.

Nowhere is that more evident than in my hometown of Memphis, TN, where Danny Thomas chose to locate St. Jude's Children Research Hospital. St. Jude's has meant hope and help for thousands of children and for their families. What finer legacy could one leave than wonder in the eyes of a child, a child who desperately needed help and who found it through one's own care and compassion.

"Make Room for Daddy" was his entertainment triumph. But he made and turned that into "Make Room for Children," his legacy.

Danny Thomas made a difference for good in the lives of so many in this world. We will miss him. We will not forget him.

We will honor his memory and his life's work in our continued support for the mission of St. Jude's.

#### PRESIDENT'S 1992 BUDGET TERMED A BLOW TO MIDDLE CLASS, TO SENIORS AND HARD- PRESSED STATES

(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, the President has committed enormous financial, human, and moral resources to fighting the war in the gulf. And the American people stand with him. Sadly, the President has walked away from the war right here at home against the evils of recession. That war, too, requires the commitment of financial, human, and moral resources. In our own backyard, Americans—middle class and poor, alike—struggle with the spiraling costs of education, health care, taxes, and unemployment.

How does the President respond to these ills?

He minimalizes the challenge. A temporary interruption of growth, he calls it. In my home State of Connecticut, and around the country, people are scared.

The President offers no initiatives to put the more than 1 million unemployed Americans back to work. The budget is silent on recovery. The President's proposal compounds the problems of the middle class. It cuts back on Medicare for seniors. It does nothing about health care and it says to the middle class, you're not eligible for college assistance.

Instead of offering tax relief to the middle class, the President offers a capital gains tax cut to the rich.

This budget is a blow to the middle class; it is a blow to seniors, and it offers little good news to our economically hard-pressed States.

□ 1410

#### A YAKIMA VALLEY MOTHER, HER SON, A YELLOW RIBBON AND OP- ERATION DESERT STORM

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

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to share a message about a mother, her son, the yellow ribbon I'm wearing, and Operation Desert Storm.

This ribbon was passed along to me by a mother I represent who has a son, a marine, on the frontlines of the war in the Persian Gulf.

While we go about our business, while most of us catch glimpses of this war through the safe filter of our televisions and in the comfort of our homes and offices, it is often too easy to forget about the members of our Armed Forces who are living this war each minute of every day.

It is for them, and the mothers and fathers, wives and husbands, and children, and friends who wait for their return, that I wear this ribbon as a reminder.

I am thankful for this gift and I will continue to wear it proudly. I invite my colleagues to do the same, and join

the folks from the Yakima Valley on what is for them, a special yellow ribbon day, as we hope for a swift end to this war; thank our troops and their families for their sacrifices; and we all look forward to the day when family and friends can be together again.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

#### THE ETHICS IN FOREIGN LOBBYING ACT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, every year foreign interests spend millions of dollars to influence our U.S. political campaigns and Government decisions. In the 1988 Federal election cycle foreign controlled PAC's contributed \$2.7 million, and that amount is growing. This money is spent on high-powered lobbyists, usually ex-U.S. Government officials, or comes from PAC contributions to candidates from foreign controlled corporations or trade associations. Yet the U.S. Government has no system in place to track these millions spent by foreigners here in our United States.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, along with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GUARINI] and 25 other cosponsors, I introduced the Ethics in Foreign Lobbying Act. It will restore some integrity back into this process. Our bill will eliminate the majority of foreign controlled PAC contributions and allow us to regain our sovereignty in the election process.

Let us keep America's political campaigns in the hands of the American people.

#### WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE STRIKER REPLACEMENT BILL?

(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, what's wrong with H.R. 5, a bill that prohibits employers from hiring permanent replacement workers during an economic strike?

H.R. 5 applies not only to large unionized employers, but also to non-union firms. Current labor law defines a labor dispute to be whenever two or more workers walk off the job to protest terms or conditions of employment.

Under H.R. 5, these workers in non-union firms would be strikers and

could not be permanently replaced or fired. Once the strikers returned to work, a day or week or month later, the strikers must be reinstated and temporary workers hired would have to be fired.

As a small businessman, let me put this in business terms. My plastics company in North Carolina needs pressmen to run the printing presses. It takes 3 years to train the pressmen. If the Clay bill were law and these workers walked off the job in an economic strike, I would have to close my doors forcing around 200 other employees out of jobs.

Do we really want to enact legislation like this? H.R. 5 is unreasonable and antiworker. Join me in stopping the prostrike bill.

#### JUST SAY NO TO THE RTC

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express great concern that the Senate Banking Committee voted yesterday to approve \$78 billion more for the savings and loan bailout. My hope is that the whole body of the Senate will reject that proposal and, most certainly, that this body, the House of Representatives, will not go along with it.

Mr. Speaker, as most Americans know, the S&L fiasco is not only the biggest act of thievery in the history of our Nation, it is the largest financial scandal in the history of the world. No one can predict exactly how much this bailout will cost the American people, but estimates run as high as \$500 billion to \$1 trillion. We have 2 million people sleeping out on the streets, a health care system which no longer functions, an educational system which is underfunded and failing and a \$3 trillion national debt, and we are talking about spending \$78 billion more for the bailout.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that the Congress will simply roll over and give the Bush administration and the Resolution Trust Corporation all that they want without a whimper. At the very least, we must demand that those individuals, the upper income people who have seen their real income soar during the 1980's, start paying their fair share of taxes and pick up this payback burden. Further, we must demand that, if the public is bailing out the system with hundreds of billions of dollars, that we get a form of public equity in the banking system which we are paying for.

There is much to be discussed about this issue, but for the moment let us just say no to the RTC.

#### THE "NEW" BILL

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise in support of the Nontraditional Employment of Women [NEW] Act, which my colleague from California, Mr. MILLER, has introduced today. The purpose of NEW is to increase nontraditional training and employment opportunities for women served by the Job Training Partnership Act; women in nontraditional jobs earn higher wages which enable them to become economically self-sufficient and support their families.

Nontraditional occupations are those jobs in which 25 percent or less of the work force is female. Some examples of nontraditional jobs are: Trades workers, electronic technicians, mechanics, and maintenance engineers.

The NEW bill complements former Labor Secretary Elizabeth Dole's nontraditional employment for women initiatives to help women gain access to the skilled trades. In November 1990, Ms. Dole increased antidiscrimination enforcement at the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training by giving the Office of Federal Conflict Compliance enforcement authority over Federal apprenticeship training programs.

If the United States is to successfully meet the challenge of Workforce 2000, in which the majority of new entrants to the work force will be women and minorities, the Nation's Federal employment and training program must have a plan to ensure that women are trained in all occupational areas. The NEW bill would be an important step in this direction.

The need for women to increase their wages to a level equal with men has become critical, as women increasingly enter the work force to support themselves and their families. Consider the following facts: Women today account for 45 percent of the work force. Four out of five adult working women have full-time employment; 43 percent of women in the labor force are in jobs that pay below poverty level wages compared with 27 percent of men; and two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women.

The Job Training Partnership Act maintains occupational segregation which in turn helps to maintain the gap in wages between women and men. According to a 1989 GAO study, women graduates of JTPA programs earned an average of \$4.65 an hour, 52 cents an hour less than male graduates. The GAO found that less than 9 percent of women in JTPA supported classroom training were being trained in nontraditional occupations. These occupations pay an average of 30 percent higher wages than occupations which are traditionally female.

Several program models for training women in a wide variety of nontraditional occupations have been successfully implemented; however, these models have not been institutionalized throughout the JTPA system. Most notable is the Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Employment for Women [ANEW] Program in Renton, WA, which has had 100 percent JTPA funding since 1984. ANEW's average entry level salary for its 21st class was over \$9 per hour for the 30 graduates placed.

NEW requires service delivery areas and States to include goals in their annual job training plans for training and placing women in nontraditional employment. It creates a 4-year demonstration program out of existing funds, at a cost of \$1.5 million annually, to foster the development and institutionalization of programs to train women for nontraditional employment.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the NEW Act which will both increase the economic self-sufficiency of low-income women and help prepare the Nation for Workforce 2000.

□ 1420

#### IS IT WORTH IT?

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I have heard President Bush say in the last few days that he does not know whether the aerial bombardment is enough to do the job and a ground war may be necessary.

I do not know what he means by "to do the job."

But if it means eliminating Saddam Hussein as a 900-pound gorilla sitting astride the Middle East, terrorizing and intimidating his neighbors, posing an intolerable threat to the peace of the region, then the President is dead wrong.

Precision surgical bombings are pummeling Saddam Hussein's military might inexorably.

Continuing to pound away from the air combined with the most effective economic sanctions the modern world has ever seen will remove Saddam Hussein as a menace to regional and global peace and security. Patience will emasculate this butcher of Baghdad and at very little cost of precious lives.

But if the President means kicking Saddam out of Kuwait, then he may be right, air bombing, and sanctions may not be sufficient. But if to do that job, we have to engage in a ground war, we can expect an exponential increase in the number of American casualties.

Is it worth it?

So far we have suffered very few casualties. A ground war would quickly change that. If this war is anything like the last four major wars we have

been involved in this century, then we can expect over 80 percent of the casualties to occur during a ground war.

Mr. Speaker, today is my 71st birthday. I wonder, if we get into a bloody ground war, how many of our 500,000 service men and women will not even live to celebrate their 21st birthday.

I urge patience, patience, patience.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ENABLE TAXPAYERS TO DONATE TO THE WAR ON DRUGS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, there are individuals in every facet of American society who need illegal drugs in order to make through the day.

We in Congress must to continue to fight the war on drugs. Many legislators are concentrating their efforts on drug prevention, and others on stiffer law enforcement penalties for drug dealers, which are efforts that I fully support.

However, today, I have introduced a bill that is aimed at helping those who are dependent on drugs and need professional treatment in order to combat their addiction.

Presently, most of the money for drug treatment comes from private individuals, private organizations and State and local government. The legislation I am introducing today will enable the individual taxpayer to help finance drug treatment programs around the country.

When filling out a form each year, an individual, couple or family can check a space on their tax form to donate \$1 or more of their income tax refund to the drug rehabilitation and treatment trust fund. The money in the fund will then be available for allotments to the State for drug treatment programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation to help make a drugfree life for millions of Americans.

#### POPE JOHN PAUL II SPEAKS OUT ON THE WAR IN THE GULF

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of this body the recent remarks of Pope John Paul II on the subject of the current conflict in the Persian Gulf. On this past Saturday, the Pope spoke to this issue during his monthly Rosary Service Broadcast. His remarks, I believe, deserve to be heard. He said:

The hearts of all of us are filled with sadness at the number of those engaged battle, the quantity of weapons being used, and the

involvement in the conflict of whole civilian populations.

He decried what he called unbelievable violence and useless slaughter. He also warned that "this harrowing situation risks spreading in time and space with tragic and incalculable consequences."

He went on to say that we should not become accustomed to the idea that all of this is unavoidable.

He is especially correct on that last point. A land war may yet be avoidable, and we should as a consequence explore every option for peace.

As the Pope concluded:

Our hearts must not be allowed to yield to the temptation of indifference and fatalistic resignation, as if people cannot avoid being caught up in the spiral of war.

#### UNITED STATES AND MEXICO INCLUDE CANADA IN FREE TRADE TALKS

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a historic day, as President Bush, Mexican President Salinas, and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney announced that Canada will participate in negotiations for a free trade agreement between the United States and Mexico. In effect, the announcement truly represents the first step toward a comprehensive North American free trade agreement.

A North American free trade agreement would mean a combined market of more than 360 million people with a combined gross national product of more than \$5.9 trillion. Total trade between the three nations amounts to more than \$225 billion, and would certainly grow significantly with a North American free trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on, but clearly these figures alone demonstrate an unparalleled opportunity for economic cooperation in North America. The far-reaching benefits of such an agreement include the opening of new markets, the development of new technologies, and opportunities for new investment, growth, and jobs in all three countries.

I congratulate President Bush and Salinas, and Prime Minister Mulroney for their vision and their foresight.

#### SUGGESTED EXPANSION OF PENTAGON 1-800 LINES

(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, many military families in my district have contacted my office in frustration in not being able to get through to the Pentagon on the 1-800 lines.

Although these lines were set up to assist families during this difficult time, the overflow of calls since the beginning of the war has resulted in busy signals and lengthy holds.

One man told me that he called repeatedly over a 24-hour period and still could reach no one.

As the war goes on, I anticipate the situation getting worse instead of better. That is why I am sending a letter to Secretary Cheney asking that the 1-800 lines be expanded and improved to better serve military families. I hope that my colleagues will join me in signing this letter.

The relatives of our service members deserve no less than a speedy and helpful voice when they call the Pentagon.

#### A MOVE TO EXPAND DEATH PENALTY VERDICTS IN CERTAIN CRIMES

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have for a decade now been struggling to try to have the Congress pass a comprehensive death penalty bill which will cover the most serious murders and infringements of law possible in our Nation. Only once in the last 10 years have we been successful just in a part of this effort, and that was to bring the death penalty to play in those cases where drug dealers intend to kill in the furtherance of their vicious enterprises.

But we want to do more. We are going to try again. We are introducing a bill which will allow the death penalty for assassination of the President, for espionage, for treason, for serious drive-by murders, for murders by payment, for murder on the high seas, and for an untold number of serious cases where the life of an individual is found to be so cheap.

Do the American people favor the death penalty for these kinds of cases? Ask them. In poll after poll for a generation now, we have found that the American people by a substantial majority feel that the jury in a particular case should have the right to impose the death penalty in these vicious types of killings.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for the cooperation of the Members during this term as well.

#### JAPAN'S PURCHASE OF AWACS WOULD MAKE GOOD ITS PROMISE ON BURDEN SHARING

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, burden sharing means more than paying for the war in the Persian Gulf. It is a

sharing of the costs and risks of mutual security as we close out this century and enter a new one.

Back in 1981, Japan agreed to purchase the AWACS aircraft needed to assume the defense of its own air space and sea lanes out to 1,000 nautical miles. Ten years later, not one of these aircraft has been purchased. As a result, the AWACS production line will close permanently in March, sticking the United States with this vital defense mission for years to come.

As Operation Desert Storm demonstrates, AWACS are worth their weight in gold. Every single sortie of the most intense war in history has been tracked and guided by AWACS. Now is hardly the time to tie up a significant portion of our AWACS fleet in the Pacific, when Japan can afford to fulfill its promise and assume this mission without violating a jot of the Japanese Constitution.

Today eight members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I have introduced legislation calling upon the President to insist that Japan assume the early warning mission in the Pacific, as they promised to do 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, burden-sharing stretches beyond events in the deserts of the Middle East. Japan must work with us to make the new world order a reality.

#### RONALD REAGAN CELEBRATES 80TH BIRTHDAY TODAY

(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, today is not only the birthday of my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], but it is also the birthday of a truly great American and a great, great Californian, although a native son of Illinois. February 6, 1991, is the 80th birthday of the 40th President of the United States of America, the Honorable Ronald Reagan. This truly historical citizen/politician is our first President to serve a full two terms, 8 years, since President Dwight Eisenhower.

My colleagues will recall that Ronald Reagan did not even run for political office until he celebrated his 55th birthday in 1966. When he won the governorship of California that fateful year it was a dynamic turnaround for many of us in the Golden State.

Gov. Ronald Reagan served 8 years, during which time California became the most populous State in the Union and the most successful of all our beautiful 50 States with a standard of living the envy of the world. Our distinguished Governor took us through a period of economic growth much the same as he led the Nation as President through the longest peacetime period

of economic growth in our Nation's history.

For a few years afterward, from 1975 through 1979, he traveled around our country speaking on what he called the rubber chicken circuit. He also kept his voice on the national scene with a syndicated radio show, and then in late 1979 he was drafted by the conservatives of his party with great expectation to be our standard bearer in the race against incumbent President Jimmy Carter, a race he won in a landslide. And did he ever fill out his 8 years of Presidential service with great distinction. Everybody, whether they were his political adversaries or his political friends and allies, nearly everyone foreign and domestic agreed that a finer man with a warmer personality had never served in that Oval Office. And there is no doubt that "Dutch" Reagan brought dignity back to the Presidency and restored a slipping national pride.

Also, in closing Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that, given the present crisis in the Middle East, it bears remembering that President Ronald Reagan was responsible for the defense buildup in the free world that is enabling us at this moment to bring to ground a ruthless, merciless dictator, the current and soon to fall Stalin-Idi Amin-Pol Pot-Adolf Hitler of the final decade of the bloody 20th century—Saddam Hussein. So happy birthday Mr. President. And thank you for all you have done.

Most of the world is grateful, especially those who live on the east side of the rubble that used to be the most evil wall ever erected in all of history. I'll be proud to my dying day to say I am a Reaganaut, one of the original crew who signed on in 1965. You, citizen Reagan, changed this Federal scene for the better, for the foreseeable future. And in a personal note, you've inspired me to devote the rest of my active years to keep the Reagan dream alive.

May you live to be 100 and then some. And from your many friends on Capitol Hill, a very, very, very, special greeting of love and affection to the "wind beneath your wings," your gracious partner, your lovely Nancy. Shalom, Irishman.

#### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELING DEMONSTRATION ACT

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

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in his budget message for fiscal year 1992, President Bush emphasizes the need to invest in our Nation's future, including early childhood education and training. This includes programs to prepare children for school, such as the highly successful Head Start Program.

As part of this emphasis on investing for the future, I believe we must identify and help those most at risk, and that is why I am reintroducing my Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act, H.R. 840.

This week has been declared "National School Counseling Week," yet most of our Nation's school systems do not have counseling programs in their elementary schools. Unfortunately, our young students are in need of these services. I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring H.R. 840.

The Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act would identify and address the special needs of our young children by establishing or expanding counseling programs in our elementary schools, through demonstration grants made by the Secretary of Education to local school districts. My bill would authorize this program for 5 years, and grants to an individual school would be available for up to 3 years at a maximum \$200,000 per year. In approving the demonstration grants, the Secretary shall ensure an equitable geographic distribution among regions of the United States, so that urban, suburban, and rural areas are represented. Special consideration would be given for applications that show the greatest need for counseling services for that school, and to programs that include innovative approaches to counseling services.

Single-parent families, drug and alcohol abuse, increased reports of child abuse, 2-worker families and other factors have resulted in unprecedented challenges and stresses for our young children. These pressures often result in emotional disorders, disruptive behavior, academic difficulties, and, tragically, even substance abuse of their own. Unaddressed, these behaviors sometimes go on year after year. They are showing up in children from families at every income level. It is not just a problem in low-income families.

The counseling program would include participation by businesses, labor organizations, higher education, community groups, and other public and private groups. Parents would also be closely involved, participating in the implementation and evaluation of their child's counseling. The children would receive both individual and group counseling.

I think my colleagues would agree that many of our young children need this type of counseling and assistance. All of us suffer when these problems and stresses occur in a child's life—the family, friends, classmates, and others—but nobody suffers as much as the child at hand. Imagine the terror, fear, and lack of self-esteem in the elementary-age youngster who sees a parent come home drunk every night, wreaking havoc on the entire family.

I urge my colleagues to support my legislation, so that we may do our small part to help kids like these.

### CONGRESS SHOULD KEEP HANDS OFF SECURITY FIRMS, WALL STREET, AND INSURANCE COMPANIES

(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, Treasury said deregulate the banks, take the shackles off, let the banks buy security firms, let them buy insurance companies, and, vice versa, let the big companies buy the banks.

Now, imagine this: What if Citibank buys Mutual of Omaha, and they get in trouble? They panic and they sell to Mitsubishi. Now, Mitsubishi, God forbid, gets in trouble. Do the American taxpayers bail out Mitsubishi, who used to be Citibank, and Mutual of Tokyo, because I assure you they will change Mutual of Omaha to Mutual of Tokyo.

We took the shackles off once before. We deregulated the thrift industry. Now, after junk bonds and bribes, they have gone belly up.

I say here, Congress should keep its hands off securities firms, Wall Street, and insurance companies, because the only shackles we put on were on the American taxpayers.

### MONEY LAUNDERING CONTROL ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today that, if passed, could dramatically improve our efforts to fight the crime of drug money laundering.

My Money Laundering Control Act of 1991 contains provisions that will apply the ultimate sanction to financial institutions that engage in money laundering, the loss of the bank's charter.

This language was adopted last year by the Banking Committee and by an overwhelming majority of the House.

My bill will also give the Justice Department additional tools to seize laundered cash and use forfeited money to pay for awards for information relating to violations of criminal money laundering laws.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation calls for the Treasury Department to take the lead in negotiations with other countries in order to obtain multilateral agreements allowing for the exchange of information regarding money laundering.

Mr. Speaker, money laundering is the lifeblood of the illicit drug business. I urge Members to take a look at my bill as a way to make it more difficult for the drug smugglers and dealers to dispose of their profits, with a view to co-sponsorship.

### TRIBUTE TO LOTTIE BOLLING HANCOCK

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to let my colleagues know about an inspiring gesture being made by one of my longtime constituent and dear friend from Austin, TX.

Lottie Bolling Hancock, the great, great, great niece of John Hancock, one of the Framers of the Constitution, is making a personal gift to the U.S. Congress today. Mrs. Hancock has purchased 535 copies of a special edition of the Constitution in which the complete, original text has been carefully set in type so that all can read this important document.

Mrs. Hancock has purchased these reproductions from the National Archives and paid for the framing of each document herself primarily by using her retirement income from her Social Security. It is her wish that this framed copy hang on the reception room wall of each Member's office. She requests your permission to enter your offices and personally hang the framed document, if this is agreeable to you. Her visit to your office will be during the month of March or April 1991. If this is not convenient for you, she will simply present the document to your staff for your own action.

The receipt of a finely printed and framed copy of the U.S. Constitution would be a special gift under any circumstances; one which would be treasured by any American. But this gift is made even more precious because of the spirit in which it is given. This gift is given not by a corporation or an association, but by a single individual who is proud of her country, her heritage, and the great document on which they are founded.

Mrs. Hancock has undertaken this project entirely on her own, using her own money for the purchasing, framing, and distribution of these documents. Not one person in a million would give so much of their own time and money for an undertaking like this. I asked her why she was willing to go to such expense and effort, and she told me that she simply wanted to make a contribution to her country and her government. She wanted to show to the people of this Nation that one person can have an impact and make a difference. She wants nothing more than to be remembered as a proud American who loves her Nation and the Constitution. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of spirit that has made this country great.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in commending Mrs. Hancock for this generous and inspiring gesture. I want to recognize her as a long-time close and personal friend. I have walked many a mile with Lottie

Bolling Hancock and worked with her on many projects and campaigns in my district, but none of them has given me any greater pride than this one. I hope my colleagues and their staffs will welcome her to their offices and display her gift prominently and proudly.

### FURTHER TRIBUTE TO LOTTIE BOLLING HANCOCK

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

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the work of a dedicated citizen of our Republic—Mrs. Lottie Bolling Hancock—still going full steam ahead in her seventies.

I am genuinely impressed at the admirable project this fine lady has taken on. She has spearheaded a national effort to provide a framed copy of the U.S. Constitution to the office of each Member of the U.S. Congress.

This is not a personal gift to each Member. No, this is a gift to the people of each and every congressional district and State in the country. These copies of the Constitution will be handed on by each Member to their successors who will in turn become the stewards of the document.

What a novel and noble idea. Imagine the arguments and issues that could be settled if we each had a sounder understanding of our Constitution. Thanks to Lottie Bolling Hancock, we will no longer have an excuse.

I am sure that my colleagues will join me and her Congressman, JAKE PICKLE, from Texas, in thanking this outstanding citizen for her immeasurable contribution to good government and the further understanding and appreciation of our Constitution and the principles which underly it.

For myself, I offer my personal and heartfelt thanks.

### AMERICA MUST HAVE ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, if they grew corn in the Middle East, we would not be there, because we have got corn in the United States, so we do not need to go anywhere to get it.

In the Persian Gulf, we are there to defend the Saudi oil fields, because they have got it and we are dependent on it. We are dependent on 50 percent of our oil coming in from outside of the United States. We get 1½ million barrels each day from Saudi Arabia.

Why is that? Because we do not have an energy policy in this country. We are the only industrial nation in the world without an energy policy.

In the President's budget, he intends to cut out \$600 million for clean coal

technology to utilize the greatest natural energy resource that we have in this country.

□ 1440

What is going to happen is we are going to become more dependent upon imported oil coming from the Middle East and other countries of the world, but we also have these restrictions, not only on burning coal, but we have restrictions on drilling oil, drilling gas, and then we have restrictions on developing nuclear fuel. That puts us in a very precarious position, and then we are going to have to defend these countries from other despots who seek power with other American lives and American money.

I think we had better wake up to the fact that we do not have an energy policy in this country and use America's great and vast energy resources.

#### THE UNITED STATES NEEDS ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, the Carter administration 12 years ago, tried to create public support for energy conservation. Then, President Carter declared it the moral equivalent of war.

We are not engaged in a war, a real war with real casualties, and it is a war over energy. President Carter's analogy, however, was not totally correct. War is something we do not want to be involved in indefinitely, but an energy policy, long-term energy planning, truly is.

Prior to this crisis our Nation was looking at another crisis, the diet industry. In 1989 we spent \$33 billion trying to lose weight, and that is going to double in the next 5 years. Had a shot not been fired, we would have spent \$30 billion in 1989 and now this war in the Middle East costs us \$1 billion a day.

Just as with energy, we eat too much food and we use too much energy. We are fat, and like a fat person looking for the quick way to lose weight, we have tried everything to get our energy appetite under control. With silly liquid diets weight loss occurs, but it creeps back when we go back to our old bad habits.

In summary, we cannot lose weight or save energy quickly or painlessly. We have to do it better. We must reduce our reliance on oil, begin the same way we would lose weight: cut calories and conserve. Likewise, we must enact a good energy strategy by investing in renewable and alternative fuels. We have more coal than Kuwait has oil. In the long run we could lose more weight, look better and be a better country for it.

#### TRIBUTE TO DANNY THOMAS

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, like most of America, I heard the sad news on the way to work this morning of the passing of the beloved comedian, Danny Thomas.

Danny Thomas, an individual of Lebanese extraction, was presented the Congressional Gold Medal by the U.S. Congress in 1983. I introduced that legislation on January 3 of that year with the immeasurable help of my esteemed colleague from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO], and with 225 cosponsors we passed that resolution and President Reagan then presented the gold medal to Danny Thomas in the White House on April 16, 1985.

At that time President Reagan spoke of Danny Thomas' remarkable career in acting. His career, however, was overshadowed and paled in comparison with his true achievement, which was his work in founding and setting up St. Jude's Childrens Research Hospital.

Danny Thomas fulfilled a promise he made when he was a struggling young comedian to St. Jude, the patron saint of the hopeless, when he vowed to build a shrine to St. Jude should he become a success in show business. He became that success, and in 1946 he raised the needed funds for the St. Jude's Childrens Research Hospital in Memphis, TN. He established the American-Lebanese-Syrian Associated Charities to undertake this fundraising effort for this hospital. The work paid off, and in 1962 St. Jude's Childrens Research Hospital opened its doors, making Danny's dream of free medical care for children a reality. And largely through Danny's tireless efforts, today St. Jude's has more than doubled the size of its patient and research facilities. Over the years it has treated more than 5,000 young patients. The care and love that is given to the children of this world at St. Jude's is second to none. It reflects the character and dedication of its benefactor, Danny Thomas.

St. Jude's has achieved a remarkable 53-percent cure rate for children suffering from leukemia, a tribute to the dedicated staff at the hospital.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I conclude in joining with the world as we mourn the loss of a truly beloved American, a comedian, but more important than that, a friend, and a true carer for all of the children of the world.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL, REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, Republican leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 6, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 801(b) (6) and (8), Public Law 100-696, following is my selection to serve as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission for the 102nd Congress: Rep. Jerry Lewis of California.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
Republican Leader.

#### COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications from the Honorable WALTER B. JONES, chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT  
MARINE AND FISHERIES,  
Washington, DC, February 5, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to 46 App. U.S.C. 1295b (h)1, I have appointed the following Members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the 102nd Congress:

The Honorable George J. Hochbrueckner of New York

The Honorable Nita M. Lowey of New York  
The Honorable Norman F. Lent of New York

As Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With warmest personal regards, I am  
Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT  
MARINE AND FISHERIES,  
Washington, DC, February 5, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194, I have appointed the following Members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the 102nd Congress:

The Honorable W.J. (Billy) Tauzin of Louisiana

The Honorable William J. Hughes of New Jersey

The Honorable Jack Fields of Texas  
As Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With warmest personal regards, I am  
Sincerely,

WALTER B. JONES,  
Chairman.

### BANKS CAN AFFORD TO PAY FOR DEPOSIT INSURANCE

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is now no secret that the bank insurance fund is in serious trouble. The fund must be replenished. The only real issue is: By whom?

The banking industry originally had said that it was willing to pay the cost. Now, it is becoming readily apparent that the banks are looking for a way to get the taxpayer to foot the bill.

The banks' major complaint is that they cannot afford to pay the rapidly escalating cost of refunding the bank insurance fund. A look at the dividends they have paid to their shareholders over the past few years undercuts that argument.

Since 1988, banks insured by the FDIC have paid their shareholders about \$40 billion in dividends. During that same period, they have paid only \$6.5 billion in deposit insurance premiums, even though the FDIC had \$19.8 billion in deposit insurance losses. Current projections show that the fund could run out of money as early as this September.

The banks and their shareholders benefit from deposit insurance and must foot the bill. They can afford it. Now they must start putting money into the bank insurance fund, rather than into their own pockets.

### VETERANS HOUSING AND MEMORIAL AFFAIRS AMENDMENTS OF 1991

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 232) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to veterans programs for housing and memorial affairs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 232

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

#### SECTION 1. NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.

Section 1832(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out subparagraph (C).

#### SEC. 2. PROPERTY MANAGEMENT.

(a) VENDEE LOANS.—Section 1833(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) After fiscal year 1990, the percentage limitations described in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall have no effect.

"(3) The Secretary may, beginning in fiscal year 1991 and continuing thereafter, sell any note evidencing a loan referred to in paragraph (1)—

"(A) with recourse; or

"(B) without recourse but only if the amount received is equal to an amount which is not less than the unpaid balance of such loan."

(b) REPEAL OF TERMINATION DATE.—Section 1833(a) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (6); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

#### SEC. 3. EXTENSIONS OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO DEFAULT PROCEDURES AND APPRAISALS.

(a) DEFAULT PROCEDURES.—Section 1832(c)(11) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1991".

(b) APPRAISALS.—Section 1831(f)(3) of such title is amended by striking out "October 1, 1990" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1991".

#### SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Section 1820 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) The Secretary shall, at the request of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and without reimbursement, certify to such Secretary whether an applicant for assistance under any law administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development is a veteran."

(b) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1803 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) The application for or obtaining of a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this chapter shall not be subject to reporting requirements applicable to requests for or receipts of Federal contracts, grants, loans, loan guarantees, loan insurance, or cooperative agreements except to the extent that such requirements are provided for in, or by the Secretary pursuant to, this title."

#### SEC. 5. WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS.

Section 3102 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall include in the notification to the payee a statement of the right of the payee to submit an application for a waiver under this subsection and a description of the procedures for submitting the application."; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking out "101 and 1801" and inserting in lieu thereof, "101, 1801, and 1802(a)(2)(C)(11) of this title"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: "An application for relief under this subsection must be made within one year after the date on which the veteran receives notice by certified mail from the Secretary of the indebtedness. The Secretary shall include in the notification a statement of the right of the veteran to submit an application for a waiver under this subsection and a description of the procedures for submitting the application."

#### SEC. 6. ENTITLEMENT AMOUNT.

Section 1803(a)(1)(A)(i) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subclause (III)—

(A) by inserting "except as provided in subclause (IV) of this clause," after "(III)"; and

(B) by striking out "but not more than \$144,000."; and

(2) in subclause (IV), by striking out "or (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(6), or (8)".

#### SEC. 7. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM OF COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY AND THERAPEUTIC TRANSITIONAL HOUSING.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—During fiscal years 1991 through 1994, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out a compensated work therapy and therapeutic transitional housing demonstration program. The demonstration program shall have two components, as follows:

(1) A component, under subsection (c), which provides for direct operation of thera-

peutic transitional housing in conjunction with the furnishing of compensated work therapy.

(2) A component, under subsection (d), which provides for the contracting with nonprofit corporations to furnish compensated work therapy in conjunction with the operation of the therapeutic transitional housing.

(b) ELIGIBLE VETERANS.—The veterans for whom therapeutic transitional housing may be provided under this section are veterans—

(1) who are furnishing services to the Department of Veterans Affairs under subsection (a) of section 618 of title 38, United States Code; or

(2) who are furnished therapeutic work pursuant to subsection (b) of that section.

(c) AUTHORITY TO OPERATE RESIDENCES AS THERAPEUTIC TRANSITIONAL HOUSING.—Under the demonstration program, the Secretary, in connection with the conduct of compensated work therapy programs, may operate residences as therapeutic transitional housing solely for veterans described in subsection (b) of this section. The Secretary may operate no more than 50 residences as therapeutic transitional housing under this subsection.

(d) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—(1) Under the demonstration program, the Secretary may contract with nonprofit corporations to conduct compensated work therapy programs under the demonstration program.

(2) The Secretary may enter into a contract with a nonprofit corporation under the demonstration program only if the corporation provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that it will operate therapeutic transitional housing for eligible veterans in conjunction with an existing compensated work therapy program at a medical center. The contract may remain in effect only as long as the corporation operates the therapeutic transitional housing for eligible veterans in connection with the demonstration program.

(3) A contract with a nonprofit corporation under this subsection may provide for the Secretary to furnish the corporation (with or without consideration) in-kind services, including—

(A) technical and clinical advice;

(B) supervision of the activities of compensated work therapy participants in the rehabilitation of any property for use as therapeutic transitional housing under the contract and for possible later sale as a private residence; and

(C) minor maintenance of and minor repairs to such property.

(e) PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES.—The Secretary may use such procurement procedures for the purchase, lease, or other acquisition of residential housing for purposes of this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to expedite the opening and operation of transitional housing and to protect the interests of the United States.

(f) CONDITIONS.—A residence may be operated as transitional housing for veterans described in subsection (b) under the following conditions:

(1) Only veterans described in such paragraph and a house manager may reside in the residence.

(2) Each resident, other than the house manager, shall pay rent for the period of residence in such housing.

(3) In the establishment and operation of housing under this section, the Secretary shall consult with appropriate representatives of the community in which the housing is established and shall comply with zoning

requirements, building permit requirements, and other similar requirements applicable to other real property used for similar purposes in the community.

(4) The residence shall meet State and community fire and safety requirements applicable to other real property used for similar purposes in the community in which the transitional housing is located, but fire and safety requirements applicable to buildings of the Federal Government shall not apply to such property.

(g) **HOUSE MANAGERS.**—The Secretary shall prescribe the qualifications for house managers for transitional housing units operated under this section. The Secretary may provide for free room and subsistence for house managers in addition to, or instead of payment of, a fee for such services.

(h) **SOURCES OF HOUSING.**—(1) The Secretary may operate as transitional housing under this section—

(A) any suitable residential property acquired by the Secretary as the result of a default on a loan made, guaranteed, or insured under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; and

(B) any other suitable residential property purchased, leased, or otherwise acquired by the Secretary.

(2) In the case of any property referred to in paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall—

(A) transfer administrative jurisdiction over such property within the Department from the Veterans Benefits Administration to the Veterans Health Services and Research Administration; and

(B) transfer from the General Post Fund of the Department of Veterans Affairs to the Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, an amount, not to exceed the amount the Secretary paid for the property, representing the amount the Secretary considers could be obtained by sale of such property to a nonprofit organization or a State for use as a shelter for homeless veterans.

(3) In the case of any residential property obtained by the Secretary from the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this section, the amount paid by the Secretary to that Department for that property may not exceed the amount that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development would charge for the sale of that property to a nonprofit organization or a State for use as a shelter for homeless persons. Funds for such charge shall be derived from the General Post Fund.

(i) **RENT AND LENGTH OF RESIDENCE.**—The Secretary shall prescribe—

(1) a procedure for establishing reasonable rental rates for persons residing in transitional housing; and

(2) appropriate limits on the period for which such persons may reside in transitional housing.

(j) **DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY.**—The Secretary may dispose of any property acquired for the purpose of this section. The proceeds of any such disposal shall be credited to the General Post Fund of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(k) **AVAILABILITY OF GENERAL POST FUND.**—Funds received by the Department under this section shall be deposited in the General Post Fund. The Secretary may distribute out of the fund such amounts as necessary for the acquisition, management, maintenance, and disposition of real property for the purpose of carrying out such program. The operation of the demonstration program and funds received shall be separately accounted for, and shall be stated in the documents ac-

companying the President's budget for each fiscal year.

(l) **REPORT.**—After a demonstration program under this section has been in effect for two years, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the operation of the program. The Secretary shall include in the report such recommendations with regard to the program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

**SEC. 8. LOANS TO ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING TRANSITIONAL HOUSING FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSERS.**

(a) **LOAN PROGRAM.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may make loans in accordance with this section to assist in the provision of transitional housing exclusively to veterans who are in (or who recently have been in) a program for the treatment of substance abuse.

(b) **LOAN RECIPIENTS.**—A loan under this section may only be made to a nonprofit organization under selection criteria promulgated by the Secretary and only to assist that organization in leasing housing units for use as a group residence for the purposes described in subsection (a). The amount of such a loan that is used with respect to any single residential unit may not exceed \$4,500. In making loans under this subsection, the Secretary shall, except to the extent that the Secretary determines that it is infeasible to do so, ensure that—

(1) each loan is repaid within two years after the date on which the loan is made;

(2) each loan is repaid through monthly installments and that a reasonable penalty is assessed for each failure to pay an installment by the date specified in the loan agreement involved; and

(3) each loan is made only to a nonprofit private entity which agrees that, in the operation of each residence established with the assistance of the loan—

(A) the use of alcohol or any illegal drug in the residence will be prohibited;

(B) any resident who violates the prohibition in subclause (A) of this clause will be expelled from the residence;

(C) the costs of maintaining the residence, including fees for rent and utilities, will be paid by the residents;

(D) the residents will, through a majority vote of the residents, otherwise establish policies governing the conditions of residence, including the manner in which applications for residence are approved; and

(E) the residence will be operated solely as a residence for not less than six veterans.

(c) **FUNDING.**—Loans under this section shall be made from the special account of the General Post Fund of the Department of Veterans Affairs established for purposes of this section. The amount of such loans outstanding at any time may not exceed \$100,000. Amounts received as payment of principal and interest on such loans shall be deposited in that account. The operation of the loan program under this section shall be separately accounted for, and shall be separately stated in the documents accompanying the President's budget for each fiscal year.

(d) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Loans under this section shall be made on such terms and conditions, including interest, as the Secretary prescribes.

(e) **REPORT.**—After the end of the 15-month period beginning when the first loan is extended under this section, the Secretary shall issue a report on the Department's experience under the section. The report shall include the following information:

(1) The default rate on loans extended under this section.

(2) The manner in which loan payments are collected.

(3) The number of facilities at which loans have been extended.

(4) The adequacy of the amount of funds in the revolving fund.

**SEC. 9. HOUSING PROGRAMS FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§1835. Housing assistance for homeless veterans and veterans in compensated work therapy programs**

“(a)(1) To assist homeless veterans and their families acquire shelter, the Secretary may enter into agreements described in paragraph (2) with—

“(A) nonprofit organizations, with preference being given to any organization named in, or approved by the Secretary under, section 3402 of this title; or

“(B) any State or any political subdivision thereof.

“(2) To carry out paragraph (1), the Secretary may enter into agreements to sell real property, and improvements thereon, acquired by the Secretary as the result of a default on a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this chapter. Such sale shall be for such consideration as the Secretary determines is in the best interests of homeless veterans and the Federal Government.

“(3) The Secretary may enter into an agreement under paragraph (1) of this subsection only if—

“(A) the Secretary determines that such an action will not adversely affect the ability of the Department—

“(i) to fulfill its statutory missions with respect to the Department loan guaranty program and the short- and long-term solvency of the Loan Guaranty Revolving Fund and the Guaranty and Indemnity Fund under this chapter; or

“(ii) to carry out other functions and administer other programs authorized by law;

“(B) the entity to which the property is sold agrees to—

“(i) utilize the property solely as a shelter primarily for homeless veterans and their families,

“(ii) comply with all zoning laws relating to the property,

“(iii) make no use of the property that is not compatible with the area where the property is located, and

“(iv) take such other actions as the Secretary determines are necessary or appropriate in the best interests of homeless veterans and the Federal Government; and

“(C) the Secretary determines that there is no significant likelihood of the property being sold for a price sufficient to reduce the liability of the Department or the veteran who defaulted on the loan.

“(4) Any agreement, deed, or other instrument executed by the Secretary under this subsection shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate and necessary to carry out the purpose of such agreement.

“(b) The Secretary may not enter into agreements under subsection (a) after September 30, 1993.”

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to subchapter III the following new item:

“1835. Housing assistance for homeless veterans.”

**SEC. 10. AUTHORIZED SOURCES FOR PROVISION OF THERAPEUTIC WORK IN COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY PROGRAM.**

(a) **AUTHORIZED SOURCES.**—Subsection (b)(1) of section 618 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out “contractual arrangements with private industry or other sources outside the Veterans’ Administration” and inserting in lieu thereof “a contract or other arrangement with any appropriate source (whether or not an element of the Department of Veterans Affairs or of any other Federal entity)”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking out “carrying out the provisions of” and inserting in lieu thereof “furnishing rehabilitative services authorized in”.

**SEC. 11. FLORIDA NATIONAL CEMETERY.**

Notwithstanding section 1004(c)(2) of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary may provide for flat grave markers in that section of the Florida National Cemetery in which preplaced grave liners were installed before July 30, 1988.

**SEC. 12. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**

(a) **AMENDMENTS.**—Title 38, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1805(a) is amended—

(A) by striking out “approved” in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof “appraised”; and

(B) by striking out “approval” in the second and inserting in lieu thereof “appraisal”.

(2) Section 1825(c) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking out “There” and inserting in lieu thereof “Except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, there”; and

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

“(3) In the case of a loan described in clause (C) of section 1829(a)(2) of this title, there shall be credited to the Guaranty and Indemnity Fund, in lieu of any amount that would otherwise be credited for such a loan under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) of this subsection—

“(A) for each loan closed during fiscal year 1990, an amount equal to 0.25 percent of the original amount of the loan for each of the fiscal years 1991 and 1992;

“(B) for each loan closed after fiscal year 1990, an amount equal to 0.25 percent of the original amount of the loan for the fiscal year in which the loan is closed and for the following fiscal year.”.

(3) Section 1829(a) is amended by striking out paragraphs (3) and (4) and redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (3).

(4) Section 1829(c)(2) is amended by striking out “section 1825(c)(2) (A) or (B) of this title and subsection (a)(3) of this section” and inserting in lieu thereof “clause (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) of section 1825(c) of this title or paragraph (3) of that section”.

(5) Section 1833 is amended by striking out the subsection (e) that was added by section 5003(a) of Public Law 101-239.

(b) **RATIFICATION.**—(1) Any action of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of the Treasury—

(A) that was taken during the period beginning on October 1, 1990, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) that would have been an action carried out under section 1825(c)(3) of title 38, United States Code, if the amendment made by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section had been made before October 1, 1990, is hereby ratified.

(2) Any failure to act by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs or the Secretary of the

Treasury during such period under section 1829(a)(3) of such title is hereby ratified.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 232, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1450

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 232 would improve housing and memorial affairs programs for veterans. It is similar to H.R. 5002 passed by the House last year. H.R. 232 is a compromise reflecting agreement with the other body on legislation that failed to pass the Senate also last year.

In a moment I will recognize the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs, but first I want my colleagues to know, Mr. Speaker, that this bill has been amended. Section 2 of the bill has been modified in order to eliminate the major direct spending provision in the bill as introduced. This provision would have prevented the VA from selling loans it made to purchasers of foreclosed houses. The committee was recently notified by CBO that the direct spending increases above baseline in the bill would be \$7 million in 1991, \$22 million in 1992 and \$68 million in 1993.

Mr. STAGGERS and I have agreed to modify section 2 to reduce the total direct spending from \$97 million to \$7 million for these 3 years. The gentleman from West Virginia will explain in more detail why the \$7 million will remain in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, our bills are the first that have been brought to the floor under the new provision of pay as you go. Other committees should be aware that pay as you go is being enforced.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia for his hard work on this measure and congratulate him on being reelected to this subcommittee chairmanship of Housing and Memorial Affairs. He has done an excellent job.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the ranking minority member of the sub-

committee, and the ranking minority member of the full committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], for their cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I rise today in support of H.R. 232, a bill containing the best provisions concerning the homeless which appeared in H.R. 5002 and S. 2100 as well as certain housing and memorial affairs provisions.

This measure is the result of considerable hard work and effort on the part of many. No one, Mr. Speaker, deserves more credit than the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY. I applaud his efforts this session to so quickly move on legislation in behalf of America’s veterans which had been agreed to in principle by the other body but upon which action was prevented during the 101st Congress. I also want to compliment the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. BOB STUMP of Arizona; and the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. DAN BURTON, who is ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs.

At the outset, I wish to state that the chairman and I have agreed to amend the bill to eliminate the prohibition of certain loan sales for the next three years since CBO has attached such a high direct spending cost of \$92 million in the first three years. Ironically, there is no money being spent here. Instead, DVA is allowed to collect principal and interest on vendee loans—thereby increasing revenues to the guaranty and indemnity fund. It should be emphasized that the sale of these assets is not necessary to operate the program.

One of the reasons that the Loan Guaranty Program has needed appropriations is due to the fact the OMB was making DVA sell their loan assets prematurely, thereby depleting the attractive parts of the loan portfolio which could have generated revenues. We will be revisiting this issue in my subcommittee.

This is a perfect example of why I didn’t support this type of scorekeeping method on the floor. The other classic example of how something appears to be something it’s not is the direct spending cost associated with providing transitional housing to certain homeless veterans. According to the CBO estimate, this is \$5 million the first year and \$1 million thereafter. Under this legislation, we’re not spending a single penny from taxpayer dollars. All of the money comes out of the general post fund which is made up of gifts, donations and bequests to aid veterans. If this committee is going to be prohibited from requiring DVA to spend funds to help needy homeless

veterans from non-appropriated money, it's really a sad state of affairs. Nevertheless, our committee will abide by the House rules and my subcommittee will make every effort to find some additional funds later this session which will offset the \$5 million cost CBO attached to the homeless initiative contained in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to explain the provisions contained in H.R. 232. America's veterans are well served by this new bill assisting certain homeless veterans by bringing together and modifying existing Department of Veterans Affairs Programs. The homeless issue and mental health issues have existed long enough, unfortunately, in the general population and the veteran community to have provided some hard lessons. One of the lessons is that transitional housing—a bridge between active, or inpatient, therapy and full return to the community—can assist individuals in becoming full members of society.

This bill would authorize the Secretary to carry out a four-year demonstration program of transitional housing for participants in the Compensated Work Therapy [CWT] Program.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is authorized to operate Compensated Work Therapy programs under section 618(b) of title 38, United States Code. The purpose of the CWT program is to provide a clinical procedure for evaluating the patient's vocational or avocational interests, aptitudes, and skills, as well as assessing the patient's physical and mental capacities for work in actual employment situations. The programs encourage the development of good working habits by emphasizing attendance, reliability, punctuality, productivity, craftsmanship, and personal responsibilities. The major component is a work regimen with monetary incentives derived from work contracts with private industry or other sources outside the Department. Jobs performed in CWT may range from simple packaging and salvaging type activities to fabrication and assembly operations using complex machines. Activities can take place in the medical center, in the community, or on the industrial site. This bill would authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs to contract with elements of DVA, as well as private or other governmental sources, for the work involved in the CWT Program.

Mr. Speaker, work and medical or rehabilitative treatment are not the only problems associated with chronically mentally ill patients or with the homeless. The need for transitional or therapeutic living space is critical to the success of any of the therapeutic programs. This bill is designed to bring together some existing Department of Veterans Affairs programs, with certain modifications, in order to provide

an opportunity for patients to consolidate their clinical improvement and to develop sufficient skills and income to achieve maximum levels of independence. Specifically, patients would be involved in a therapeutic program which would combine the CWT Program with therapeutic residential living prior to discharge to the community.

This bill would give the Department the needed authority to purchase, lease and sell housing that would be used for patients participating in the CWT programs. The Veterans Health Services and Research Administration [VHSRA] would have authority to purchase properties, if deemed appropriate by the Secretary, that have been acquired under the Veterans Benefits Administration's [VBA] guaranteed home loan program through foreclosure.

Mr. Speaker, another provision of the bill establishing this transitional housing demonstration program would authorize the Department to collect rent and utilities payments from individuals living in such housing units. These monies would help to defray the operating expenses of these housing units. Veterans may be allowed to live in the therapeutic residences for a stated period of time to be determined by the Secretary. Veterans may remain in the therapeutic residence after completion of the CWT Program only if they are receiving Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient services and are awaiting placement in community housing. Each therapeutic residence would have a house manager who could be provided room and board and possibly a minimal stipend in exchange for overseeing the residence. The Secretary would be required to prescribe qualifications for house managers for these transitional housing units.

This bill would authorize funds to be disbursed from the general post fund as may be necessary for the acquisition, management, maintenance, and disposition of real property for the purpose of carrying out this transitional demonstration housing program. This authority also includes reimbursement from the general post fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund of amounts equal to the amount which could have been obtained by the sale of the Department's acquired property to a nonprofit organization or a State for use as a shelter for homeless veterans. Money deposited in the general post fund comes from non-governmental sources and is not appropriated. Fund balances have been running in the amount of approximately \$31 million.

Mr. Speaker, the bill would also authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs to lend from the general post fund up to \$4,500 with a maximum total outstanding amount of \$100,000 to groups or individuals setting up group homes for homeless veterans recovering from substance abuse. The idea is to provide

transition time between active treatment and the return of recovering veterans to the outside world. Group homes of this nature provide a supportive environment which permits individuals to avoid relapsing into addictive use of alcohol and drugs.

Relapses by individuals recovering from either alcoholism or drug addiction are a costly and difficult problem. Harvard Medical School's study of adult development reported that in an 8 year posttreatment study of 100 individuals who had inpatient treatment for alcoholism, only 29 percent had achieved stable abstinence of at least 3 year's duration.

More than 140 DVA medical centers have treatment programs that follow the traditional 28-day inpatient mode. Each of these hospitals has groups of veterans leaving an inpatient program every week. It would seem beneficial to loan money to groups for setting up houses as a transition for recovering veterans. This would not only assure that recovering veterans live in a safe place close to after-care treatment, it would make better use of Federal dollars in the long run by treating more veterans and giving them a chance to turn their lives around, rather than seeing the same veterans repeatedly in an inpatient treatment program. This bill, therefore, hopefully provides a way to help reduce the recidivism rate and increase the abstinence rate for veterans.

Last, the bill would extend authority to the Secretary for another 3 years to discount foreclosed properties sold to nonprofit organizations to assist homeless veterans and to persons who enter into an agreement with the Department to employ veterans who are participants in the CWT Program. Currently, these properties may be discounted up to 50 percent.

This bill also addresses housing issues under the Department's Home Loan Guaranty Program.

This bill also makes permanent the requirement in section 1832(a)(4) of title 38 that the Department of Veterans Affairs provide information and counseling to veterans who default on VA-guaranteed home loans about the effect of, and alternatives to, foreclosure. The notification and counseling assistance requirement took effect March 1, 1988, and would expire on March 1, 1991. The time limit was imposed to provide a trial period during which the effects of the provisions on lowering foreclosure through notification, information and counseling could be evaluated by Congress. All indications, by the Department, the General Accounting Office, and others indicate that notification, information and counseling do make a difference. Of the 28,675 defaults reported cured during the first quarter of fiscal year 1990, 913 can be directly related to the over 37,000 personal servicing contracts

made by Department personnel. The Department estimates that those 913 cures saved the Government over \$17 million.

Mr. Speaker, veterans are eligible for certain benefits under the National Housing Act. That act, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD], provides lower downpayment requirements for loans to veterans insured by the Federal Housing Administration. Since 1966, under an agreement with HUD, the Department has been issuing certificates of veterans' status for HUD. The agreement under which the Department processed the certificates called for HUD to reimburse the Department \$1.25 per certificate for processing costs. In recent years HUD has declined to reimburse the Department for these costs. As a service to veterans, the Department has continued to issue the certificates. This bill authorizes the Department to continue issuing the certificates without reimbursement from HUD.

The bill would also exempt housing loans guaranteed, insured, or made by the Department of Veterans Affairs from the lobbying reporting requirements of 31 U.S.C. 1352 which was added by section 319 of Public Law 101-121. That law prohibits certain government contractors or recipients of Government assistance from using appropriated monies for lobbying, and requires certain lobbying disclosures for those persons. That statute does not apply to loans which are \$150,000 or less. In the conference report on this legislation—House Report 101-264—it was stated that the \$150,000 threshold "serves to exempt \*\*\* individuals who seek federally insured loans—for the purchase of personal residences, for example—from these provisions." There is no statutory or Department-imposed regulatory ceiling on the amount of a loan guaranteed by the Department. Custom and practice in the lending industry and secondary market, however, limits VA-guaranteed loans to four times the guaranty amount. Until recently, the maximum guaranty was \$36,000. Therefore, VA-guaranteed loans rarely exceeded \$144,000. In enacting Public Law 101-237, the Congress recognized that in certain high cost areas of the Nation \$144,000 was not sufficient for many veterans to purchase satisfactory housing. Therefore, that law increased the guaranty to 25 percent on loans exceeding \$144,000 to a maximum guaranty of \$46,000. This new guaranty gives lenders the authority to make no down payment VA-guaranteed loans of up to \$184,000. As stated in the conference report on Public Law 101-121, Congress recognized that the purchase of a single family home with a federally guaranteed loan has not been the subject of abuse that led to the enactment of Public Law 101-121 and expressed an in-

tent to exempt such borrowers from the burdens imposed by that law. Therefore, this bill would exempt all veterans from that burden including those who reside in high housing cost areas.

Last, this bill would authorize the use of flat markers in a specific area of the Florida National Cemetery. Public Law 99-576 required the use of upright grave markers in national cemeteries for interments occurring after January 1, 1987. Upright markers are not required in national cemeteries closed or scheduled to be closed prior to September 30, 1991, and the Department is permitted to continue to furnish flat markers in an open section already using them until the section is completed. Public Law 100-322 permitted the use of flat markers on graves in cemeteries located on the grounds of, or adjacent to, a VA health-care facility. The Florida National Cemetery does not meet these criteria. It is not scheduled to close, does not have a section already using flat markers, and is not located on or adjacent to a VA health-care facility. There is one section of Florida National Cemetery, however, in which preplaced graveliners were installed prior to enactment of Public Law 99-576. According to the Department, the size of the graveliners prohibits the use of upright markers. Therefore, this bill would provide authority to the Department to use flat grave markers in that section of Florida National Cemetery only.

Again, Mr. Speaker, although there is a \$5 million cost in direct spending, I wish to reemphasize that appropriations are not needed to fund this legislation. I therefore urge favorable consideration of this measure.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I also rise to commend the chairman of the subcommittee who has brought this legislation to the floor.

Yesterday, as many Members know, we indicated concern about the costs in the veterans' bills and, in particular, the costs that were here, not because substantively these are not important programs. As to the loan sale program, it is difficult to understand why it involves a cost. Nevertheless, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that would be the case.

Because of that, it could possibly raise the specter of sequester.

What the committee has done is to basically remove that loan sale provision, section 2, I believe, of the bill, but, at the same time, keeping what I think is a very important policy position with regard to the issue of trying

to provide help to homeless veterans, and the funds in that section would come out of the post fund which essentially pays for those provisions.

So, again, I want to commend the committee, because in the past in reconciliation you have always adhered to the targets that we have presented you. Now when we indicated our concerns with regard to the budget agreement, the committee was willing to go back and eliminate the provision and basically meet the pay-as-you-go requirement. So I want to congratulate you and also to congratulate you on the issue itself, because it is extremely important that we care for these veterans, particularly at this time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman that my subcommittee will take up legislation later in the session to offset the cost CBO attached to proposals that are left in the bill, but there is frustration on this gentleman's part that this is money that is not coming from taxpayers' dollars. It is gifts and bequests. It is something that hopefully we will be able to iron out.

I am not frustrated at the gentleman, because I know he is under the same restrictions that we are, but something has to be done with this, and hopefully we will be able to work this out in the future.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman and again commend him.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 232, as amended, a bill to amend certain housing and memorial affairs provisions. This measure builds on existing Department of Veterans Affairs Programs by providing therapy and work programs in a transitional housing environment. With this measure, we hope to help some homeless veterans develop the skills necessary to live independently. To help defray costs, residents would be required to pay rent monthly.

Mr. Speaker, this measure also contains provisions to give the Secretary more flexibility in the disposition of properties acquired through the Loan Guaranty Program.

This compromise measure is the result of many hours of hard work. My good friend, SONNY MONTGOMERY, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, should be commended for his leadership in moving this legislation promptly.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend Mr. STAGGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs, and Mr. BURTON, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider favorably this veterans' housing and homeless legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 232, the veterans housing and memorial affairs amendments of 1991.

I would like to commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] for introducing this important measure, and the chairman of the Veterans Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for their unceasing efforts on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

H.R. 232 makes permanent the requirement for notifying veterans of the alternatives to foreclosure; extends certain Department of Veterans Affairs default and appraisal procedures through December 31, 1991; allows VA to contract with Federal agencies to provide therapeutic work for veterans under VA's Rehabilitative Compensated Work Therapy Program; provides the authority to issue certificates of veterans status for use with HUD programs; as well as deletes the requirement that a certain percentage of acquired properties sold by VA be sold with vendee financing.

Mr. Speaker, this important measure confirms the support in Congress for our veterans by increasing the eligibility of loans. These loans will assist veterans who are in temporary financial distress, recovering from substance abuse, and will provide information and counseling to veterans who default on VA guaranteed home loans.

Furthermore, H.R. 232 authorizes the VA to conduct a 4-year transitional housing demonstration program for patients in the VA's Rehabilitative Compensated Work Therapy Program.

Mr. Speaker, more of our Nation's veterans are becoming homeless each day. H.R. 232 takes the necessary steps toward preventing our veterans from living on the streets by establishing a transitional housing demonstration program.

Accordingly, I support this measure, and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

□ 1500

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS], a member of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 232, a bill that will improve the veterans' housing programs. Since I serve on the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am particularly pleased that this legislation will be considered so early in the 102d Congress. This compromise bill contains many of the provisions of a previous bill, a House

resolution passed by the House during the 101st Congress.

The bill authorizes a demonstration project of transitional housing for homeless veterans participating in VA-compensated work therapy programs [CWT]. In addition, the bill allows the Department of Veterans Affairs to sell foreclosed properties at a discount to groups who agree to employ veterans participating in CWT programs. This measure attempts to protect the guaranty and indemnity fund by requiring the Department of Veterans Affairs to counsel veterans who are close to default on their loan. In many cases, counseling or refinancing can prevent foreclosure. I believe it is always better to keep a veteran in his or her home, than to sell foreclosed properties at a discount in auctions.

Although I am very pleased that this legislation was completed so early in the 102d Congress, I am disappointed that one provision was not included in the final measure. For the past several years, I have supported the idea that National Guardsmen and reservists should be allowed to participate in the Veterans' Home Loan Program. Current law does not permit guardsmen and reservists to benefit from this useful program.

As many of my colleagues are aware, the number of reservists and guardsmen serving in Operation Desert Storm is tremendous. My home State of Alabama has one of the highest percentage of reservists protecting our Nation. I believe these men and women should enjoy the same benefits as their counterparts in the active service branches.

I will continue to actively support legislation designed to add these loyal soldiers and sailors to this program. It is the very least we can do.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama about housing coverage for the National Guard and reservists. We certainly will take another look at that next year, but I want to point out to the National Guardsmen and reservists who have been called to active duty that if they serve 180 days, plus 1 day on active duty during the Persian Gulf war, they will be eligible for these housing benefits, and if we pass the veterans' provision that declares for veterans' purposes that this is a war, then they will be eligible after being on active duty for 90 days, so most of the guardsmen and reservists called to active duty will be covered under this veterans housing bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy once again to rise in support of legislation which will assist our Nation's veterans. H.R. 232, the veterans' housing amendments makes a variety of changes in veterans' housing programs, authorizes a demonstration project of transitional housing for homeless veterans and makes other adjustments in the VA-compensated work therapy programs.

I would like to commend chairman MONTGOMERY for his ongoing work in the area of veterans' affairs. We have seen an impressive level of activity on behalf of veterans early in this session of Congress. In addition, I would like to thank the chairman of the Housing and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, Mr. STAGGERS, for his work in bringing this worthwhile legislation to the floor.

The Veterans' Administration is well aware of the housing problems, particularly homelessness, that face many veterans. Along with the rehabilitative Compensation Work Therapy [CWT] Program that is authorized in this bill, H.R. 232 takes important steps to help those veterans participating. This bill would extend the VA's authority to sell foreclosed properties at a discount to people who agree to employ veterans in the CWT Program. The bill also authorizes the VA to conduct a 4-year transitional housing demonstration project for homeless veterans participating in CWT programs. This program would help veterans develop skills and earn income as they struggle for self-sufficiency.

I am encouraged by the work of this committee with respect to homelessness. The pilot program contained in this bill is one which could yield results that will be helpful in trying to end homelessness throughout the United States.

Again, I commend the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for its efforts.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, within the last 2 weeks, approximately, the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the ranking member on the other side, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] have brought to this House important legislation which affects veterans and their families. It is a recognition, I believe, of the sensitivity they have for all veterans in the country and they are acting promptly out of concern for that. They have given relief in the area of the cost of living, agent orange, and disability benefits and other specific legislation, and now today including the one on veterans housing and memorial affairs amendments.

These are important bills that affect every veteran in this country. I think

as one Member of the House who is a veteran, I think it is proper for us to pay our respects to the chairman on both sides who brought this legislation to us. It is meaningful, it is helpful, and it is a recognition that we have the greatest fighting force in the world. We ought to remember that and support all these pieces of legislation.

So Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE] for his remarks.

We have had total support for these bills that we have brought up in the last 3 weeks. This will be our last bill, I am happy to say, for a couple weeks. When we have a vote on this bill, I hope it will be unanimous, as the other bills have been.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today we will be taking up H.R. 232, the Veterans Housing Amendments of 1991. There are a number of excellent provisions in that legislation; however, one of the provisions that is not included is a provision the House adopted last year to extend the home loan program to selected members of the National Guard and Reserves.

I, along with the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY, Mr. BOB STUMP, ranking minority member of the full committee as well as DAN BURTON, ranking minority member of the VA Housing and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee are introducing legislation that would allow members of the Guard and Reserves who are not otherwise qualified the opportunity to participate in the VA Home Loan Program.

Under our legislation, selected reservists with 6 or more years committed to the Guard or Reserves would be eligible to participate in the housing program. My decision to sponsor this legislation last year, as part of H.R. 5002, was prompted by very favorable hearings in Mississippi, Georgia, Virginia, as well as here in Washington.

This legislation is not a quick fix to attract attention to the Persian Gulf situation. It is a well developed proposal that would help attract and retain members of the Guard and Reserves. That was one of the initial reasons why this proposal was initially made; however, given the events of the past 6 months, it is more important now than ever that we continue to work on ways to attract the best persons possible into the citizen-soldier component of our total military force.

I am very pleased that the House supported this provision, last year, prior to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. I am pleased to have this bipartisan support. Although the House Veterans' Affairs is working on other legislation that will look more closely at the Persian Gulf war and ways to properly provide benefits for the men and women fighting in the Persian Gulf area, it is very important that we remember the long-term interest in making the Guard and Reserves programs attractive to continue to keep that component of our fighting force

strong into the next century. The legislation we introduce today will do that.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman in support of H.R. 232, the veterans housing and memorial affairs amendments of 1991. This bill includes provisions of several measures considered by the committee during the 101st Congress, in particular H.R. 5002, which was passed by the House but not considered by the Senate.

H.R. 232 contains a variety of provisions to assist homeless veterans, as well as those in the Compensated Work Therapy [CWT] Program. In addition, the legislation will allow veterans to use the increased entitlement for DVA-guaranteed, interest rate reduction financing loans.

H.R. 232 also expands the authority of the Department of Veterans Affairs [DVA] to contract with Federal agencies, in addition to private and nonprofit entities, to provide therapeutic work for veterans under the DVA's rehabilitative CWT Program.

Furthermore, the DVA is directed to conduct a 4-year transitional housing program for homeless veterans participating in the CWT Program. This is a significant program in that it requires each CWT patient to pay rent to live in the transitional housing, and permits these veterans to develop job skills and a steady income before being discharged into the local community.

In particular, the DVA would be authorized to purchase or lease property for the program, prescribe regulations for operation of the program, and establish qualifications for house managers of transitional housing units.

In order to assist veterans and their families, H.R. 232 would also allow the Secretary, through nonprofit organizations, to make foreclosed property available at a discount to needy veterans. Furthermore, this legislation makes permanent the requirement for notifying veterans of alternatives to foreclosure, as well as the availability of counseling by the DVA.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 232, a compromise package enhancing veterans' rights and responsibilities by making significant changes in existing law.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 232, the Veterans Housing and Memorial Affairs Amendments of 1991. This bill incorporates the provisions of several measures considered during the 101st Congress, primarily H.R. 5002, the Veterans Housing and Homeless Amendments of 1990.

As some of my colleagues may recall, H.R. 5002 was passed by the House in July of last year. Unfortunately, this bill was not considered by the other body before the close of Congress.

The chairman of the Housing and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee has described in great detail the provisions of H.R. 232. I, too, would like to highlight a few important provisions of this bill which I believe make this bill worthy of our support.

The first provision I would like to highlight involves the disposal of foreclosed VA properties. It is a sad fact, but each year the VA acquires a number of properties through foreclosure. These properties must be disposed of by the VA.

Under current law, the VA is required to sell a fixed percentage of these properties with vendee financing. Unfortunately, this requirement often prevents the VA from disposing of these properties quickly as cash sales. As a result, the VA often must pay more in administrative costs associated to maintain these properties. By deleting the requirement that a certain percentage of acquired properties sold by the VA be sold with vendee financing, we can give the VA the flexibility it needs to dispose of these properties both quickly and profitably.

Finally, I would like to point out one last provision of H.R. 232 which targets our homeless veterans. Specifically, it allows the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to contract with Federal agencies in order to provide therapeutic work for veterans under the DVA's Rehabilitative Compensated Work Therapy [CWT] Program. Under prior law, the Secretary was limited to contracting only with private and nonprofit entities. I believe that this provision will give the Secretary the flexibility he needs to help our veterans lead productive and successful lives.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Housing and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee, Mr. STAGGERS, for all his hard work on this legislation. I would also like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. MONTGOMERY, for the speed with which he has brought this bill to the house floor.

I urge my colleagues to support the Veterans Housing and Homeless Amendments of 1990.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 232, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie	Bennett	Callahan
Ackerman	Bentley	Camp
Alexander	Bereuter	Campbell (CA)
Allard	Berman	Campbell (CO)
Anderson	Bevill	Cardin
Andrews (ME)	Bilbray	Carper
Andrews (NJ)	Billirakis	Carr
Andrews (TX)	Billey	Chandler
Annunzio	Boehlert	Chapman
Applegate	Boehner	Clay
Archer	Bonior	Clement
Armey	Borski	Clinger
Aspin	Boucher	Coble
Atkins	Boxer	Coleman (MO)
AuCoin	Brewster	Coleman (TX)
Bacchus	Brooks	Collins (IL)
Baker	Broomfield	Collins (MI)
Ballenger	Browder	Combest
Barnard	Brown	Condit
Barrett	Bruce	Conyers
Bartlett	Bryant	Cooper
Barton	Bunning	Costello
Bateman	Burton	Coughlin
Bellenson	Byron	Cox (CA)

Cox (IL) Hughes  
Coyne Hunter  
Cramer Hutto  
Crane Hyde  
Cunningham Inhofe  
Dannemeyer Jacobs  
Darden James  
Davis Jefferson  
DeFazio Jenkins  
DeLauro Johnson (CT)  
DeLay Johnson (SD)  
Dellums Johnston  
Derrick Jones (GA)  
Dickinson Jones (NC)  
Dicks Jontz  
Dingell Kanjorski  
Dixon Kaptur  
Dooley Kasich  
Doolittle Kennelly  
Dorgan (ND) Kildee  
Dorman (CA) Kleczka  
Downey Klug  
Dreier Kolbe  
Duncan Koiter  
Durbin Kopetski  
Dwyer Kostmayer  
Eckart Kyl  
Edwards (CA) LaFalce  
Edwards (OK) Lagomarsino  
Emerson Lancaster  
Engel Lantos  
English LaRocco  
Erdreich Laughlin  
Espy Leach  
Evans Lehman (CA)  
Fascell Lehman (FL)  
Fawell Lent  
Fazio Levin (MI)  
Feighan Lewis (CA)  
Fields Lewis (GA)  
Fish Lightfoot  
Flake Lipinski  
Foglietta Livingston  
Ford (MI) Lloyd  
Frank (MA) Long  
Franks (CT) Lowery (CA)  
Frost Lowey (NY)  
Gallegly Luken  
Gallo Machtley  
Gaydos Madigan  
Gejdenson Manton  
Gekas Markey  
Gephardt Marlenee  
Geren Martin  
Gibbons Martinez  
Gilchrest Matsui  
Gillmor Mavroules  
Gilman Mazzoli  
Gingrich McCandless  
Glickman McCloskey  
Gonzalez McCollum  
Goodling McCrery  
Goss McCurdy  
Gradison McDermott  
Grandy McEwen  
Gray McGrath  
Green McHugh  
Guarini McMillan (NC)  
Gunderson McMillan (MD)  
Hall (OH) McNulty  
Hall (TX) Meyers  
Hamilton Mfume  
Hammerschmidt Michel  
Hancock Miller (CA)  
Hansen Miller (WA)  
Harris Mineta  
Hastert Mink  
Hatcher Moakley  
Hayes (IL) Molinari  
Hayes (LA) Mollohan  
Hefley Montgomery  
Hefner Moody  
Henry Moorhead  
Herger Moran  
Hertel Morella  
Hoagland Morrison  
Hobson Mrazek  
Hochbrueckner Murphy  
Holloway Murtha  
Hopkins Myers  
Horn Nagle  
Horton Natcher  
Houghton Neal (MA)  
Hoyer Neal (NC)  
Hubbard Nichols  
Huckabay Nowak

Nussle  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Swift  
Synar  
Tallon  
Tanner  
Tausin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Traxler  
Unsoeld  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Washington  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weber  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wolpe  
Wyden  
Wyllie  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NAYS—0

## NOT VOTING—23

Anthony  
Bustamante  
Conte  
de la Garza  
Donnelly  
Pickle  
Dymally  
Early  
Edwards (TX)  
Ford (TN)  
Gordon  
Ireland  
Kennedy  
Levine (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
McDade  
Miller (OH)  
Owens (UT)  
Rostenkowski  
Savage  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Udall  
Weiss

□ 1532

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on H.R. 232, veterans housing and memorial affairs amendments of 1991.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in Florida, I was not present to vote on today's resolutions. I would like to take this opportunity to state that I would have voted in favor of H.R. 232, the veterans housing and memorial affairs amendments of 1991.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in an important meeting with the Secretary of the Air Force during the vote on rollcall No. 21. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "Yea" on H.R. 232, the veterans housing amendments.

## ESTABLISHING THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER, THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, AND THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 51 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 51

Resolved,

## TITLE I—SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

## ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 101. There is hereby established in the House of Representatives a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Hunger (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "select committee").

## FUNCTIONS

SEC. 102. (a) The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction. The select committee shall have authority—

(1) to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the problems of hunger and malnutrition, including but not limited to, those issues addressed in the reports of the Presidential Commission on World Hunger and the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, which issues include—

(A) the United States development and economic assistance program and the executive branch structure responsible for administering the program;

(B) world food security;

(C) trade relations between the United States and less developed countries;

(D) food production and distribution;

(E) corporate and agribusiness efforts to further international development;

(F) policies of multilateral development banks and international development institutions; and

(G) food assistance programs in the United States;

(2) to review any recommendations made by the President, or by any department or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, relating to programs or policies affecting hunger or malnutrition; and

(3) to recommend to the appropriate committees of the House legislation or other action the select committee considers necessary with respect to programs or policies affecting hunger or malnutrition.

(b) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to limit or alter the legislative and oversight jurisdiction of any standing committee of the House under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 103. (a) The select committee shall be composed of thirty-three Members of the House, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman.

(b) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Members" shall include any Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives.

## AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 104. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this title the select committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the select committee except the provisions of clause

2(m)(1)(B) of rule XI relating to subpoena power.

(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of clause 2(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the select committee.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 105. (a) Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the select committee may incur expenses in connection with its duties under this title.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this title, the select committee is authorized—

(1) to appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

(2) to utilize the services of the staffs of those committees of the House from which Members have been selected for membership on the select committee;

(3) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

(4) to fix the compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate as provided by clause 6(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives;

(5) to terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and

(6) to reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee held in the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS AND RECORDS

SEC. 106. (a) The select committee shall submit an annual report to the House which shall include a summary of the activities of the select committee during the calendar year to which the report applies.

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

(c) The records, files, and materials of the select committee shall be transferred to the Clerk of the House.

#### TITLE II—SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

##### ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 201. There is hereby established in the House of Representatives a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "select committee").

##### FUNCTIONS

SEC. 202. (a) The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction. The select committee shall have authority—

(1) to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and review of the problems of children, youth, and families, including but not limited to income maintenance, health (including medical and child development research), nutrition, education, welfare, employment, and recreation;

(2) to study the use of all practical means and methods of encouraging the development of public and private programs and politics which will assist American children and youth in taking a full part in national life and becoming productive citizens; and

(3) to develop policies that would encourage the coordination of both governmental and private programs designed to address the problems of childhood and adolescence.

(b) Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to limit or alter the legislative and oversight jurisdiction of any standing committee of the House under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

##### APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 203. (a) The select committee shall be composed of thirty-six Members of the House, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, and one of whom he shall designate as chairman.

(b) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Members" shall include any Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives.

##### AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 204. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this title, the select committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the select committee.

(c) Nothing contained in subsection (a) of this section shall be construed to limit the applicability of clause 2(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the select committee.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 205. (a) Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the select committee may incur expenses in connection with its duties under this title.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this title, the select committee is authorized—

(1) to appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

(2) to utilize the services of the staffs of those committees of the House from which Members have been selected for membership on the select committee;

(3) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

(4) to fix the compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate as provided by clause 6(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives;

(5) to terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and

(6) to reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee held in the District of Columbia.

##### REPORTS AND RECORDS

SEC. 206. (a) The select committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

(c) Any such report shall be referred to the Committee or committees having jurisdiction over the budget matter thereof.

(d) The records, files, and materials of the select committee shall be transferred to the Clerk of the House.

#### TITLE III—SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

##### ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 301. There is hereby established in the House of Representatives a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "select committee").

##### FUNCTIONS

SEC. 302. The select committee shall not have legislative jurisdiction. The select committee shall have authority—

(1) to conduct a continuing oversight and review of the problems of narcotics, drug, and polydrug abuse and control, including (but not limited to) the study and review of (A) the abuse and control of opium and its derivatives, other narcotic drugs, psychotropics, and other controlled substances, as defined in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, and any such drug or substance when used in combination with any other substance; (B) domestic and international trafficking, manufacturing, and distribution; (C) treatment, prevention, and rehabilitation; (D) narcotics-related violations of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; (E) international treaties and agreements relating to the control of narcotics and drug abuse; (F) the role of organized crime in narcotics and drug abuse; (G) problems of narcotics and drug abuse and control in the Armed Forces of the United States; (H) problems of narcotics and drug abuse and control in industry; and (I) the approach of the criminal justice system with respect to narcotics and drug law violations and crimes related to drug abuse;

(2) to review any recommendations made by the President, or by any department or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government, relating to programs or policies affecting narcotics or drug abuse or control; and

(3) to recommend to the appropriate committees of the House legislation or other action the select committee considers necessary with respect to programs or policies affecting narcotics or drug abuse or control.

##### APPOINTMENT AND MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 303. (a) The select committee shall be composed of thirty-five Members of the House, who shall be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. At least one member of the select committee shall be chosen from each of the following committees of the House: The Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(b) Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "Members" shall include any Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the House of Representatives.

##### AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 304. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this title, the select committee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the

United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary.

(b) The provisions of clauses 1, 2, and 3 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the select committee.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 305. (a) Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the select committee may incur expenses in connection with its duties under this title.

(b) In carrying out its functions under this title, the select committee is authorized—

(1) to appoint, either on a permanent basis or as experts or consultants, such staff as the select committee considers necessary;

(2) to prescribe the duties and responsibilities of such staff;

(3) to fix the compensation of such staff at a single per annum gross rate as provided by clause 6(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives;

(4) to terminate the employment of any such staff as the select committee considers appropriate; and

(5) to reimburse members of the select committee and of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties and responsibilities for the select committee, other than expenses in connection with any meeting of the select committee held in the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS

SEC. 306. (a)(1) The select committee shall report to the House with respect to the results of any field investigation or inspection it conducts.

(2) The select committee shall submit an annual report to the House which shall include a summary of the activities of the select committee during the calendar year to which the report applies.

(3) The select committee shall report to the House its recommendations for a comprehensive program to control the worldwide problem of drug abuse and drug trafficking.

(b) Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MOAKLEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on House Resolution 51 be limited to not more than 1½ hours.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary one-half of the debate time, in this instance, 45 minutes, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] pending which I yield myself

such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 51 will establish three House select committees and set their total membership for the 102d Congress: The Select Committee on Hunger which will have 33 members; the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families which will have 36 members; and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control which will have 35 members.

None of the select committees will have legislative jurisdiction but each will be charged with the responsibility of studying problems in their respective subject areas and recommending practical solutions to the House. The Speaker will appoint the membership of each select committee and designate one member from each select committee to serve as its chairman.

The select committees will be authorized to sit and act and will be bound by the House rules which relate to standing committees. Each select committee will be authorized to hire staff and incur expenses only upon the adoption by the House of a separate funding resolution reported from the Committee on House Administration.

The House has authorized the establishment of these select committees in past Congresses and the Rules Committee feels that their establishment once again is an important step which the House of the 102d Congress ought to take.

Mr. Speaker, as all of our colleagues are aware, there are many serious problems which face our country and the world. Of these problems, hunger is the most acute, persistent, and difficult to solve. Since the end of World War II our Nation has endeavored to find ways to solve the problem of hunger and malnutrition. More than 40,000 people die each day of hunger or complications related to severe malnutrition. That amounts to a staggering 14.6 million people annually. In 1980 alone, the World Bank estimates that 730 million people were unable to obtain enough food to consistently maintain good health.

Progress has been made in alleviating hunger but much remains to be done. By establishing the Select Committee on Hunger, the House will demonstrate its continuing commitment to seek out practical solutions that can have major impact on hunger and its consequences. In the past four Congresses, the Select Committee on Hunger and its task forces on domestic and international hunger have brought such proposals before the legislative committees of the House.

Enactment of House Resolution 51 will allow the select committee to continue to provide this valuable service to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families which House Resolution 51 will establish is well-suited to deal with a number of other crises facing our Nation.

The select committee investigations in the last Congress revealed that the proportion of children living in poverty has increased dramatically during the past decade. One in every 5 children under the age of 18 is poor and of children under the age of 6, the ratio rises to 1 in 4. Poverty is more prevalent in single parent families, especially those headed by a female. The number of children who will spend some part of their childhood in a single parent family has grown from 17 percent in 1980 to 20 percent in 1988. During that same period the number of children living in a family with a female head of the household increased by 21 percent.

Violent crime has always been detrimental to the social development and safety of children, but within the last decade homicide has become the second leading cause of death for 15- to 24-year-olds. It is the fourth leading cause of death for 1- to 4-year-olds and 5- to 14-year-olds. Even though these homicides are not all directly related to drug activities taking place in neighborhoods across this country, they can be traced to the culture of violence which is continually fueled by drug trafficking.

Another issue which we should be especially concerned about is health care for children. Presently, 1 in 7 children live in families which have no health care insurance coverage, even though many of their parents are in the work force. To not act and address this problem more aggressively means that costs for emergency and long-term care will increase as these children enter adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, the select committee has played a major role in identifying these problems, helping Congress understand their cause, and providing leadership in the pursuit of adequate solutions which are both compassionate and cost-effective.

Reestablishment of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families will allow the House to continue to benefit from the expertise which has been demonstrated by its Members. Historically our Nation has found its strength within the family. Therefore, it is our duty to continue to develop policies which address the causes of the problems which destroy the family.

Mr. Speaker, the work and accomplishments of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control are well-known. The select committee under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. RANGEL, has led the way in the Congress' continued commitment to the war on drugs.

The pervasive and destructive nature of illegal drug abuse continues to tear at the fabric of our society. Over the

past few years, there has been marked improvement in the interdiction and enforcement areas and the number of American drug abusers has declined from 23 million in 1985 to 14.5 million in 1988. Still heroin and cocaine continue to cross our borders at unacceptable levels. At the same time a thriving domestic marijuana industry has come into being to replace failing marijuana imports. Even with the decline in drug usage, drug trafficking remains a \$100 billion a year business and the annual economic costs are estimated at \$60 billion. Drug abuse is the basic cause of the dramatic surge in the rate of violent crime.

The Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control played a major role in the development of the Crime Control Act of 1991, and the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986 and 1988 by advocating new initiatives in all facets of our Nation's response to this terrible problem. The value of their oversight and advice to the House cannot be measured. Now as the effects of recent legislation begin to take hold, it is imperative that we reconstitute the select committee, in order that they may continue to oversee the implementation of these programs and advise the House on any modifications or additions to the laws which may be needed to help end the crisis of drug abuse in America.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to inform Members that the question on this resolution may be divided. If any Member so desires there may be a separate vote on each of the three titles of the resolution. However, I do not intend to demand a division of the question. I urge my colleagues to adopt this resolution. Establishment of these select committees will be a crucial first step in the development of solutions to the many problems which face our Nation today.

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

□ 1540

Mr. Speaker, once again we are considering a resolution to create for the next 2 years, a Select Committee on Hunger; a Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families; and a Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

The House has been through all of this before on several occasions. As of today, the Select Committee on Hunger has existed for almost 7 years; the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families for over 8 years; and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control for over 14 years.

According to guidelines for the establishment of select committees issued by the Rules Committee in 1983, a select committee is supposed to exist for a limited amount of time in order to achieve a clearly defined purpose. Mr. Speaker, to continue these select com-

mittees indefinitely is not a satisfactory solution.

At some point the House is going to have to either make these select committees permanent or else reincorporate them into the standing committee structure. And when we do it, Mr. Speaker, the entire standing committee structure should be realigned along lines that more nearly reflect the needs of the 1990's.

As far as the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control is concerned, the time to change is now. After 14 years it no longer makes sense to continue dealing with a long-term major problem like drug abuse by relying on a short-term limited solution like a select committee. It is time to establish a permanent standing committee on drug abuse and control.

I should note that in material submitted to the Rules Committee in support of its request for reestablishment, the chairman of Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, Mr. RANGEL, included the following:

Ultimately, if the House is to maintain a leadership role in drug abuse prevention and control, it should consider the establishment of a permanent mechanism for comprehensive oversight of drug abuse issues.

Mr. Speaker, the time is now!

The executive branch has one drug czar to coordinate the actual implementation of our national drug policy, but the Congress in planning that policy has dozens of committees and subcommittees all claiming jurisdiction over part of the drug problem.

According to the most recent information available through the Congressional Research Service, the House alone has a total of 54 committees and subcommittees with legislative jurisdiction over narcotics. And that does not include the Budget or the Appropriations Committees which would be involved in funding the various programs. Nor does it include the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, since it has no legislative jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, we need one committee with the mandate to focus on the problem and the power to report legislation dealing with the problem.

Yesterday, I along with three of my colleagues on the Rules Committee introduced a resolution to do just that.

The resolution we have introduced would not take away jurisdiction from any committee which currently has it. The proposal would provide that bills dealing with drug abuse be initially referred by the Speaker only to the Committee on Drug Abuse and Control. However, after being reported by the committee, the bills could then be referred by the Speaker to any other standing committee which has jurisdiction, subject to appropriate time limitations.

For bills which cover subjects other than just drugs, such as the Depart-

ment of Justice authorization, the Drug Abuse and Control Committee would not have the same kind of primary authority. Instead it would have split, sequential or joint authority for those portions relating to drugs, under the regular referral process.

The resolution would also abolish the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control when the standing committee is established. This would occur 90 days after the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the Rules Committee the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEIL-ENSON], and the ranking member, Mr. DREIER, also from California, committed to hold subcommittee hearings on our proposal.

With that assurance, Mr. Speaker, I will support this package today, while continuing to press for a better long-term solution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], the very distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger, for purposes of debate only.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker I rise in support of House Resolution 51. The resolution provides for three select committees of the House during the 102d Congress. All three committees are valuable assets to this House, and this country. I am proud to be the chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger.

Over 400 private, advocacy, and charitable organizations support the creation of the select committee in the 102d Congress. Under leave to include extraneous matter, I will insert the list of those organizations into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Select Committee on Hunger is a valuable asset to this House. Our job is to investigate the problems of hunger here at home and around the world. I think we do that job very well.

We've had some successes in the past years, on the WIC Program shortfall, on relief to Angola, Ethiopia, and Sudan, on helping the world's refugees.

The Hunger Committee—the issue of hunger—cuts across party lines. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is more than my ranking Republican; he is a friend and a partner in the fight against hunger. We're fortunate to have two excellent and committed members chairing the two committee task forces, BYRON DORGAN on international hunger and MIKE ESPY on domestic.

We're fortunate to have an excellent and committed staff. They're hard working people, who are dedicated to helping the poor and the hungry around the world.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Hunger is making a dif-

ference. I ask my colleagues to let them continue to make a difference.

When a country goes to war, it's easy to forget some things: The homeless, the children who live in poverty, the millions of Americans who depend on food stamps. The Hunger Committee helps us to remember.

Hunger is an enemy a thousand times older—and a thousand times deadlier—than Saddam Hussein. Hunger and poverty kill 40,000 American children every year. It kills 40,000 of the world's children every day.

My friend Mickey Leland devoted his life to the war on hunger. But Mickey believed—as I do—that the war on hunger is one we can win. It's a war that has no losers, only winners.

Hungry people don't have an army, they don't have political action committees; they don't have lobbyists. But they do have a representative in Washington—the Hunger Committee. We're the advocates for the poor and the hungry; we're the voice for the voiceless.

There is no more important issue in the world today than helping the millions of poor and hungry people in the world. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and support the Select Committee on Hunger.

COALITION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER 1991-92

Academy for International Development.  
ACCION International.  
Action for Corporate Accountability.  
Action in the Community Through Service.  
Adventist Development and Relief Agency International (ADRA).  
AFL-CIO.  
African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF).  
African Methodist Episcopal Church—Development Committee.  
African-American Institute.  
Africare.  
Agricultural Cooperative Development International.  
Agriculture Council of America.  
AIDS Action Council.  
Alan Guttmacher Institute.  
Alternatives.  
America's Development Foundation.  
American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.  
American Agriculture Movement, Inc.  
American Association for Ethiopian Jews.  
American Association for International Aging.  
American Association of Port Authorities.  
American Association of Retired Persons.  
American Association of School Administrators (AASA).  
American Association of University Women.  
American Association of World Health.  
American Association on Mental Retardation (AAMR).  
American Dietetic Association.  
American Federation of State, County, & Municipal Employees.  
American Forum: Education in a Global Age, Inc.  
American Great Lakes Ports.  
American Home Economics Association.  
American Institute of Cooperation.  
American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

American Jewish World Service.  
American Maritime Congress.  
American Medical Students Association.  
American Nurses' Association.  
American Public Health Association.  
American School Food Service Association.  
American Society of Allied Health Professionals.  
American Welfare Association.  
American Youth Work Center.  
American-Near East Refugee Aid (ANERA).  
Americans Against World Hunger.  
Americares Foundation, Inc.  
Arrowhead Food Bank.  
Association for Childhood Education International.  
Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs.  
Association of State & Territorial Public Health Nutrition Directors.  
Association of State & Territorial Public Health Officials.  
Association on Third World Affairs, Inc.  
Audrain County Human Resources Development.  
B'nai B'rith.  
Banking Information Center.  
Baptist World Alliance.  
Blue Ridge EMC.  
Border Agricultural Worker's Union/Proyecto Organizativo Sin Fronteras.  
Bread Basket of Northeastern Pennsylvania, Inc.  
Bread for the City, Inc.  
Bread for the World.  
Break Through Foundation.  
Bretton Woods Committee.  
Brother's Brother Foundation.  
California Action Network (CAN).  
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation.  
Campaign to End Hunger.  
Capitol Area Community Food Bank.  
CARE.  
Casa de Peregrinos.  
Catholic Charities, USA.  
Catholic Relief Services (CRS).  
Center for Community Change.  
Center for Development & Population Activities.  
Center for Ecumenical Aid to Transients (CEAT).  
Center for Health Services, Research and Development.  
Center for Science in the Public Interest.  
Center of Concern.  
Center on Budget & Policy Priorities.  
Cesarean Prevention Movement.  
Channels.  
Child Care Food Program Sponsors Forum.  
Child Welfare League of America.  
Children's Defense Fund.  
Children's Foundation.  
Children's Survival Fund.  
Chittenden Emergency Food Bank.  
Christian Children's Fund.  
Church Women United.  
Church World Service.  
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs.  
Clergy and Laity Concerned.  
Coalition for Food Aid Policy & Programs.  
Coalition for Peace in the Horn of Africa.  
Coalition for Women in International Development.  
Colorado Department of Agriculture.  
Common Ground Ministries.  
Community Food Bank of Clark County.  
Community Nutrition Institute (CNI).  
Community Stew Pot, Inc.  
Concern America.  
Consortium of Citizens with Development Disabilities.

Consumer Federation of America.  
Consumer Union.  
Continuing Recovery Center, Inc.  
Cooperative Housing Foundation.  
Cooperative Insurance—International Affairs, League Insurance Companies.  
Council for International Development.  
Council for Responsible Nutrition.  
Council for Rural Housing and Development.  
Cranks Creek Survival Center.  
Cultural Survival.  
D.C. Coalition for the Homeless.  
Dare to Care.  
Delmarva Rural Ministries.  
Development GAP.  
Development International, Inc.  
Direct Relief International.  
District 1 MEBA/NMU, AFL-CIO.  
Domestic Social Development, United States Catholic Conference.  
Empire State Family Farm Alliance.  
End Hunger Network.  
EPIC.  
Epilepsy Foundation of America.  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.  
Experiment in International Living.  
Family Life Support Center.  
Family Tree, Inc.  
Farm Labor Organization Committee (FLOC).  
Farmworker Justice Fund, Inc.  
Federation of Southern Cooperatives.  
Feed the Children.  
Food Bank of Northern Nevada.  
Food for All.  
Food for Famine.  
Food for the Hungry, Inc.  
Food Lifeline.  
Food Research & Action Center (FRAC).  
Food Trust.  
Foreman and Heidepriem.  
Foundation for International Community Assistance (FINCA).  
Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific.  
Freedom from Hunger Foundation.  
French (Col.), National Director, The Salvation Army.  
Friends Committee on National Legislation.  
Friends of VISTA.  
General Federation of Women's Clubs.  
Global Tomorrow Coalition.  
Global Water.  
Good Samaritan Inn.  
Goodwill Industries of America.  
Grassroots International.  
Gray Panthers.  
H.O.P.E.  
Habitative System, Inc.  
Health and Human Rights Coalition of the Harvard School of Public Health.  
Health Education Associates, Inc.  
Health Volunteers Overseas.  
Heifer Project International.  
Helen Keller International.  
Hopkins, Raymond F.  
Housing Assistance Council.  
Houston Food Bank.  
Human Development Center of Mississippi.  
Hunger Action Coalition of Southern Michigan.  
Hunger Project.  
Hunger Project, International.  
Hunger Services Network.  
In Our Own Way.  
INSA.  
Institute for Development Anthropology.  
Institute for Food and Development Policy/Food First.  
Institute for Transportation and Development Policy.  
Institute for Culture Affairs—Development Education.

- InterAction.  
 Interchurch Medical Assistance, Inc.  
 Interfaith Hunger Appeal.  
 Interfaith Hunger Coalition.  
 Interfaith IMPACT.  
 Interfaith Nutrition Network, Inc.  
 International Center for Research on Women.  
 International Child Health Foundation.  
 International Eye Foundation.  
 International Rescue Committee.  
 International Trade and Development Foundation.  
 International Union, UAW.  
 International Voluntary Service.  
 International Women's Health Coalition.  
 Iowa Farm Unity Coalition/Prairiefire Rural Action.  
 Jesuit Refugee Service.  
 Just Harvest: A Center for Action Against Hunger.  
 Khidmah Corporation.  
 Kids First, Inc.  
 Land O'Lakes, Inc.  
 League of Rural Voters.  
 Lifelines Emergency Shelter, Inc.  
 Los Angeles Regional Food Bank.  
 Los Niños.  
 Love's Gift.  
 Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod.  
 Lutheran Family Mission.  
 Lutheran World Relief.  
 Maine Department of Agriculture.  
 MAP International.  
 Maritime Institute for Research & Industrial Development.  
 Martha's Table.  
 Maryland Food Committee.  
 Mayer, Dr. Jean, President, Tufts University.  
 MCD International.  
 Medical Care Development, Inc.  
 Meehan Seaway Service, Inc.  
 Mennonite Central Committee.  
 Mercy Corps International.  
 Michigan Department of Agriculture.  
 Miller's National Federation.  
 Minnesota Association of Cooperatives.  
 Minnesota Department of Agriculture.  
 Minnesota Food Education & Resource Center.  
 Mississippi Department of Human Services.  
 Missouri Rural Crisis Center.  
 Montgomery State Farmers Market Demonstration Committee.  
 National Alliance to End Homelessness.  
 National American Indian Housing Council.  
 National Anti-Hunger Coalition.  
 National Association for Hispanic Elderly.  
 National Association of Community Action Agencies.  
 National Association of Community Health Centers, Inc.  
 National Association of Counties.  
 National Association of Elementary School Principals.  
 National Association of Social Workers.  
 National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC).  
 National Association of State Community Service Programs.  
 National Association of Wheat Growers.  
 National Association of WIC Directors.  
 National Audubon Society.  
 National Black Child Development Institute.  
 National Black Nurses Association, Inc.  
 National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health.  
 National Central America Health Rights Network.  
 National Coalition for the Homeless.  
 National Coalition of Hispanic Health & Human Service Organizations.  
 National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy.  
 National Community Development Association.  
 National Congress for Community Economic Development.  
 National Congress of American Indians.  
 National Consumers League.  
 National Cooperative Bank.  
 National Cooperative Business Association.  
 National Corn Growers Association.  
 National Council for International Health.  
 National Council of Catholic Women.  
 National Council of Farmers Cooperatives.  
 National Council of Jewish Women.  
 National Council of La Raza.  
 National Council of Negro Women.  
 National Council of Returned Peace Corps Volunteers.  
 National Council of Senior Citizens.  
 National Council on Aging.  
 National Education Association (NEA).  
 National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Associations.  
 National Farmers Union.  
 National Governor's Association.  
 National Grange.  
 National Hispanic Council on Aging.  
 National Institute for Hispanic Children and Families/El Centro Rosemount.  
 National Institute for Women of Color.  
 National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association.  
 National Milk Producers.  
 National Organization on Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting.  
 National Resources Defense Council.  
 National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.  
 National Soybean Processors Association.  
 National Urban Coalition.  
 National Urban League, Inc.  
 National Women's Health Network.  
 National Women's Political Caucus.  
 Near-East Foundation.  
 Nebraska Department of Agriculture.  
 Nebraska League of Rural Voters.  
 Nebraska Pantry Network of Inter-Faith Church Ministries of Nebraska.  
 New Horizons for New Hampshire, Inc.  
 New Transcendental Foundation.  
 North American Indian Women's Association.  
 North Carolina Coalition of Farm and Rural Families.  
 North Dakota Department of Agriculture.  
 North-South Connection.  
 OEF International.  
 Ohio Department of Agriculture, State of Ohio.  
 Ohio Hunger Task Force.  
 Older Women's League.  
 Operation Blessing.  
 Operation California.  
 Opportunities Industrialization Centers International (OICI).  
 Overseas Cooperative Development Committee.  
 Overseas Development Council (ODC).  
 Oxfam America.  
 Pan-American Development Foundation.  
 Partners for Improved Nutrition and Health.  
 Partners for the Americas.  
 Partnership Assistance to the Homeless.  
 Partnership for the Homeless.  
 Pathfinder Fund.  
 PAX World Foundation.  
 Peace Corps Institute.  
 Pennsylvania Farmers Union.  
 People for Progress.  
 Phelps-Stokes Fund.  
 Philabundance.  
 Physicians Task Force on Hunger.  
 Pilmoor Memorial United Methodist Church Emergency Food Center.  
 PLAN International.  
 Planned Parenthood Federation of America.  
 Planned Parenthood New York City, Inc.  
 Population Crisis Committee.  
 Population Institute.  
 Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief—The Episcopal Church.  
 Private Agencies Collaborating Together (PACT).  
 Project Bread.  
 Project Bread Hotline.  
 Project Concern International.  
 Project FEED, Inc.  
 Project FREE—Family Rehabilitation Education Effort.  
 Project Outreach, Inc.—East Oakland Food Pantry.  
 Project SOUP.  
 Protein Grain Products International.  
 Public Voice for Food & Health Policy.  
 Refugee Voices.  
 RESULTS.  
 Rice Millers Association.  
 Rural Advancement Fund.  
 Rural Coalition.  
 Rural Vermont.  
 Saint John Social Service Center.  
 Saunders, William, Executive Director, National Alliance of Black School Educators.  
 Save the Children.  
 Seaway Port Authority of Duluth.  
 Second Harvest.  
 Second Harvest Saint Paul Food Bank.  
 SEEDS.  
 Self Help, Incorporated.  
 Share Our Strength (SOS).  
 Share Our Surplus.  
 Sierra Club.  
 Sister Cities International.  
 Society for Nutrition Education.  
 Somerville Community Corporation.  
 South Carolina Department of Agriculture.  
 South Central Pennsylvania Food Bank.  
 Southern Health Association.  
 Standing Rock Sioux Tribe—Tribal Health Office.  
 State Economic Opportunity Office, State of Vermont.  
 Sunshine Rescue Mission.  
 TCR Services.  
 Technoserve.  
 Tennessee Hunger Coalition.  
 Texas Department of Agriculture.  
 Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.  
 Transport Institute.  
 Trees for Life, Inc.  
 Trickle Up Program.  
 Tucker-Foreman, Carol, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.  
 Unitarian Universalist Service Committee.  
 United Auto Workers.  
 United Church of Christ.  
 United Food & Commercial Workers International Union.  
 United Nations Association, USA.  
 United States Committee for Refugees.  
 United States Committee for UNICEF.  
 United States Conference of Mayors.  
 United Steel Workers.  
 United Way of America.  
 Unity House.  
 Urban Dreams.  
 Utahns Against Hunger.  
 Vermont Department of Agriculture.  
 Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA).  
 Volunteers in Technical Assistance (VITA).

Washington State Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

We Care Community Service, Inc.  
We Care, Inc.

Western Great Lakes Maritime.

Women's Equity Action League (WEAL).

Women's Lunch Place.

Women's National Democratic Club.

World Concern Development Organization.

World Council of Credit Unions (WCCU).

World Education, Inc.

World Hunger Education Service.

World Hunger Year.

World Neighbors.

World Relief.

World Runners.

World Share.

World Vision.

Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA), Washington, DC.

Zero Population Growth.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I want to point out in the very short period for this debate on the floor of the House, about 3,000 children will die of hunger in this world. The winds of hunger blow every day across this globe. But they do not produce headlines or news. It is still a tragedy, though.

It is not a disease for which we do not have a cure. All of us know what causes these 40,000 deaths each day. The question is how can we in public policy develop programs and shine spotlights on world hunger in the world to try to help people who desperately need help.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Hunger does wonderful work to respond to a crushing problem that affects millions of people in this world. I believe that we should continue its invaluable work.

In my district we produce food in great abundance and store it in grain elevators. Those who produce it do not get a decent price. Yet in other parts of the world people are dying because they do not have enough to eat.

Mr. Speaker, we must put together approaches and policies that will solve this crushing problem of world hunger; the mismatch of surplus food and those who hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for his work, the ranking minority member, Mr. EMERSON, and ask Members to support this very important select committee in order that it may continue its work in the 102d Congress to combat this world tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 51, which would reauthorize the Select Committee on Hunger; Children, Youth, and Families; and Narcotics Abuse and Control. All three have helped to focus the work of Congress on a critical issue, which might have otherwise received inadequate attention.

As the chairman of the International Task Force of the Select Committee on Hunger, I want to urge my colleagues to join in a unanimous vote of support to reauthorize the Select Committee on Hunger.

The Hunger Committee has fulfilled its mandate with distinction. With a very modest, but hardworking staff, it has consistently and persistently raised the issues of international and domestic hunger and offered effective recommendations for curbing hunger, malnutrition, and related problems. It has served to coordinate the work of many other committees, under whose jurisdiction the subject of hunger is too widely spread to develop coherent responses to mankind's most ancient enemy.

Under the leadership of our late colleague, Chairman Mickey Leland, the committee brought into view for the entire world the staggering dimensions of hunger in Ethiopia and Sudan. Our current chairman, TONY HALL, has expanded this compass to include the pressing needs of refugees, children, and other nations that fight the daily battle of hunger. Both attacked the vexing problem of global hunger, but neither failed to address the scandal of malnutrition in our own Nation.

Both chairmen have traveled with me to Indian reservations in North Dakota where they witnessed that tragedy of grinding poverty and severe malnutrition in an affluent nation. The Three Affiliated Tribes at Fort Berthold, ND, recently dedicated the Mickey Leland Model Diabetes Center, which will provide a lifeline of treatment and prevention to a tribe whose diabetes mortality rate was once nearly 12 times the national average and whose nearest source of kidney dialysis treatment is still 100 miles away. But that, too, is about to change in no small part to the work of the Select Committee on Hunger.

Yesterday I received a draft report from the General Accounting Office which grew out of a hearing which Chairman HALL and I convened at the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation in my State. I hope that we will soon receive definitive recommendations on how to improve the USDA commodity food distribution program which presently distributes unpalatable canned meats, laced with connective tissue and covered with a salty layer of fat, to tribes with diabetes and heart disease rates that far exceed those of the general population.

Last year, the International Task Force joined hands with the Subcommittee on Africa to refocus our attention on the emergency food aid needs in the Horn of Africa. In partnership with the administration, I believe that we played an instrumental role in averting a wholesale calamity in that vulnerable region. Regrettably, continued civil conflict, drought, and the breakdown of relief corridors has left 10 to 20 million Africans vulnerable to hunger again this year. I would submit the committee's role will be needed this year more than ever.

May I also note for my colleagues, that the Hunger Committee played the leading role in crafting the Child Survival Assistance Program and the Central American Survival Assistance Program which have brought emergency food, shelter, and medical care to civilian victims of civil strife in neighboring countries to the

south. I am particularly proud that this work has resulted in the fitting of prosthetic devices on several hundred children and the performing of hundreds of life-restoring surgeries to burn victims and previously disfigured war victims.

I strongly believe that the Select Committee on Hunger still has a critical role to play in the halls of Congress. Its continued work on the Food for Peace Program, the WIC program, global famine emergencies, and domestic malnutrition will help to relieve human misery and suffering and to show that America's humanitarian spirit is alive and well.

Continuing the Committee's work will enable us to recall with the songwriter:

And if you can see a smile  
In the faces of those  
Who would have no reason to smile  
You know that there is still time.

Amidst the demanding pressures of war and recession, I encourage my colleagues to redeem the time and to retain the conscience of the Congress, the Select Committee on Hunger.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, who is the chairman of the Domestic Task Force on Hunger.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to support House Resolution 51, and in particular to support the reauthorization of the Select Committee on Hunger. Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], and also that of the vice chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], the Select Committee on Hunger continues to make important contributions to a war we cannot afford to forget. That, Mr. Speaker, is the war against hunger, even as we devote our Nation's attention to the war in the Persian Gulf. The Select Committee on Hunger continues to remove our blinders, to focus our attention, and probe our conscience. We do live in a world where 14 million children die unnecessarily each year, 40,000 per day, 1,500 per hour.

Mr. Speaker, hunger and poverty are not partisan issues; they are human tragedies. Every child that dies before its first birthday is a star whose light we refused to let shine. The Select Committee on Hunger has the leading role to play in continuing to address this issue. This committee and its dedicated staff are vital if we are to intensify our efforts to find solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] for yielding, and urge Members to support this reauthorization of this very valuable and necessary committee.

Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Domestic Task Force of the House Select Committee on

Hunger, I rise in support of title I of H. Resolution 51 which reauthorizes the House Select Committee on Hunger for the 102d session of the Congress.

The House Select Committee on Hunger was created on February 22, 1984, by a vote of 309 to 78 with a mandate to conduct a continuing comprehensive study of the problems of hunger and malnutrition, to review executive branch recommendations relating to policies and programs affecting hunger and malnutrition, and to recommend to appropriate House committees legislation or other necessary action. Under the leadership of its first chairman, the late Representative Mickey Leland of Texas who died in a plane crash on August 7, 1989, the committee quickly assumed a role on Capitol Hill as the major voice for the hungry, the homeless, and the poor.

Now, under the distinguished chairmanship of Representative TONY HALL, the committee continues to work to identify both the causes of and the solutions to the basic causes of hunger and hunger-related problems. The House Select Committee on Hunger, through its hearings, special reports, investigations, studies, and work with the antihunger and antipoverty advocacy community continues to remove our blinders, focus our attention, and probe our conscience so that the hungry and the poor, who might otherwise have less of a voice in our political process and policymaking, are heard.

Although progress has been made, the work of the Hunger Committee is by no means finished. In these United States, this land of plenty, this wealthiest of nations, 1 of every 5 of our children lives in poverty, and it is estimated that by the end of this decade that nearly 50 percent of our children will spend some time of their lives in poverty before they reach their 18th birthday. And, the outlook is even worse for minority children. Our infant mortality rate should be a source of national embarrassment. Ten children out of every 1,000 never live to see their first birthday, and the infant death rate for black children is nearly twice the rate of white children.

Nearly 13 percent, or more than 31 million, of our citizens live in poverty. And, that poverty rate is higher than it was in 1978. While poverty rates have risen in both rural and urban areas, the poverty rates have risen as fast or faster in rural areas. Further, the number of working poor has climbed. Between 1978 and 1987, the number of people who work but remain poor increased by 28 percent. The numbers of persons qualifying for food assistance through the Food Stamp Program have also increased with some 20 million persons receiving food stamps monthly. And that number reflects only about half of those potentially eligible but not served. More than half of those food stamp recipients are children. Preliminary data from a Food Research and Action Center survey of child hunger suggests that between 3.5 and 5 million children are hungry at any given time and that another 4 to 5 million children have inadequate sources of assured food. Decent housing is a problem, with the cost of home ownership well beyond the reach of many hard-working families. And the waiting lists are staggering for those families who qualify for low-income housing. The education level of our citizens remains a prob-

lem with high school graduation rates below 1976 levels and with an adult illiteracy rate around 13 percent. Over 20 million adults in this country cannot even read and write.

In my own State of Mississippi, with a population of 2.5 million, and a civilian labor force of almost 1.2 million, our statewide unemployment rate is 8 percent with a range by county from a low of 4.1 percent to a high of 24 percent. Less than 67 percent of our teenagers graduate from high school and in the adult population, 45 percent have no high school education. More than 34 percent of our children live in poverty, and that is a higher incidence than in any other State. That is a statistic we could do without. Additionally, 75 percent of our welfare recipients are children.

America's economic strength needs to be restored. We cannot be competitive economically if we continue down our current path. We are an innovative people, a people committed to equal opportunity for all, a people committed to civil rights and human rights, and social justice. And, I ask you, where is the social justice in the picture I have just portrayed?

We need a sense of urgency in our fight against hunger and poverty, not a tolerance for continued high unemployment rates particularly among blacks and Hispanics, an embarrassing infant mortality rate in this country which spends more money on health care than any other nation, a growing number of working men and women whose families are just an illness away from financial disaster, burgeoning numbers of medically uninsured and underinsured, the growing homeless population, hungry children who cannot concentrate in school because they are distracted by hunger pangs, welfare programs that reinforce dependency instead of fostering self-esteem and self-sufficiency, and economic policies that keep down in the throes of poverty millions of Americans in families with full-time workers.

Hunger and poverty are not partisan issues; they are human tragedies, tragedies about which this wealthiest among nations should feel great shame. The House select committee has a leading role to play in continuing to explore these issues in an effort to find solutions. More than 400 nongovernment organizations representing every sector of American society and ranging the full political spectrum have joined together in a bipartisan coalition to support reauthorization of the House Select Committee on Hunger. I too speak strongly in favor of that reauthorization.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] for making a great statement, and certainly for his efforts as chairman of the Domestic Hunger Task Force of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in closing that I cannot think of a more important issue that we can discuss and work on in the House of Representatives than this. We are making a difference. I would ask Members to reauthorize us.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN] be allowed to manage the remaining time on our side of the aisle.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], the ranking member of the Select Committee on Hunger.

□ 1550

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 51, a resolution of which I am an original cosponsor. This resolution is a combined effort on the part of all of our members of the Select Committee on Hunger and emphasizes our continued commitment that hunger be addressed on a bipartisan basis. The problem knows no partisan or ideological bounds and the solutions should not know any such bounds.

Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. HALL] leads the select committee with great distinction, and his strong personal commitment to hunger and poverty-related issues is the driving force behind the Select Committee on Hunger.

A key focus of our committee lies with the domestic task force, as was well stated by the gentleman from Mississippi. Domestically, the select committee had a very busy and fruitful 2 years of the last Congress. As one example of their work, legislation passed through the Congress in only 4 days regarding the WIC Program. The committee had discovered a shortfall in funding for the special supplemental food program which would mean that many clients, those with special nutritional needs, would be threatened with denial of participation in the program. Fortunately, due to swift action on the part of Chairman HALL and the committee, this situation was rectified.

The select committee has worked closely with administration officials from the Agency for International Development and private voluntary organizations on emergency humanitarian relief operations in many countries, including Angola, Ethiopia, and Sudan. Our efforts in the International arena have helped to provide the Congress with a comprehensive data bank of information on hunger and poverty-related issues, including such concerns as infant mortality.

The Select Committee on Hunger serves an important function within the Congress. Although we are oversight in nature, and do not have legislative authority, the committee has succeeded, cooperatively and constructively, in assessing standing committees in both domestic and international hunger-related issues.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the committee has made significant progress in

working towards alleviating hunger. Chairman HALL has said it is his hope, and it is certainly my hope that this problem may be relieved entirely by the year 2000.

I urge the favorable consideration of this reauthorization so that this valuable committee may continue its work of helping to focus on hunger-related issues worldwide. Once again I thank the gentleman for yielding the time to me.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, a Member who has publicly been congratulated by Governor Cuomo in his State of the State speech. I am very happy that he is still our chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker let me thank the chairman and the members of the Rules Committee for reporting out this rule for the three select committees, and also the Members of the House and the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen for the cooperation that we have received over the years. During the time that I have been chairman, and even before that, we have not had any partisan differences on the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. We have worked together in not trying to supersede the legislative authorities of the standing committees, but to work and hold hearings in areas that their agendas would not allow them to do.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 51 which will establish the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control in the 102d Congress.

The reconstruction of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control will demonstrate the continuing commitment of the House of Representatives to comprehensive oversight of the war on drugs.

In the 101st Congress, the select committee held 29 hearings and conducted 5 study missions to review narcotics control efforts in key drug producing and trafficking countries and to participate in a major international anti-drug conference. We issued 11 reports, and we supplemented our own investigations with independent GAO studies, releasing 5 GAO reports on various aspects of the drug problem.

Among our other activities, we have conducted vigorous oversight of the national drug control strategy mandated by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, looked into the root causes of drug abuse, examined the effectiveness of drug abuse treatment, documented the serious overcrowding in our prisons which is largely drug-related, focused attention on the reemergence of methamphetamine and the emergence of smokable, crystal methamphetamine

or ice, reviewed the impact of drugs on American business, and monitored with growing concern the crisis that drug abuse and drug-related violence are creating in hospital emergency rooms across the country.

The Narcotics Committee and its members proposed legislation and supported the legislative efforts of the standing committees on a broad array of drug issues during the last Congress including correctional alternatives, funding for drug treatment and prevention programs, drug treatment policy, drug paraphernalia, poppers, ice and methamphetamine, drug-free schools, money laundering, interdiction improvements, hospital emergency rooms, and international narcotics control. As the only committee in the Congress devoted exclusively to comprehensive oversight of drug problems, the select committee has served as a highly visible and accessible focal point for drug concerns in the House. We have responded to Members' needs for information on critical drug issues through newsletters, dear colleagues, reports, and other means, serving as a narcotics clearinghouse in the Congress.

In the past several weeks, we have heard a lot of good news about the drug problem. The 1990 household survey on drug abuse, conducted by the National Institute on Drug Abuse [NIDA] and released in December, shows that casual use of drugs by most groups of Americans continues to decline. NIDA's high school senior survey, released 2 weeks ago, continues to show that drug use in this benchmark population—those students who make it to their senior year—is declining or leveling off. Public attitudes against drugs are also hardening.

These are encouraging signs. All of us in the House can be justifiably proud that the antidrug campaign of the past several years, which we helped initiate with the landmark antidrug abuse acts of 1986 and 1988, is having some positive effects.

We must not, however, be misled into thinking that these welcome developments constitute victory in the war on drugs. At a time when events in the Persian Gulf and economic woes at home occupy center stage, it may be tempting to drop the curtain on the drug war. But we have barely begun the battle. We cannot afford complacency at this time in our antidrug efforts. We need to intensify, not relax, our campaign against drugs.

Drug abuse and drug trafficking remain serious national and international problems, and the consequences of these activities continue to inflict enormous harm upon our society. Rather than patting ourselves on the back for the limited successes we have achieved, we need to roll up our sleeves and tackle the intractable,

hardcore drug problems that government surveys miss.

Middle-class Americans may be abandoning recreational drug use, but millions of Americans remain mired in drug addiction and drug dependency. Too often, these victims of drug abuse are the most disadvantaged among us, those who have no opportunity, no hope, nothing to lose—the homeless, the unemployed, high school dropouts, arrestees and prisoners, African-Americans and other minority populations—and often they live in urban communities ravaged by drugs and drug crime.

Despite some evidence of temporary disruptions in cocaine supplies, drugs are readily available, cheap, and potent.

Illicit street sales of drugs remain a \$100 billion industry a year.

The most recent rock bottom estimate of the economic costs of drugs to society is about \$60 billion annually which does not include the financial impact of the crack and drug-related AIDS epidemics and many drug-related business losses.

Worldwide production of heroin and cocaine continues to set new records, and a thriving domestic marijuana industry has grown up to replace falling marijuana imports. Powerful drug cartels are expanding their networks worldwide and joining alliances with other criminal organizations. Traffickers continue to threaten the economic and political stability of democratic governments in this hemisphere.

Health care professionals and law enforcement officials do not report seeing a lessening of the drug crisis in our country. In the past 3 years, cities around the Nation are reporting high rates of AIDS, tuberculosis, hepatitis A, kidney ailments, gonorrhea, syphilis, and communicable childhood illnesses. These epidemics—some of which many in our health establishment believed we conquered years ago—can be traced to the onset of crack and chronic drug use in the inner city and the resulting catastrophic impact on the structure of the family and the drain on limited health care resources.

This health care crisis can be most dramatically seen in hospital emergency room and pediatric care wards. Emergency care providers have testified before the select committee that they have seen an increase in homicides, gunshot wounds, violent assaults, opportunistic illnesses, a shortage of beds, and other complications from the drug crisis. Pediatric wards across the country are being swollen with boarder babies afflicted with AIDS or addicted to drugs and abandoned by parents who are either unable or unfit to care for them.

Our courts, prisons, and jails are overcrowded with defendants and inmates, many of them there for drug-related crimes. Treatment programs

are similarly straining at the seams, and the bare bones treatment services available at many clinics today do little to address the other serious problems that often contribute to an addict's drug use such as illiteracy, joblessness, and unemployment.

The 102d Congress marks the beginning of a new period in the evolution of our national drug control strategy. The President's third annual strategy report to Congress was delivered last Thursday. He has nominated a new Director of National Drug Control policy and a new Secretary of Education who will play important roles, respectively, in shaping our overall antidrug policies and our critical efforts to reduce the demand for drugs through education and prevention.

The House of Representatives must continue to provide leadership in addressing the serious drug problems confronting our Nation. The select committee can continue to help the House meet this critical responsibility.

The select committee will continue to provide vigorous, bipartisan oversight of our Nation's antidrug efforts. Our comprehensive oversight and analysis will continue to assist the House in evaluating drug abuse problems and formulating effective policies. Our unique jurisdiction and accumulated expertise are valuable resources that will help the House maintain a strong leadership role in drug prevention and control. Our efforts will supplement and support, not duplicate, the work of the standing committees.

I urge the House to pass House Resolution 51 to reconstitute the select committee for the 102d Congress.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution to reconstitute the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control for the 102d Congress.

Having been a member of this committee for more than a decade and currently serving as its ranking minority member, I believe I can speak from both knowledge and experience when I assure my colleagues of the pivotal role our committee fulfills in congressional antidrug efforts.

Let me acknowledge from the outset that the Congress, like the entire country, is preoccupied with the war in the Persian Gulf. But as we wage war against aggression in the Middle East, we cannot afford to neglect another war against aggression that we are fighting right here at home, that is the war against drugs.

I am pleased to report that, under President Bush's leadership, we are making progress in the war against drugs. We are witnessing, for example, growing public aversion to the use of drugs, especially among young people,

and significant declines in casual drug use and in hospital emergency room mentions. In addition, we have achieved some disruption of cocaine trafficking and production in Latin America.

As President Bush emphasized in his State of the Union Address last week, however, much remains to be done and we will not rest until the day of the dealer is over forever.

We must continue to seek solutions to the crucial problems of hard core drug addiction and drug-related violence and crime.

We must address the increasing incidence of AIDS cases related to intravenous drug abuse and the tragedy of babies born addicted to drugs.

We must continue to support institutions in our society—from prisons to the courts to law enforcement agencies to hospitals and drug treatment centers—that are in the front lines in the war against drug abuse.

We must continue to work closely with the leaders of drug-producing countries who are trying desperately to free their people from the clutches of violent drug lords.

The need for the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control exists now more than ever. Our committee's sole mission is to examine the problems of drug abuse and trafficking in their entirety. I am proud to report that we are fulfilling that mission.

In our oversight function, for example, we have spent considerable time and energy closely monitoring Federal drug policies and programs while encouraging and supporting drug abuse education, prevention, treatment, interdiction, law enforcement, and international initiatives.

Although ours is not a legislative committee, we have worked closely with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and the standing committees during the past two Congresses to review and enact two major anti-drug abuse acts. We have spearheaded efforts to implement the national drug control strategy and contributed significantly to anti-crime legislation by advocating strong provisions to combat drug-related crime.

In addition, our committee has traveled to a number of drug-producing Latin American countries to meet and discuss cooperative anti-drug efforts with their heads of state. Our visits to these countries have enabled us to witness the results of the Andean strategy and serve to assure these foreign leaders that the United States remains truly committed to the war against drugs.

In the nearly 14 years since the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control was established, drug abuse has become our Nation's No. 1 domestic priority. I encourage my colleagues in the House to continue to demonstrate their unequivocal support for the war

against drugs by voting to reconstitute the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 51 to reauthorize the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, the Select Committee on Hunger, and the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

I have been privileged to serve as chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families since it was first created, and together with my many able colleagues on the committee, have worked to bring needed attention to our investment in its children and families, today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve as chairman of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families since it was first created, and together with my able colleagues on the committee, we have worked long and hard to bring needed attention to the necessity of investment in our children and families today and tomorrow. I would like at this time to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. TOM BLILEY, who has served as the ranking minority member on this committee for the past 2 years for all of his interest, concern, and hard work on behalf of children and families in this country, and to welcome the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. FRANK WOLF, who will be the new ranking member of this committee after it is constituted by the House.

I am gratified to be joined by more than 200 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle in support of the reconstitution of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Congress they can be very proud of this committee as they can the other select committees because, since the House first created the select committee, it has unfailingly worked to assist the Congress in attending to fundamental, yet very complex issues affecting the Nation's children and families. The committee has dedicated its agenda, efforts and resources to carrying out its congressional mandate to provide an ongoing assessment of the conditions of the Nation's children and families, and to enhance the capacity of the Congress to make better policies for them.

More than 13 full standing committees and their subcommittees have legislative authority for some aspect of an issue that affected families. Yes, prior to the establishment of this select committee, there was no one place in the Congress where the wide range of

interrelated issues affecting children and families could be examined and reviewed in all their complexity.

When the select committee began, there was little awareness in either the Congress or the public of the nature or extent of the many and complex issues affecting children, youth, and families. We knew even less about the emerging social, cultural, and demographic changes of the recent decades and their impact on children and families. In addition, few anticipated the far-reaching consequences of changes in public policy which have substantially deepened the vulnerability of millions of American families.

During the last several years, the significance of these issues and their implications for the current and future work force and the overall health of the Nation have gained widespread recognition. The need for the Nation's investment in its current and future work force—the children and families of today and tomorrow—has rightly become a high priority on the public policy agenda. Without a healthy, thriving, educated, and trained population ready and able to enter and become productive participants in the labor market and their communities, our Nation's capacity to lead and compete in the increasingly global economy and to sustain our democracy is placed in jeopardy.

A just released report highlighting child well-being across the Nation indicates that the status of young Americans remains dismal with high rates of child poverty, violent deaths, infant mortality, and low birthweight births that remain unabated.

The need for investment has drawn heightened political attention on both sides of the aisle, in the administration, among the Nation's Governors, corporate leaders, the media, and the public. With children and family issues assuming a high legislative priority, the expertise provided by this select committee is more timely and critical than ever.

This select committee has anticipated as well as responded to the pulse of the Nation and its policymakers to help define and describe a prominent agenda to promote improvements in the well-being of children and families.

During its tenure, the committee has conducted nearly 100 hearings and dozens of site visits. We have produced some 30 studies and major reports. Dedicated to our charge, we have raised the visibility of and tackled the most serious problems affecting America's families and children. In so doing, we have provided timely information and guidance to the Congress and others to address those problems more effectively, and even more importantly, to prevent them from occurring or becoming too serious in the first place.

In the last Congress alone, we highlighted and addressed problems of

working families, access and availability of health care, environmental toxins and children, the impact of substance abuse and HIV infection on children and families, conditions and prospects for children in out-of-home placement, and increasing violence by and against children. We also investigated issues and conditions affecting particular subgroups within our population, including Hispanic and African-American children and their families, took a detailed comparative look at children's well-being internationally, and examined and provided resource materials on respite care and other family supports.

The committee also continued to seek out and synthesize the best evidence documenting the program benefits and cost effectiveness of successful programs to assist children and their families, from small model programs in localities across the country to well known Federal programs such as WIC and Head Start.

Our study of effective interventions, first issued in the committee's 1985 report, "Opportunities for Success: Cost-Effective Programs for Children," and updated in 1988 and again last year, has been cited and editorialized in prestigious journals as well as local newspapers and magazines, and adopted by preeminent panels as diverse as the American Agenda, cochaired by former Presidents Ford and Carter, the Council on Competitiveness, the Committee for Economic Development, and the Urban Institute. In our 1990 update we provided an even stronger base of documentation along with new and promising models of success.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families has become an important institutional asset, both within and outside the Congress. We have become the repository for a broad base of vital information about America's families and children. The committee has become a valued resource on these issues for most of the Members of Congress and their staff.

We have also become a clearinghouse for the media, for concerned parents and for community organizations, whose frontline experiences have proven so important to us and the Congress in devising reasonable and workable policies to address complex and serious problems. We did not initially anticipate the wide roles we would assume, but have come to understand how important they are to meeting our congressional charge.

We have also been called upon to help identify promising State or local programs and successful models to promote adoption, to prevent teen pregnancy, or to improve educational success, for example. In addition, legislators and others have asked us to identify effective infant mortality reduction strategies, innovative family preservation efforts that can keep families

together safely, new ways of working with increasing number of troubled youth, as well as creative and more efficient interagency service delivery strategies.

The committee has become increasingly well respected and well utilized as a resource because we've sought out, gathered, and presented the most credible information available. We also tried to anticipate what the issues and implications are going to be in a few months from now, a year from now, 5 years from now. And, as we enter a new decade, it becomes even more imperative that we maintain a long-term view toward the approaching 21st century.

Our mandate directs us to assist standing committees with legislative jurisdiction as they deliberate issues affecting children and families. The select committee's work has helped result in bipartisan legislation in numerous instances. For example, in the 101st Congress, the committee's crosscutting activities helped to inform bipartisan legislation on prenatal care and nutritional assistance, health care for homeless children, landmark child care assistance, respite care and crisis nurseries, and the care of infants and children exposed to drugs and HIV infection.

While the committee continues to monitor and provide oversight of an extensive range of issues affecting children and families, the issues receiving the greatest indepth study today differ from those studied extensively in an earlier year because some of those issues have found legislative leadership attention and action.

Child care, an issue extensively examined and documented by this committee beginning in 1983, is a notable example.

Similarly, we continue to chart important concerns and responses to parental leave and early childhood education, among several of the major issues taken up by the committee in earlier years. They have now achieved high visibility and priority, and the focus of debate has moved to a legislative forum.

Although elements of sound prevention have increased and progress has been made to reach the unserved, we have continued to concentrate on prevention as an effective investment strategy. It was this select committee that documented and called attention to selected programs of prenatal care, immunization, basic nutrition, and preschool education that save lives and save money.

Last year, recognizing the need to examine many aspects of our preparedness to compete in the increasingly global economy, we took an indepth look at how children fare comparatively around the world. I am delighted that several of our major standing committees will take up those concerns in the 102d Congress.

Our work today focuses on identifying and bringing you the best information available on new issues and successful interventions in local communities and other public and private sectors at all levels. Our work also emphasizes the need to recognize and bring together the expertise of many diverse individuals and groups. Despite the progress made on behalf of children and families in the 101st Congress, many of the new challenges and problems facing the Nation's children and families today are more difficult and deeper than anyone would have imagined, requiring complex and interdisciplinary solutions. In these deeply troubling times of war and recession that only worsen the economic burdens and stress on all of us, especially our most vulnerable children and families, we require even more creative and far-reaching thought and action.

We provide that forum inside and outside the Congress. That is our charge.

Different committees have called upon us when they were considering crosscutting proposals, such as determining appropriate health care and family supports for sick and abandoned infants and young children. We've been called upon to inform proposals that marry services such as education, health care, child care, training and counseling, that could enable a family to stay together and gain economic stability instead of falling into welfare dependency.

We have now, as we have had before, the ability to ask questions and to delve into issues that standing committees cannot because of their legislative agendas and jurisdictions.

We are proud of the work that we have been able to do with the help of so many: parents, caregivers, teachers, volunteers, corporate leaders, the organizations which represent them and policymakers at all levels. I especially want to thank my fine colleagues in the Congress, on both sides of the aisle, who have backed their commitment to these issues with a lot of hard work. I am again gratified that so many organizations, from the American Academy of Pediatrics to the Child Welfare League of America to the Girl Scouts and the United Way have come forward once again to endorse and support the reconstitution of the committee. I am attaching a complete list of those groups for today's RECORD.

Eight years ago when the House of Representatives created the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, we hoped to assist in informing the debate on vital issues affecting America's children and families. We have shown that we make a timely and valuable contribution to improving the debate and ultimately the policies affecting our children and families. Our work is not done, and I urge you to join

me in support of the opportunity to continue those efforts.

**ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE RECONSTITUTION OF THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES FOR THE 102d Congress**

- Action for Alaska's Children.
- ACTION for Child Protection (Aurora, CO).
- Advocates for Children of New York, Inc.
- Alabama Council on Human Relations/Lee County Head Start.
- American Academy of Childhood and Adolescent Psychiatry.
- American Academy of Pediatrics.
- American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.
- American Baptist Churches U.S.A.
- American Bar Association.
- American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.
- American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.
- American Home Economics Association.
- American Nurses Association.
- American Orthopsychiatric Association.
- American Psychological Association.
- American Public Health Association.
- American Public Welfare Association.
- Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families.
- Association of Junior Leagues International, Inc.
- Association for Retarded Citizens of the United States.
- Boys and Girls Clubs of America.
- Boys Town.
- Bread for the World.
- California Children's Hospital Association.
- California Children's Lobby.
- Candlelighters Childhood Cancer Foundation.
- Catholic Charities USA.
- CEDEN Family Resource Center (Austin, TX).
- Center for Population Options.
- Center for the Study of Social Policy.
- Center for Youth Services (DC).
- Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
- Child Advocacy Commission of Durham, Inc.
- Child and Family Services (Knoxville, TN).
- Child Serv (Park Ridge, IL).
- Child Welfare League of America.
- Children NOW.
- The Children's Alliance (Seattle, WA).
- Children's Defense Fund.
- The Children's Foundation.
- Children's Research and Education Institute, Inc. (Cambridge, MA).
- Children's Services of Colorado, Inc.
- Citizens' Committee for Children of N.Y., Inc.
- Coalition for Children (Albuquerque, NM).
- Coalition for Maine's Children.
- Coalition on Permanence for Children (Minneapolis, MN).
- Columbia University, School of Social Work.
- Community Child Protection Network (Burlington, VT).
- Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA).
- Consumers Union.
- Council For Children Inc. (Atlanta, GA).
- Council for Exceptional Children.
- County Supervisors Association of California.
- Crossroad (Fort Wayne, IN).
- Dawn for Children, Inc. (Providence, RI).
- Epilepsy Foundation of America.
- Family Impact Seminar.
- Family Service America.
- Food Research and Action Center.
- Friends Association for Care and Protection of Children.
- Friends Committee on National Legislation.
- Fund for the Advancement of Camping.
- General Federation of Women's Clubs.
- George Washington University, Women's Studies Program.
- Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.
- Greater Minneapolis Day Care Association.
- Hawaii (State of) Office of Children and Youth.
- Illinois Action for Children.
- Illinois (State of) Citizens Assembly.
- Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Iowa Commission on Children, Youth and Families.
- Jewish Child Care Association of New York, Inc.
- Juvenile Justice Center of Pennsylvania.
- Kansas Action for Children.
- Kansas Children's Service League.
- March of Dimes Birth Defect Foundation.
- Michigan Network of Runaway, Homeless and Youth Services.
- Mississippi (State of) Department of Human Services, Office for Children and Youth.
- Mississippi Human Services Coalition.
- Montanans for Children, Youth and Families, Inc.
- National Association for Family Day Care.
- National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions.
- National Association of Counties (NACo).
- National Association of Elementary School Principals.
- National Black Child Development Institute (NBCDI).
- National Center for Children in Poverty, Columbia University.
- National Child Abuse Coalition.
- National Child Welfare Leadership Center.
- National Coalition of Title I Parents.
- National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse.
- National Council of Jewish Women.
- National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.
- National Council on Family Relations.
- National Crime Prevention Council.
- National Education Association.
- National Head Start Association.
- National Institute for Women of Color.
- National Mental Health Association.
- National Network of Runaway and Youth Services.
- National PTA.
- Nevada (State of), Department of Human Resources, Youth Services Division.
- New York State Citizens' Coalition for Children, Inc.
- North American Council on Adoptable Children (NACAC)
- North Carolina Child Advisory Institute.
- Ohio Association of Child Caring Agencies, Inc.
- Oklahoma (State) Commission on Children and Youth.
- Parent and Child Development Services, Inc. (Savannah, GA).
- Parents Anonymous.
- Parents United (Omaha, NE)
- Parents United, Inc.
- Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic.
- The Piton Foundation (Denver, CO).
- St. Mary's County (Maryland), Council on Children and Youth.
- San Antonio CARES (San Antonio, TX).
- Tahoe Human Services, Inc., Youth and Family Services.
- Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations.

United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc.  
The United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society.  
University of Maryland, Family Research Center.  
Utah Children.  
Utah Issues (Salt Lake City, UT).  
Vermont (State) Department of Education.  
Vermont Parent/Child Center Network.  
Voices for Illinois Children.  
WAIF, Inc.  
West Virginia Youth Coalition.  
Wisconsin Maternal and Child Health Coalition.  
Wisconsin Nutrition Project.  
YWCA of the U.S.A.  
Youth Service America.

□ 1600

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution that would reauthorize the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. The family has never been in more trouble and the efforts of the select committee have never been more important.

Every indicator of family well-being from out of wedlock births to divorce reveals the terrible breakdown of the family. In a study of the social and economic conditions of American children from 1980 to 1988, released a few days ago, substantial increases were observed across the Nation in the percentage of children in poverty, juveniles who are in jail, out of wedlock births and teen violent death. Between 1980 and 1988, the number of children living only with their mother increased by 21 percent, from 11.4 million to 13.5 million. These statistics represent a tragedy in the making.

While an argument can be made that virtually all Federal programs have some impact on children by shaping the very communities in which they live, there are currently over 125 Federal programs directed specifically toward children and their families. Yet jurisdiction over these programs is divided among 13 standing committees. This has created, over the years, a patchwork of policies which is fragmented and shortsighted.

In fact, the select committee was established 8 years ago because of a concern that too often the stability of American families was in fact undermined by programs and policies established by this piecemeal approach.

As an oversight committee, that does not have legislative authority, the members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, can take an integrated and comprehensive look at the underlying causes of family problems and help to shape solutions that move beyond the constraints of legislative mandates.

I believe that one of the greatest contributions this committee can make is to highlight State and local initiatives, both public and private, which successfully empower families.

When the Federal Government clearly has an interest or a role to play in assisting families, the select committee can frame the issues and create the debate by insisting on policies that involve families as active players in the solutions, thereby making success more likely. Our goal must be to strengthen families, not to replace them or add to their burdens.

It is my hope, that in this Congress, we can look at several issues important to families: Policies designed to preserve and promote tax fairness for families, workplace policies that are family sensitive, programs that promote adoption, and initiatives that support family formation.

Mr. Speaker, one last comment: I think at this time the family is probably under attack more today than it ever has been. There is more spouse abuse, there is more child abuse, there is more teenage suicide, there is more alcohol abuse, there is more drug abuse than at any other time, and hopefully this committee can do something positive.

I think the committee, if it is bold enough and willing to look at it, really must address the question of family values. It is not just enough to pass legislation that sets up new programs.

You can do everything you want with bricks and mortar and dollars, but unless we build upon a firm foundation of traditional values—a question of right and wrong—I am not sure there will be positive change in the area of children, youth, and families.

I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] for their efforts, and Senator COATS before that, and really look forward to working with the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] and the members of the other side and our side to see if we can honestly and truly do something that helps the American family.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the pending resolution.

I would like to speak especially about the importance of establishing the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control on which I serve.

I think that all Members of Congress know of the crucial role that has been played by this committee in improving our Nation's response to the crisis of drug and crime that plagues so many of our Nation's communities, and not only has the committee performed an essential oversight role in all aspects of our national antidrug strategy, but

it has performed admirably in coordinating the congressional response to the drug crisis and has been in the vanguard of initiatives to improve Federal antidrug efforts.

We have come a long way in recent years on the issue of drugs and drug crime. We clearly have a long way to go.

Without the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, the Federal Government would still be floundering about without any direction, without coordination, without a clear sense of the next steps that need to be taken to improve our Nation's antidrug policy.

Now that we are making progress in the direction of fighting the real war against drugs, we need to do everything possible to ensure that these efforts succeed. That is why I feel we need the select committee now more than ever.

The select committee shows enormous promise of leading us into an era where we can make significant progress in fighting drugs. Today we should reaffirm that commitment by reestablishing the vital committee during the 102d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to join in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

□ 1610

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of House Resolution 51, which provides for the reauthorization of the select committees on: Hunger; Narcotics Abuse and Control; and Children, Youth, and Families. I am confident the value of these select committees has been proven over the course of their existence.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics since its inception. This particular select committee has demonstrated continually, the significant role it plays in the investigative function of the House of Representatives.

As a senior member of the Narcotics Select Committee and of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I can assure my colleagues that there remains a critical need for a House Narcotics Committee today. Our Nation is suffering from the effects of a drug epidemic. We are reeling under the impact of crack, which has brought drug abuse and drug-related crime and violence to terrifying new levels. Our criminal justice system is overloaded with drug dealers, and our drug treatment centers are swamped by more requests for help than they can possibly meet.

Over the past 15 years, the Narcotics Committee has held numerous hearings and conducted insight investigations in both the United States and abroad.

Most recently, our Select Committee on Narcotics has been in the forefront in the evaluation of the President's national drug control policy.

No single standing committee has the time, resources, or expertise to monitor all aspects of the drug problem, but by working together the standing committees and the Narcotics Select Committee can effectively work with the executive branch in implementing our antidrug legislation and in developing a comprehensive, coordinated drug strategy.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add my support to the reauthorization of the Select Committee on Hunger. As we all well know, the Select Committee on Hunger will never be the same since the loss of our beloved colleague, Mickey Leland. But it is important that Mickey's concern for hunger lives on. Half the people of the world still go to bed hungry every night and millions of children die each year because malnourishment has eroded their ability to fight infection and disease.

Through coordinated efforts with the committees of jurisdiction, the Select Committee on Hunger has been faithful to its mandate to both study and review the root causes of hunger, and to make significant recommendations to alleviate it.

Mr. Speaker, so too, has the work of our Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families played a significant role in the work of this Congress in responding to our domestic familial needs.

Accordingly, I support House Resolution 51, and I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to reestablish the Select Committees on Children, Youth, and Families, on Hunger, and on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

As a Member who has been privileged to serve on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, I would like to speak on behalf of its continuation in particular.

The work of the select committee, since its inception in 1983, has been heralded as far-reaching and timely by private and public groups, by parents and providers, by advocates and researchers. Its reports have been quoted by the President and championed by corporate executives. Most importantly, the committee's work has served as a resource and stimulus for countless family policy issues considered by this Congress.

The select committee's pioneering efforts to document the benefits of a range of cost-effective programs for children have been especially valuable to my own work on the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. The efforts of the select committee have been

especially helpful in securing enhanced funding for the highly successful WIC Program so that thousands more high-risk pregnant women and their infants could participate.

In addition, I was privileged to chair a recent select committee hearing on ensuring healthy infant development in upstate New York. It was a rare opportunity to hear not only about the importance and success of WIC, but the relationship between WIC and prenatal care, between home visiting and healthy birth outcomes about the special needs of rural families. I and other members of the select committee would not have had the opportunities to explore these issues in such depth in any other forum, nor would we have had the occasion to learn about innovative State and local efforts to address the problem.

The select committee has been successful not only in educating its own members, but in providing resources and guidance to other standing legislative committees, to all Members of Congress, and to the public.

There is no doubt that the select committee's role was central to the progress made in the last Congress on behalf of children and families by helping to lay the groundwork for the enactment of historic child care legislation, and in the expansion of critical cost-effective programs such as Head Start, WIC, and Medicaid.

But our work is not done.

In fact, given the progress Congress made in the last session, the need for the select committee is more important than ever. There are still more children in poverty in the United States than in all Western European countries combined, the male homicide rate in our country is five times higher, and the rates of teenage pregnancy continue to outstrip those of many other nations. And here in the United States, where we spend a higher percentage of our GNP on health care than all other developed nations, millions of children still have no health insurance coverage and our high infant mortality rate has not substantially improved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of all three select committees and I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 51, which will reestablish select committees, but particularly the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] on a job well done.

I have been a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics since I came to Congress in 1983.

As a former law enforcement officer, I have seen the devastating effects of drug use firsthand.

My congressional district in Texas reaches the United States-Mexico border so I know what it is like on the front lines of the drug war.

The Select Committee on Narcotics provides an effective forum for discussing our Nation's treatment capacity, how to make our school's drug free and a means for examining how well our law enforcement agencies are cooperating.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and I look forward to continued successes with the select committees.

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

I would like to conclude by saying that we strongly support the passage of this resolution. These committees have done excellent work over time, but not only that the selection of the membership of the committee, I think bears a great deal of distinction. Specifically, I would mention the chairman of the Committee on Hunger. If we were to choose a chairman from our body, I am convinced we could not choose any Member better suited than the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL]. As we heard from the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and commitment and dedication that he has, these select committees, outside their purview and range of the standing committees, have taken on a separate and a special burden and responsibility for the service to our Nation. That is highlighted by the establishment of the select committees.

I would only add, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that we have established the select committees is because it highlights something of great concern to our Nation, and in order to deal with them expeditiously and in a consolidated manner, and deal with them in a way that there is not the diversity of interests that one experiences with agriculture, dealing with hunger and all of these other examples that I could use, their effectiveness is, in my mind, diminished because they are not given exclusive jurisdiction.

□ 1620

I submit that if these committees were given exclusive jurisdiction, then the Select Committee on Narcotics could come to us with a bill that would go right to the heart of the need, that would represent the expertise that the members of that select committee possess and the Congress would benefit and the Nation would benefit as well; however, in the instance of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and

Control, 23 committees and sub-committees have joint jurisdiction.

On the Committee on Hunger, eight committees have joint jurisdiction.

On the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, 13 committees have joint jurisdiction.

So even though these committed Members serve on these committees and even though they have the proper hearings, even though they gather the proper information and prepare quality legislation, it is significantly hampered and diminished, as I say, because of the inability to move that legislation with the joint concurrence of the 13, 23, or 8 other committees.

So my recommendation and suggestion would be as we move in the years ahead to give those who are most committed, those who volunteer to serve on these committees and have this experience and expertise should be given jurisdiction over the issue, or else we should not face this situation that we face today, and that is reestablishing it and then hamstringing their performance with this joint jurisdiction.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong continued support for the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, and the reconstitution of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control of the House.

As a member of the select committee, I would like to thank the chairman, Representative RANGEL, and the ranking minority member of the committee, Representative COUGHLIN, for their bipartisan leadership. Under their leadership, the committee has played a key role in reviewing the development and implementation of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988.

Mr. Speaker, as a committee we have conducted oversight activities on the national drug control strategy. During the 101st Congress, the committee held 19 hearings in Washington, DC, and at critical locations around the country assessing the effectiveness of the strategy.

As a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control it is a unique privilege to serve on the only committee in Congress devoted exclusively to addressing the national and international drug problem.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the 10th District in the State of New Jersey, a district that has suffered from the plight of substance abuse. The effects of crack cocaine, ICE, PCP, and heroin have become a part of our day-to-day lives.

According to Charles Knox, director of Essex County, New Jersey's Bureau of Narcotics, there has not been a reduction of drug use within the county which includes the city of Newark. A new threat has returned to the streets

of New Jersey's 10th District. Heroin use has increased by 10 to 15 percent. Federal authorities just completed a study of the purity of the heroin now found on Newark's streets. It was found that the level of purity was the highest in the country.

Just this past weekend 10 people died from fentanyl, an animal tranquilizer being sold as heroin. This drug, called Tango and Cash on the streets, killed at least six people in my district last weekend. To date more than 135 persons have overdosed on this drug and it has taken 17 lives in the New York, Connecticut and New Jersey tri-State area.

The need to reconstitute the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control is clear for the residents of the 10th District. My constituents continue to see the fallout of drugs—crime, homelessness, and an alarming number of our future generations born addicted to drugs. The select committee and its work have offered hope to the people of New Jersey's 10th District.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I worked to serve on the select committee and why I rise in support of House Resolution 14. I urge my colleagues to give their support and vote for this legislation.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago this body voted overwhelmingly in favor of creating the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Today, we have the opportunity to renew that support and I am pleased to express my support for the reauthorization of this important committee.

The impressive record of the Select Committee has proven to us that our votes were not just a symbolic gesture toward the needs of children and families. Since its inception, the select committee has done an excellent job in fulfilling its principal mandate. Included has been the assessment of the status of children, youth, and families by the gathering of information about problems facing them and looking at both public and private efforts to remedy these problems.

Jurisdiction over issues relating to children, youth, and families is shared by at least 13 of the 32 House standing committees and numerous subcommittees. Under the current committee system, the House lacks the capacity to conduct comprehensive oversight affecting these groups. No single Federal or State agency focuses on the diverse and complex problems of this vulnerable segment of our society. The resolution on which we are voting today reauthorizes the select committee to develop policies that would encourage the coordination of both governmental and private programs designed to address the many problems of families, childhood, and adolescence.

During the 101st Congress, the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families held 19 hearings, conducted 5 site visits, and issued 8 reports. Over 200 witnesses testified before the select committee.

The continuation of this select committee is especially vital as the family unit becomes increasingly weaker, and the concerns of American youth become more complex. The problems reach far beyond the 21 percent of chil-

dren living in poverty or the rising teenage pregnancy rate. The dilemmas our Nation's children face take root in the family.

Families are changing. Marital dissolution, time constraints, and competing pressures are impairing the ability of the family to function properly. Only one third of all first marriages presently remain intact forever. Less than one eighth of families now consist of a married couple with children in which the mother does not work outside the home. Today more than one half of all families with a child under 6 are in the paid labor force. Over 6 million households with young children are headed by a single parent and this figure could increase to 7.5 million by the year 2000 if present trends continue.

Children are generally given a low priority in our society, and yet, they are a precious resource that society cannot ignore. It is imperative that this Congress renew its support for the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. It is imperative that this Congress renew its support for the future. Support for children and families begins in the House.

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as I rise today in support of the continuation of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, my attention centers on how our Nation is measuring up to the challenge of creating a happy and healthy future for our children.

Why is this so important? Why must we answer this challenge? Why must we invest in our children's future?

The answer is simple. It is because our children are our greatest resource. A committed investment in our children today will guarantee a bright and prosperous future for our Nation.

With the passage of the landmark child care bill during the last session of Congress, it is now more important than ever for Congress to examine issues affecting children. On the national level, America's children are suffering needless hardships every day.

The United States rates last among the industrialized nations in infant mortality. More than one-third of children between the ages of 1 to 4 are not appropriately immunized against disease. One quarter of children under 6 grow up in poverty. These are problems which must be solved and solved quickly.

We need to do more to reduce infant mortality, to prevent teen-pregnancies, to stop drug and alcohol abuse in our youths, to eliminate high school drop out, and to increase immunization. The call for action has never been more urgent and, as the wealthiest Nation on Earth, we now have the means at hand to solve these problems.

As a member of this committee during the 101st Congress, I can attest to the work and accomplishments of the select committee on issues concerning the children and families of our Nation. Currently, issues affecting children are covered by over half of the House's standing committees. The select committee thus fills the role of focusing on issues of primary concern to children and families and serving as an excellent resource for these issues.

We must make a commitment now for our children and decide what legacy we will leave for them. Do we want them to remember their lack of education or poor nutrition? The horrors of substance abuse or the poverty that surrounded them?

Or a sound caring family life that provided the tools and skills necessary to compete in the world. Childhood has always been difficult but a child's life now is full of dangers that we did not have to face. However, it does not have to be that way.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families to live up to the challenge our children have given us. It is a challenge which we must and will win.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution to reconstitute the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. I had the pleasure of serving on that committee in the 101st Congress and found the committee to be extremely useful in assisting the Congress in our continuing effort to address the many public policy issues affecting our Nation's children and families.

In the 101st Congress, the select committee made available to the Members of this body a variety of background information that we can use to develop sound policy proposals to strengthen Federal services to children and families. With a very capable staff and the fine leadership of Chairman MILLER of California, the committee brought together a diverse body of knowledge and experience on children's issues such as health care, foster care, perinatal substance abuse, violence by and against children, and the environmental exposure of children to hazardous substances.

I found especially helpful the select committee's activities surrounding the issues of pregnancy, drug use, drug-exposed infants, and maternal and child health care. These issues cross jurisdictional lines of the standing committees of the House and are currently addressed in a very fragmented manner. The select committee was able to get to the heart of this complicated set of issues so that options for Federal action to address these issues became clearer.

The Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families has a demonstrated track record of usefulness to the Congress. I wholeheartedly endorse its reconstitution for the 102d Congress so that we can look forward to its continued assistance as we grapple with issues affecting our Nation's children and families.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support for the reauthorization of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families for the 102d Congress. I hope that my distinguished colleagues recognize the invaluable service the select committee, its chairman, and staff have rendered not only to this body but to the American people in helping us better understand the debilitating problems that confront our children and their families in today's society.

As we approach the 21st century, we must come to grips with the multifaceted forces that are tearing at the fabric of our Nation's most sacred institution—the American family. During the 101st Congress, the select committee held 19 hearings on a number of vital issues affecting the well-being of our children and the stability of the family unit, such as child care, substance abuse, and infant mortality.

Our children need a champion, defender and advocate that will tirelessly promote their cause before the Congress and the American

people. The Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families has faithfully and distinguishably served this function and will continue to do so with your continued support.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Family. Through this select committee we in Congress are able to examine the present and future status of the new family.

In times when drugs continue to invade our society and traditional family values are attacked from all sides, our main objective at the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Family is to assist and strengthen the family structure—to make ourselves available to the families that make up this great Nation. As an oversight committee we explore the current trends and conditions of our Nation's youth and create the forum for debate on domestic policy.

Within my district alone the impact of committee hearings on infant mortality and teen pregnancy has further provoked both State and local initiatives in this area. It is clear to me that the work of the committee is essential and I fully support reauthorization.

I would also like to take a brief moment to salute the leadership of our former ranking minority member TOM BLEILEY. Tom has moved to the District of Columbia Committee and will be missed by every member of the committee.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the two Houses.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of ascertaining from the majority leader the schedule for the week after we return from the upcoming recess, and I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Obviously, our business will soon be finished for this week.

The Congress will reconvene on Monday, February 18; however, the House on that date will not be in session. There will be a continuation of the Lincoln-Washington district work period.

On Tuesday, February 19, the House will meet at noon to consider several suspensions. We do not yet have the outline of those. As soon as we have them, we will obviously make it known to all the Members.

Recorded votes on suspensions will be postponed until Wednesday, February 20. There will be no votes on Tuesday, February 19.

On Wednesday, February 20, the House will meet at 2 p.m. to vote on suspensions held over from Tuesday, February 19, and then additional legislative business with votes will be held on that day, and again the exact outline of those measures will be made known as soon as we have them.

On Thursday, February 21, the House will meet at 11 a.m. Again there will be some legislative business with votes.

On Friday, February 22, the House will not be in session.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, so if I understand the gentleman, the period of time that we would have votes is Wednesday and Thursday of that week. It appears to me it is possible that as of the Thursday of that week that the House would finish up in pretty good time and Members could figure on getting planes at a decent hour. Is that correct?

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

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

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO APPOINT TWO MEMBERS TO REPRESENT THE HOUSE AT GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY CEREMONIES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order for the Speaker to appoint two Members of the House, one upon the recommendation of the minority leader, to represent the House of Representatives at appropriate ceremonies for the observance of George Washington's birthday to be held on February 22, 1991.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, February 19, 1991, the Speaker and the minority leader be author-

ized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, February 20, 1991.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF REQUEST FOR  
MEMBERS TO SERVE AS CON-  
GRESSIONAL LIAISON ON CHRIS-  
TOPHER COLUMBUS  
QUINCENTENARY JUBILEE COM-  
MISSION

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to announce that I have requested the following Members to serve as congressional liaison on the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission:

Mr. FOGLIETTA of Pennsylvania, chairman;

Mr. FASCELL of Florida;  
Mr. CONTE of Massachusetts;  
Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas;  
Mr. ANNUNZIO of Illinois;  
Mr. RUSSO of Illinois;  
Mr. VENTO of Minnesota;  
Mr. GUARINI of New Jersey;  
Mr. LEWIS of Georgia;  
Mrs. MORELLA of Maryland;  
Ms. PELOSI of California;  
Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado;  
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida; and  
Ms. MOLINARI of New York.

RANKING OF MEMBERS ON COM-  
MITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND  
CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in House Resolution 43, adopted by the House on January 24, 1991, electing the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Ms. NORTON be elected to rank ahead of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COM-  
MITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OF-  
FICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (House Resolu-

tion 57) and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 57

Resolved, That the following named Members, be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

Standards of Official Conduct: Louis Stokes, Ohio, Chairman; Matthew F. McHugh, New York; Gary Ackerman, New York; George (Buddy) Darden, Georgia; Benjamin L. Cardin, Maryland; Nancy Pelosi, California; Jim McDermott, Washington.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have parliamentary inquiries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his inquiries.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to my written inquiry to the Parliamentarian about the meaning of and the circumstances surrounding the inclusion in House Resolution 43 of a proviso which states that "the powers and duties conferred upon the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be exercised by the vice chairman thereof until otherwise ordered by the House," does the inclusion of this proviso in any way affect the privileged nature of the resolution electing Members to standing committees of the House—and the reason I ask is that the correspondence I have received from the Parliamentarian cites one precedent, but that precedent involves a resolution that was called up by unanimous consent—is there any precedent for including language such as this in a privileged resolution?

□ 1630

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows of no precise precedent, but the Chair considers the provision incidental to the normal privileged resolution providing for the election and consequent empowerment of the chairman of the committee.

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

As I understand it, clause 6(b) of rule XI provides that in the temporary absence of the chairman the vice chairman shall act as chairman—we have already had an automatic transfer of authority. The Parliamentarian stated in correspondence to me on this subject—correspondence which I would ask unanimous consent be included in the RECORD in its entirety at this point.

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

There was no objection.

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, January 31, 1991.

Hon. WILLIAM H. BROWN,  
Parliamentarian, House of Representatives, The  
Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL: I am writing with regard to H. Res. 43, providing for the election of Members of standing committees of the House, agreed to on Thursday, January 24. The paragraph listing Members elected to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs includes the following language:

Provided, That the powers and duties conferred upon the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the House rules shall be exercised by the Vice Chairman thereof until otherwise ordered by the House.

In this connection, I am interested in receiving your responses to the following questions: (1) has this language or any similar language ever appeared in a resolution providing for the election of Members to House committees? (2) what precisely does this proviso mean? and (3) why wasn't the minority informed about the inclusion in the resolution of this language?

Your assistance will be appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. WALKER.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 1, 1991.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: In your letter of January 31, 1991, you inquire about the meaning of and the circumstances surrounding the inclusion in H. Res. 43 on January 24, 1991 of the proviso electing Members to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which states that "the powers and duties conferred upon the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the House rules shall be exercised by the Vice Chairman thereof until otherwise ordered by the House."

To my knowledge, a precedent for this type of resolution occurred on March 18, 1954 where the House agreed to a resolution permitting the powers and duties conferred on the chairman of a standing committee to be exercised during the absence of the chairman by the next ranking majority members thereof until otherwise ordered by the House. (Deschler's Precedents, Vol. 4, Ch. 17, sec. 17.5). On that occasion, Speaker Martin recognized Majority Leader Halleck to call up the resolution by unanimous consent during the 83rd Congress after the committees had been elected. The Parliamentarian's note following that precedent suggests that the resolution may have been necessary because the Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries was unable to perform the duties of signing subpoenas, vouchers, and appointing subcommittee due to illness.

While clause 6(b) of Rule XI provides that in the temporary absence of the chairman the Vice Chairman shall act as chairman, it would appear that the language included in H. Res. 43 would impose upon the House the responsibility of determining when the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should resume his powers and duties. Although I am not aware of any precedent for inclusion of such language in an initial resolution electing members to committees, it does appear that the House has at least in one case taken this step when

a chairman's disability developed during the course of a Congress after he had been elected. The inclusion of this provision in the resolution electing the majority members was the responsibility of the majority party caucus and was presumably undertaken as a matter incidental to the election and consequent empowerment of Representative Udall as chairman in that same resolution. I am not aware of the extent of consultation, if any, between the majority and minority leadership on this question, although it was presented as part of the privileged resolution electing members presented by the majority party caucus pursuant to clause 6(a), Rule X.

I will be glad to discuss this question with you further at your convenience.

Sincerely,

BILL BROWN

Mr. WALKER. In that letter he says that the proviso included in House Resolution 43 imposed additionally on the House the responsibility to determine when the chairman of the committee should resume his powers and duties.

Who will make that decision?

The SPEAKER. It would, under this provision, require the House to make a determination as to the time at which the full authority of Mr. UDALL as chairman would be restored. It is true that House rules provide that, in the temporary absence of the chairman, the vice chairman of the committee should assume responsibility. But in a situation with which the House is presently involved, the absence of the distinguished chairman of the committee is for a period of time that is presently not known and it was thought advisable to confer more specific authority on the vice chairman of the committee to carry on the duties of the chairman until the House should otherwise order and determine.

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

We have established that a subsequent order of the House will be necessary to restore powers and duties to the chairman of the committee. Would such a subsequent order take the form of a privileged resolution that could be called up at the direction of the majority party caucus or the minority party conference?

The SPEAKER. If called by the direction of the majority caucus, it would be privileged under clause 6(a)(1) of rule X. Such a privilege attaches to the minority conference only when making recommendations with regard to the assignment of its Members to committees or the election of its members to committees.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO REPRESENT THE HOUSE AT GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY CEREMONIES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair appoints the following Members to represent the House of Representatives at appropriate ceremonies for the observ-

ance of George Washington's birthday to be held on February 22, 1991: Mr. OLIN, of Virginia, and Mr. WOLF, of Virginia.

#### APPOINTMENTS AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 93-304, as amended by section 1 of Public Law 99-7, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe the following Members of the House: Mr. HOYER of Maryland, Cochairman; Mr. FASCELL of Florida; Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts; Mr. RICHARDSON of New Mexico; Mr. FEIGHAN of Ohio; Mr. RITTER of Pennsylvania; Mr. PORTER of Illinois; Mr. SMITH of New Jersey; and Mr. WOLF of Virginia.

#### ANNUAL REPORT DESCRIBING ACTIVITIES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, February 6, 1991.)

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1989—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, February 6, 1991.)

#### ANNUAL REPORTS FOR 1988 AND 1989 OF FEDERAL PREVAILING RATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, February 6, 1991.)

#### ANNUAL REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL RAILROAD SAFETY ACT OF 1970—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, February 6, 1991.)

#### NATIONAL GIRLS AND WOMEN IN SPORTS DAY

Mr. McNULTY. 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. 30) to designate February 7, 1991, as "National Girls and Women in Sports Day" and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 30

Whereas women's athletics is one of the most effective avenues available through which women of America may develop self-discipline, initiative, confidence, and leadership skills;

Whereas sport and fitness activity contributes to emotional and physical well-being and women need strong bodies as well as strong minds;

Whereas the history of women in sports is rich and long, but there has been little national recognition of the significance of women's athletic achievements;

Whereas the number of women in leadership positions of coaches, officials, and administrators has declined drastically over the last decade and there is a need to restore women to these positions to ensure a fair representation of women's abilities and to provide role models for young female athletes;

Whereas the bonds built between women through athletics help to break down the social barriers of racism and prejudice;

Whereas the communication and cooperation skills learned through athletic experience play a key role in the athlete's contributions at home, at work, and to society;

Whereas women's athletics has produced such winners as Flo Hyman, whose spirit, talent, and accomplishments distinguished her above others and exhibited for all of us the true meaning of fairness, determination, and team play;

Whereas parents feel that sports are equally important for boys and girls and that sports and fitness activities provide important benefits to girls who participate;

Whereas early motor-skill training and enjoyable experiences of physical activity strongly influence life-long habits of physical fitness;

Whereas the performances of such female athletes as Jackie Joyner-Kersey, Florence Griffith Joyner, Bonnie Blair, Janet Evans, the United States Women's Basketball Team and many others in the 1988 Olympic Games were a source of inspiration and pride to all of us;

Whereas the athletic opportunities for male students at the collegiate and high school level remain significantly greater than those for female students; and

Whereas the number of funded research projects focusing on the specific needs of women athletes is limited and the information provided by these projects is imperative to the health and performance of future women athletes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That February 7, 1991, is hereby designated as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon local and State jurisdictions, appropriate Federal agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 30, designating February 7, 1991, as "National Girls and Women in Sports Day."

Since 1985, a day has been set aside to honor and recognize the great achievements made by women and girls in sports. It is vital that we continue to commemorate the strong participation and outstanding accomplishments of these female athletes.

Athletic participation at any level has proven to be extremely significant emotionally and physically. Initiative, team work, confidence, leadership skills, and self-discipline are just some of the qualities which are developed through athletic participation. This involvement has become an integral part of the educational, athletic and personal development of women.

National Girls and Women in Sports Day, while recognizing the accomplishments of women athletes, also recognizes and seeks to remedy the inequalities which still exist in athletic opportunities. For example, women still have fewer opportunities for achievement in the administration and coaching of women's athletics.

Only 47.3 percent of women's teams are coached by women—down from 90 percent in 1972. In addition, only 15.9 percent of women's programs are headed by a female administrator—also down by almost 90 percent since 1972. Although steps are being pursued to eradicate these inequalities, we must recognize that they still exist.

On this day, we also recognize the success and effort of female athletics around the country. We honor their accomplishments in the past and join in their hopes for the future.

I am extremely proud to recognize the accomplishments of student-athlete Rachel Bouchard of Farmingdale, ME, a senior at the University of Maine at Orono. Rachel is a member of the women's varsity basketball team. She is the all time high scorer for women at the university and is just 48 points shy of being the all time high scorer for both men and women. It is predicted that she will break that record in the next few games.

In May, Rachel will graduate and is planning to play professionally overseas. She would also like to go on to graduate school to study sports psychology. Rachel's success on the court has carried over into her academic life. She has the highest grade point average on the team, a 3.6, has been on the dean's list every semester and was elected last year to the GTE academic all American team.

I commend Rachel's commitment to her sport and her studies. She is an outstanding role model for young women in Maine and elsewhere. Rachel's stellar performance off the court demonstrates the benefits for women that can accrue through equal participation in athletics.

It is my hope that National Girls and Women in Sports Day will be a step toward giving women in sports the recognition they deserve both in and out of the sports world, and in paving the way for more opportunities down the road.

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.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 30, legislation to designate February 7, 1991, as "National Girls and Women in Sports Day." This recognition of the important role women have played in the world of sports is long overdue. Only in recent years have women been afforded the opportunity to participate on an equal level with their male counterparts in the athletics.

Today, women represent about one-third of intercollegiate athletes, and the number of women in administrative positions in athletic programs continues to rise. This strong representative of female athletes in our educational system was not always the case. Mr. Speaker, it was a long and hard road to climb to give girls and women equal opportunity in athletics and an equal amount of resources for their programs.

In my previous tenure in the Congress one of the accomplishments I am most proud of is the passage of title IX legislation, which resulted in a major reform of athletic programs around the Nation, to give women their fair share of resources, recognition, and opportunity. This legislation was not designed only for athletics, but for the educational system as a whole. However, the most blatant form of inequity between men and women was in the sports.

We have come a long way and today the evidence of the success of title IX is everywhere as women's competitions in many sports now challenge the popularity of men's competition. But there is still a long way to go before equality in sports is as real in life as it is in law.

In House Joint Resolution 30, "National Girls and Women in Sports Day," we recognize all women in sports whether they are on our Olympic team, or play in the U.S. Open or are on the local volleyball team. In this resolution, Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute to girls and women who love the achievement and competitiveness of sports as much as any male competitor.

Today, I would also like to take the opportunity to recognize an outstanding athlete, who

has played a key role in the success of women's athletics around the Nation. Two-time Olympic gold medalist and U.S. Olympic Hall of Fame enshrinee, Donna de Varona is a premier role model of excellence in the women's athletic world. Beyond her achievements as a swimmer Ms. de Varona has excelled as a sportscaster for major networks, founded the Women's Sports Foundation, and traveled extensively to touch younger generations with the opportunity and fulfillment of sports at any level.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Congress to join me in supporting House Resolution 30 and designate February 7, 1992, as "National Girls and Women in Sports Day"; to recognize the accomplishments of women such as Donna de Varona; and to support each and every woman athlete of our Nation as she runs, throws, hits, shoots, kicks, spins, bounces, skates, rides, skis, or swims her way to new heights.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 30, the joint resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

#### WORLD POWERS MUST STOP SUPPLYING ARMS TO THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

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

Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend our Secretary of State, Mr. James Baker—for having presented before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this morning, a most comprehensive statement of the war in the Persian Gulf, as well as the administration's proposed budget on international operations for fiscal year 1992.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note with interest one of the issues mentioned in Secretary Baker's statement, that is, the critical need of arms control and to stop the proliferation of sales of arms in the Middle East and to Third World countries.

Secretary Baker further noted that five Middle Eastern countries have more tanks than Great Britain or France.

The irony of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that our country, the Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, our NATO allies and France, are the biggest sellers of biological-chemical weapons, bullets, fighter planes, tanks, warships, and all. It is like giving these Third World countries the guns, and all they need to do is pull the trigger.

Mr. Speaker, are we really serious about arms control—when are we going to stop this insane and contradictory situation.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of Secretary Baker's statement for my colleagues to review.

TESTIMONY BY SECRETARY OF STATE JAMES A. BAKER III BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to appear before this Committee to testify on behalf of our Foreign Affairs funding proposal for FY 1992. With your permission, I would have my detailed written statement entered into the record. This year, even more so than most years, the funds requested should be seen as an investment in a better future—a world of secure nations, free peoples, and peaceful change.

I realize that as armies fight in the Persian Gulf such a world seems far distant. Yet I believe that it is vitally important to see the challenges we face also as opportunities to build a more secure and just world order. And so, today I would like to make a few comments concerning our ideas about post-crisis challenges and arrangements.

#### THE GULF WAR

The international coalition has been waging war against Iraq for three weeks now with very clear objectives: to expel Iraq from Kuwait; to restore the legitimate government of Kuwait; and to ensure the stability and security of this critical region. I want to make several observations about the course of the conflict so far.

First, the international coalition has held steadily to its purpose and its course. An outstanding achievement of the current crisis has been the ability of the United Nations to act as its founders intended. Before January 15, a dozen Security Council resolutions guided the United States and other nations as together we waged a concerted diplomatic, political, and economic struggle against Iraqi aggression. We did so because we all share a conviction that this brutal and dangerous dictator must be stopped and stopped now. Since January 16, in actions authorized by Security Council Resolution 678, we have been able to wage war because we are equally convinced that all peaceful opportunities to end Saddam's aggression had been explored and exhausted.

Let me give you some idea of those exhaustive efforts, both by the United States and other nations. In the 166 days between the invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990 and the expiration of the UN deadline for Iraqi withdrawal on January 15, 1991, I personally held over 200 meetings with foreign dignitaries, conducted 10 diplomatic missions, and travelled over 100,000 miles. For over six and one half hours, I met with the Iraqi Foreign Minister—six and one-half hours in which the Iraqi leadership rejected the very concept of withdrawal from Kuwait, even the mention of withdrawal. As you know, many others also tried—the Arab League, the European Community, the UN Secretary General, Kings, Presidents, and Prime Ministers.

None succeeded because Saddam Hussein rejected each and every one.

Second, the coalition is sharing responsibility for the economic burdens of conflict. Support for U.S. military outlays covers both 1990 commitments for Desert Shield and 1991 commitments for the period of January through March for Desert Shield/Storm. In addition, funds have also been forthcoming to offset the economic costs confronting the front line states in the region.

To date, we have pledged of over \$50 billion to support our military efforts and over \$14 billion to assist the front line states and others with their economic needs.

Third, our unfolding military strategy fully reflects our political purposes. This is the place to restate, as the President has done so often, that we have no quarrel with the Iraqi people. Our goal is the liberation of Kuwait, not the destruction of Iraq or changes in its borders.

A thoroughly professional and effective military campaign is underway. Our young men and women and the forces of our coalition partners are writing new annals of bravery and skill. But the task is formidable, and no one should underestimate Saddam's military capabilities. Iraq is not a third rate military power. Billions have been diverted from peaceful uses to give this small country the fourth largest army in the world. Iraq has more main battle tanks than the United Kingdom and France combined. It has more combat aircraft than either Germany, France, or the United Kingdom. Ejecting Iraq from Kuwait will not be easy, but, as the President said, "So that peace can prevail, we will prevail."

We are also trying our best to wage a just war in a just way. Our targets are military, and we are doing all we can to minimize civilian casualties and avoid damage to religious and cultural sites. And as General Schwarzkopf has pointed out, the coalition forces are even putting themselves in danger to minimize the risk to innocent lives.

In shocking contrast, Saddam Hussein's conduct of the war has been not unlike his conduct before the war: a relentless assault on the values of civilization. He has launched missiles against Israeli cities and Saudi cities, missiles aimed not at targets of military value but fully intended to massacre civilians. He has abused and paraded prisoners of war and he says he is using them as "human shields"—actions totally in violation of the Geneva Convention. And he has even attacked nature itself, attempting to poison the waters of the Persian Gulf with the petroleum that is the patrimony of the region's economic future.

We have heard, and we take at face value, Saddam's threats to use chemical and biological weapons. We have warned him—and he would be well advised to heed our warning—that we will not tolerate the use of such weapons. Any use of chemical or biological weapons will have the most severe consequences. And we will continue to insist that Iraq fulfill its obligations under the Geneva Convention with respect to coalition POWs.

I think that our conduct of the war is in itself a great strength, the strength that comes from doing the right thing in the right way. And Saddam's continuing brutality redoubles our resolve and the entire coalition's conviction about the rightness of our course. Ending Saddam's aggression will also be a blow to state-sponsored terrorism.

This is also the place to note our deep appreciation and great admiration for the extraordinary restraint of the Government of Israel. Israeli cities have been attacked by Saddam Hussein because part of his strategy has been to consolidate his aggression by turning the Gulf crisis into an Arab-Israeli conflict. Despite its clear right to respond, the Israeli government has acted with restraint and responsibility. The United States has been and will continue to be in close contact at the highest levels with Israel. We have offered and Israel has accepted batteries of Patriot missiles—some with Amer-

ican crews—to defend against Scud attacks. We continue to devote special military efforts to destroying the Scuds and their launchers.

Everyone should know: when we speak about our unshakeable commitment to Israeli security, we mean it.

The fourth observation I would make is this: the great international coalition that is now winning the war must also be strong enough to secure the peace. Winston Churchill once observed that "We shall see how absolute is the need of a broad path of international action pursued by many states in common across the years, irrespective of the ebb and flow of national politics." If we are going to redeem the sacrifices now being made by the brave men and women who defend our freedom with their lives, then we must fashion a peace worthy of their struggle. And that can be done if we can hold together in peace the coalition tempered by war.

I believe that when Congress voted the President authority to use force in support of the United Nations Resolutions, it voted also for peace—a peace that might prevent such wars in the future. I believe that the American people support our role in the coalition not only to defeat an aggressor but to secure a measure of justice and security for the future.

#### POST-WAR CHALLENGES

Mr. Chairman, we and every nation involved in this conflict are thinking about the post-war situation and planning for the future. It would be irresponsible not to do so. At the same time, it would be both premature and unwise for us to lay out a detailed blueprint for the postwar Gulf or, for that matter, the region as a whole.

The war itself and the way it ends will greatly influence both the security of the Gulf and the rest of the area. The deepest passions have been stirred. The military actions now underway necessarily involve many casualties, great hardships, and growing fears for the future. Tough times lie ahead.

We should therefore approach the postwar problems with a due sense of modesty. Respect for the sovereignty of the peoples of the Gulf and Middle East must be uppermost. In any event, modern history has shown that no single nation can long impose its will or remake the Middle East in its own image. After all, that is partly why we are fighting Saddam Hussein.

Yet among all the difficulties we face, one fact stands out: The peoples of the Gulf and indeed the entire Middle East desperately need peace. I truly believe that there must be a way, working in consultation with all of the affected nations, to set a course that brings greater security for all and enduring peace. We should therefore make every effort not just to heal the Persian Gulf after this war but also to try to heal the rest of the region which needs it so badly.

So I would like to discuss several challenges that I believe we must address in the post war period.

One challenge will be greater security for the Persian Gulf. After two wars in ten years, this vital region needs new and different security arrangements. In our view, there are three basic issues to be resolved: the purposes or principles of the security arrangements; the role of the local states, regional organizations, and the international community; and in the aftermath of the war, the military requirements until local stability is achieved, and thereafter.

I think we would find already a wide measure of agreement on the principles. They would include:

Deterrence of aggression from any quarter. Territorial integrity. There must be respect for existing sovereignty of all states and for the inviolability of borders.

Peaceful resolution of disputes. Border problems and other disputes that have long histories—and there are many beyond the Iraq-Kuwait example—should be resolved by peaceful means, as prescribed by the U.N. Charter.

These principles must be put into action first and foremost by the local states so that conflicts can be prevented and aggression deterred. We would expect the states of the Gulf and regional organizations such as the Gulf Cooperation Council to take the lead in building a reinforcing network of new and strengthened security ties. No regional state should be excluded from these arrangements. Post war Iraq could have an important contribution to play. And so could Iran as a major power in the Gulf.

There is a role, too, for outside nations and the international community, including the United Nations, to encourage such arrangements and to stand behind them.

As for the United States, we have deployed small naval forces in the Persian Gulf ever since the Truman Administration in 1949. We had and continue to have very strong bilateral ties with Saudi Arabia and other local states. And through the years, we have conducted joint exercises with and provided military equipment for our friends in the region. The President has said that we have no intention of maintaining a permanent ground presence on the Arabian Peninsula once Iraq is ejected from Kuwait and the threat recedes.

Before security is assured, however, important questions must be answered. We will be going through an important transitional phase in the immediate aftermath of the war as we try to establish stability. Let me list just a few of the questions that need to be answered.

Should there be a permanent, locally stationed ground force made up of local troops under UN auspices or under regional auspices, such as the GCC?

How can the international community reinforce deterrence in the Gulf, whether by contributing forces or through other political arrangements, such as resolutions or security commitments?

No one has the answers yet to these and other questions. Some may never be answered. But however we eventually proceed, we will conduct extensive consultations among all of the concerned parties to such arrangements.

A second challenge will surely be regional arms proliferation and control. This includes both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. The terrible fact is that even the conventional arsenals of several Middle Eastern states dwarf those of most European powers. Five Middle Eastern countries have more main battle tanks than the United Kingdom or France. The time has come to try to change the destructive pattern of military competition and proliferation in this region and to reduce arms flows into an area that is already overmilitarized. That suggests that we and others inside and outside the region must consult on how best to address several dimensions of the problem:

How can we cooperate to constrain Iraq's post war ability to retain or rebuild its weapons of mass destruction and most destabilizing conventional weapons?

How can we work with others to encourage steps toward broader regional restraint in the acquisition and use of both conventional armaments and weapons of mass destruction? What role might the kinds of confidence building measures that have lessened conflict in Europe play in the Gulf and the Middle East?

Finally, what global actions would reinforce steps toward arms control in the Gulf and Middle East? These could include rapid completion of pending international agreements like the Chemical Weapons Convention, as well as much tighter supply restraints on the flow of weapons and dual-use technology into the region. And what implications does that have for arms transfer and sales policies?

A third challenge will be economic reconstruction and recovery. An economic catastrophe has befallen the Gulf and the nations trading with it. Kuwait has been looted and wrecked. Hundreds of thousands of workers have lost jobs and fled. Trade flows and markets have been disrupted.

I am confident that the people of Kuwait will rebuild their country. As we have worked with the Kuwaitis in their moment of trial so we shall look forward to cooperating with them in their hour of recovery.

And no one should forget that for the second time in a decade, the people of Iraq will be recovering from a disastrous conflict. The time of reconstruction and recovery should not be the occasion for vengeful actions against a nation forced to war by a dictator's ambition. The secure and prosperous future everyone hopes to see in the Gulf must include Iraq.

Of necessity, most of the resources for reconstruction will be drawn from the Gulf. Yet, should we not be thinking also of more than reconstruction? It might be possible for a coalition of countries using both local and external resources to transform the outlook for the region—in expanding free trade and investment in assisting development, and in promoting growth-oriented economic policies which have taken root across the globe.

Any economic effort must have a special place for water development. Well over half the people living in the Middle East draw water from rivers that cross international boundaries or depend on desalination plants. We have all been incensed by Saddam Hussein's deliberate poisoning of the Gulf waters, which could affect a large portion of Saudi Arabia's desalinated drinking water.

Finally, we will want to consult with governments both from the Middle East and from other regions about specific arrangements that might best serve the purposes of region-wide economic cooperation. Such cooperation would surely be helpful in reinforcing our overall objective: reducing one by one the sources of conflict and removing one by one the barriers to security and prosperity throughout the area.

A fourth challenge is to resume the search for a just peace and real reconciliation for Israel, the Arab states, and the Palestinians. By reconciliation, I mean not simply peace as the absence of war, but a peace based on enduring respect, tolerance, and mutual trust. As you know, I personally had devoted considerable effort before the war to facilitating a dialogue between Israel and the Palestinians—an essential part of an overall peace process. Let's not fool ourselves. The course of this crisis has stirred emotions among Israelis and Palestinians that will not yield easily to conciliation. Yet in the aftermath of this war, as in earlier wars, there may be opportunities for peace—if the par-

ties are willing. And if they really are willing, we are committed to working closely with them to fashion a more effective peace process.

The issues to be addressed are of course familiar and more challenging than ever.

How do you go about reconciling Israelis and Palestinians? What concrete actions can be taken by each side?

What will be the role of the Arab states in facilitating this process and their own negotiations for peace with Israel?

How will regional arms control arrangements affect this process?

What is the best diplomatic vehicle for getting the process underway?

Again, we will be consulting and working very closely with our friends and all parties who have a constructive role to play in settling this conflict.

A fifth and final challenge concerns the United States: we simply must do more to reduce our energy dependence. As the President has stressed, only a comprehensive strategy can achieve our goals. That strategy should involve energy conservation and efficiency, increased development, strengthened stockpiles and reserves, and greater use of alternative fuels. We must bring to this task the same determination we are now bringing to the war itself.

As you can see, Mr. Chairman, some of these elements are political, some are economic, and some of necessity are related to security. That suggests that we should view security not just in military terms but as part and parcel of the broader outlook for the region. We're not going to have lasting peace and well-being without sound economic growth. We're not going to have sound economic growth if nations are threatened or invaded—or if they are squandering precious resources on more and more arms. And surely finding a way for the peoples of the Middle East to work with each other will be crucial if we are to lift our eyes to a better future.

#### THE SOVIET UNION AT A CROSSROADS

Before closing, I would like to say a few words on another challenge we face: our relations with the Soviet Union.

The President has spoken often of a new world order in which freedom and democracy might flourish, secure from the fears of the Cold War. We have been hopeful about such an order partly because of the growing cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. In the fall of 1989, I described that cooperation as a search for points of mutual advantage. And this search has yielded good results.

Three examples will suffice. First, over the past year, a democratic Germany, fully a member of NATO, was united in peace. The Iron Curtain has vanished and with it the Cold War. Second, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe have emerged in their own right once more, free to pursue democracy and economic liberty. Third, the Soviet Union has joined the international coalition confronting Iraqi aggression. As Foreign Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh reiterated last week, the Soviet Union continues to completely support the full implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions.

While we both have worked at finding these and other points of mutual advantage, it has long been clear to both sides that the potential for long-term cooperation or even partnership between our countries would depend ultimately on the course of the Soviet Union's domestic reform. That is why when last fall I called for pathways of mutual advantage, not just discrete points, I also announced our desire to see a broader demo-

cratic dialogue with Soviet reformers. Not just economic reform but essential political reform could transform the Soviet Union into a very different society.

Over the course of several summits and numerous meetings, we have become much more familiar with the ups and downs of perestroika, the enormous and daunting difficulty of changing after seventy years a society's basic direction and many of its values.

In the last several months, however, we have seen a series of unsettling events. They include the tragic violence in the Baltics; an apparent turn toward economic re-centralization; a less free media; extension of army and KGB authority; and the resignation or departure from the government of key reform advocates.

These actions are completely inconsistent with the course of peaceful change, democratic principles, the rule of law, and real economic reform. There is simply no justification for the use of force against peaceful and democratically elected governments. Our hearts go out to the courageous people of the Baltic states who have acted throughout with dignity and restraint.

The President and I have had extensive discussions with President Gorbachev and other Soviet officials about these developments. We and our European allies have pointed out the inevitable consequences if the Soviet government continues on this path. And we have stated our belief that the Soviet Union cannot hope to succeed in meeting its own objectives if it should abandon perestroika, democratization, and glasnost.

On the Baltics, I could do no better here than to quote the President's words from the State of the Union address: "... our objective is to help the Baltic peoples achieve their aspirations, not to punish the Soviet Union."

We have had representations from the Soviet leadership about their continuing commitment to reform, the peaceful dialogue with the Baltics, and to creating a society ruled by law, not force. We're going to watch this situation closely to see whether these representations become enduring realities.

I hope that the Soviet Union will relearn quickly the lesson from its own hard experience: the old ways are not the right ways. Perestroika cannot succeed at gunpoint. Clearly, we cannot rule out the possibility that matters may still turn more for the worse. But at the same time, we must be careful not to jump to premature conclusions.

The Soviet leadership is at a crossroads. We have made clear that their last several steps have taken them down a path of no benefit for them or for us or for anyone else. For the sake of history and for the sake of the world, I hope they resume the march that has given the entire world hope of a better future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to sum up my comments today with this observation. When I appeared before you a year ago to review our overall foreign policy, we were well on the way to a whole and free Europe, secured by expanding U.S.-Soviet cooperation in resolving the continent's outstanding political and military problems. The possibility, even the idea, of this terrible conflict in the Gulf was beyond anyone's imagination. Yet now we face the challenges of hot war in the Gulf and growing uncertainty about the course of Soviet reform.

There can be different views of how to handle these situations. I look forward to your counsel and good words on both issues. Yet

on one point I believe we are in very basic agreement: the need for American leadership. If we do not do our part, then Churchill's broad path pursued by many states in common will not be possible. And as Churchill warned, "the middle path adopted from desires for safety and a quiet life may be found to lead direct to the bull's eye of disaster." More clearly than we could have ever imagined a year or even six months ago, the world emerging from the end of the postwar era will be shaped by the United States and its international allies. Our constant purpose must be to make of that world a fitting place for free peoples to live.

#### OVERVIEW OF OUR FUNDING REQUEST

Let me turn to our foreign affairs funding request. For FY 1992, we seek \$21.9 billion in discretionary budget authority for International Affairs Budget Function 150, an increase of \$1.8 billion over levels appropriated for FY 1991. In addition, we are requesting a one-time appropriation of \$12.2 billion as the U.S. share of a global quota increase for the International Monetary Fund.

In accordance with the terms of the Budget Enforcement Act, our request provides for specific, stringent limits on our spending levels, in spite of unprecedented demands for U.S. leadership across the globe.

In order to achieve our worldwide objectives within these resource constraints, additional flexibility is needed. Last year, I appealed to this committee to make constructive consultation—not earmarking—the primary vehicle for achieving consensus on program objectives. I am pleased to note that we made some progress toward that goal last session.

Earmarking in our Economic Support Fund (ESF) declined from 82 percent in FY 1990 to just over 68 percent in FY 1991. In our Foreign Military Financing (FMF) account, the decline was less dramatic but still significant, from 92 percent to 87 percent. This is a welcome trend, one that we want to encourage and promote.

But we still have a long way to go. To support our request this year, let me express the Administration's willingness to work in partnership with Congress to develop greater flexibility in our State operations and foreign assistance legislation. To guide this effort, let me suggest five broad objectives for our international cooperation programs, built around the five foreign policy challenges which I presented in my testimony before this Committee last year.

First, promoting and consolidating democratic values, including free and fair elections and respect for human rights. As the President noted in his State of the Union address, this fundamental American principle has stood as a beacon to peoples across the globe for more than two centuries.

Transitions toward democracy, however difficult, cannot be accomplished in isolation from the rest of the world. The essential ingredients of democracy—respect for human rights, the rule of law, free and fair elections, and political and economic opportunity—are also the basic building blocks of the new world order.

Second, promoting free market principles and strengthening U.S. competitiveness. Sustainable economic development cannot be separated from the pursuit of sound, growth-oriented policies; together, these can promote U.S. economic interests abroad. By fostering market forces through deregulation, privatization, and promotion of free trade and investment, reform-minded countries can establish an appropriate complement to building and securing democracy.

They also can develop into thriving markets for U.S. exports and the jobs they represent. Indeed, U.S. exports to four aid graduates—Colombia, Chile, Taiwan, and Korea—total more than twice the value of our entire worldwide foreign assistance budget. Our long-run goal should be to graduate more countries from foreign assistance toward mutually beneficial trade and investment relationships with the United States.

Third, promoting peace by helping to defuse regional conflicts, strengthening the security of our regional partners, and pursuing arms control and nonproliferation efforts.

As the crisis in the Persian Gulf has demonstrated, there is no substitute for strong U.S. leadership. We continue to play a vital role in bolstering the security of regional allies around the world. Egypt and Turkey—two long-standing beneficiaries of U.S. security assistance—are bulwarks of the coalition against Saddam Hussein.

National and regional security are preconditions for democracy and free enterprise to flourish. Saddam Hussein's aggression is a dramatic reminder of the continuing need to protect the security of regional states of vital interest to the United States and our allies. The proliferation of missile systems and chemical and biological weapons further sharpens our interest in promoting regional stability.

Fourth, protecting against transnational threats, especially to the environment and from narcotics and terrorism.

As I noted in my first statement to Congress two years ago, "The future of our civilization demands that we act in concert to deal with a new class of problems, transnational in nature." This includes curbing proliferation, protecting the environment, and countering terrorism and narcotics.

We have made progress in all of these areas. We have led the international effort to tighten nonproliferation export controls on a global basis. We continue to work to advance our environmental agenda. We are actively pressing state sponsors of terrorism in an effort to thwart terrorism around the globe. And our international narcotics efforts to counter supply are complemented by reports of declining demand at home.

But progress is sometimes slow, unheralded, and hard won. Iraq's conduct following its invasion of Kuwait is a brutal reminder of the danger posed by the interaction of these transnational threats. Saddam Hussein's most recent actions illustrate how traditional concepts of threats to national security need to be extended. Indeed, Iraq has combined:

A credible threat of the use of chemical and biological weapons.

A contemptible use of missile technology as a weapon of terror against innocent civilian populations.

Perhaps the world's first deliberate use of an environmental disaster as a wartime weapon, with unknown consequences for the entire region for years to come; and

A worldwide call for terrorist actions, sometimes supported by embassies abroad in flagrant violation of the basic principles of diplomacy.

These challenges to international order can all be defeated by a committed world community, supported by firm U.S. leadership and appropriate resources as needed.

Finally, meeting urgent humanitarian needs will continue to reflect deep and abiding concerns of the American people. America's record for responding quickly and substantially to alleviate severe suffering

caused by natural and man-made disasters is unequalled. We salute the role played by American private voluntary agencies and private American citizens in this regard. Meeting the most pressing humanitarian needs with food aid, disaster relief, and refugee assistance will always be an essential component of U.S. assistance policies.

We are prepared to work with Congress on legislation that builds on these basic objectives to provide more flexibility and simplicity to our economic cooperation efforts. Working with our global partners, we envision the use of five principal mechanisms to advance this agenda worldwide:

One, more flexible and integrated bilateral assistance authorities. We seek more flexible account structures and greater ability to transfer funds both within and among accounts to meet pressing, unexpected needs. We hope to move toward an assistance program unified around a single set of core objectives, along the lines of those outlined above. As a first step toward this goal, we have proposed a modest \$20 million Presidential contingency fund in our FY 1992 budget request.

The need for flexibility is especially urgent at a moment when developments in the world are moving so quickly and unpredictably, while our ability to respond with additional resources is severely constrained by budgetary realities. The Gulf crisis, the restoration of democratic rule in Nicaragua and Panama, and the dramatic developments in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and South Africa over the past year illustrate that when unprecedented demands for American leadership are combined with limited resources, our need for flexibility becomes all the more urgent.

Two, we see scope for more creative use of multilateral mechanisms to advance our objectives, through both the international financial institutions and the United Nations system.

The Bretton Woods institutions have now admitted all the Eastern European countries, and are playing a central role in structuring sound, adequately financed programs to ease their transition to market economies based on private initiative. Should the Soviet Union move further along the path of structural economic and political reform, we would expect the IMF and the World Bank to play a role in facilitating its transformation as well. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development will promote the development of infrastructure, environmental programs, and private sector development in the reforming countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Meanwhile, through our Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, the Inter-American Development Bank is expected to play a major role in promoting sound investment policy in our own hemisphere.

To support the efforts of these institutions, we are again proposing full funding for the multilateral development banks—including all arrears—plus a periodic quota increase for the IMF. This funding will allow these institutions to leverage other contributions in support of our objective of promoting sound, growth-oriented economic policies in the developing world.

As President Bush noted in his State of the Union address, the United Nations has played a historic role in the Gulf crisis, one that is close to fulfilling the vision of its founders. The Security Council's twelve resolutions, which laid the basis for ending the crisis, symbolized the unity of the international community against Iraq's aggression and established the principle of collec-

tive security as a cornerstone of the post-Cold War era. At the same time, the humanitarian organizations of the U.N. system have assisted the hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing from Iraqi aggression. The United States has a vital interest in strengthening this new, revitalized United Nations as a full partner in the building of a post-Cold War world where peace, stability, and prosperity prevail.

Three, we foresee greater reliance on creative responsibility sharing as we strengthen our global partnerships with the European Community members and Japan in particular. As many in Congress have noted, our own difficult budgetary situation makes such efforts especially important for the advancement of a common agenda with partners who share our values and interests.

No effort so well illustrates the collective response of the world community to defend world peace as our successful efforts to enlist worldwide support for Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and for the front-line states whose economies have been set back by the effects of Saddam Hussein's aggression.

In 1990, our coalition partners pledged \$9.7 billion to meet Desert Shield costs, representing 88% of the roughly \$11 billion in total incremental expenses we incurred. As soon as hostilities broke out, our allies again responded promptly and generously to shoulder their fair share of coalition military expenses under Operation Desert Storm. Over the past three weeks, we have received unprecedented pledges totaling in excess of \$40 billion from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the UAE, Japan, Germany, and Korea, to offset Desert Shield Storm expenses expected to be incurred during the first three months of 1991.

The world community has also responded swiftly and generously to the needs of the front-line states, especially Egypt and Turkey, as they incurred substantial costs in standing up to Saddam Hussein's aggression. Through the U.S.-chaired Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group, over \$14 billion has been pledged by the Gulf states, Europe, Japan, and Korea to ensure that the economies of affected regional states are stabilized and that their commitment to stay the course is reinforced. The United States has played its part in this effort, supported by Congress, by canceling Egypt's \$6.7 billion military debt, thereby relieving a heavy burden on a critical regional ally. Other countries have followed suit and canceled an additional \$8 billion in Egyptian debt.

Meanwhile, in Eastern Europe, the successful G-24 process chaired by the European Commission has mobilized more than \$18 billion in pledges for Poland and Hungary, to ease their transition to market economies. And in the Philippines, the Multilateral Assistance Initiative (MAI) has been responsible for nearly doubling the level of international assistance to this struggling democracy. We are also looking to our worldwide partners to assist us in clearing arrearages of Panama and Nicaragua to the international financial institutions and to assist in the financing of the enhanced debt strategy. Finally, we are encouraging Europe and Japan to join us in pledging \$100 million a year over five years to create a Multilateral Investment Fund for Latin America and the Caribbean. This Fund is a key part of the President's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and will play a crucial role in enabling countries to move from aid to trade and private investment as the principal engines of economic growth.

In each case, both strong U.S. leadership and a community of interests are essential to catalyze a broad worldwide response.

Four, we envision more creative use of trade and investment policies as vehicles to promote U.S. interests in world economic growth, as well as to enhance our own economic strength.

Central to these efforts over the past four years has been our determination to pursue a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations. We continue to believe that the Uruguay Round has profound political as well as economic implications for the shape of the world in the next century. Successful conclusion of the round is essential for the economic growth and stability of the emerging Eastern European democracies, as well as the wide range of developing countries who will ultimately rely on expansion of world trade—not aid—as the primary vehicle to generate employment opportunities and sustainable economic growth.

In our own hemisphere, the President's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative represents a comprehensive effort to promote economic growth and stability in the region, combining free trade and investment—the primary vehicles for growth—with debt relief and environmental initiatives.

As an important step toward the eventual goal of hemispheric free trade, the Administration intends to seek a North America Free Trade Area with Mexico and Canada, which we are convinced promises important economic benefits for all three countries. Since the President's announcement last June of his desire to seek a free trade agreement with Mexico, we have engaged in extensive consultations with Congress and the private sector. Canada's participation in these talks will establish a free trade zone throughout the world's largest market, worth over \$6 trillion and including more than 350 million consumers. The resulting stimulus to exports and the creation of new business opportunities would act as a significant engine of growth and employment generation.

Meanwhile, the United States has worked actively with our Asian partners in the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), to advance market-oriented cooperation among member states.

Our Bilateral Investment Treaty program has been an important vehicle in ensuring an open and liberal investment climate for U.S. investors and exporters. Over the past year, we completed negotiations with Poland and Czechoslovakia and are actively negotiating with nine other countries which are in the process of undertaking economic restructuring programs.

Finally, we will be challenged to pursue more vigorous U.S. diplomacy, in the context of a State Operations budget that reflects an activist approach to the diplomatic challenges of a changing world stage. I would again reiterate our need for funding flexibility, especially as it relates to our ability to transfer funds among accounts within our very tight State Department Operations budget.

#### BILATERAL ASSISTANCE

Bilateral military and economic assistance will remain an essential tool in advancing U.S. interests through the 1990's, assuming the necessary flexibility can be provided to meet emerging needs. No other vehicle at our disposal is as well suited to provide timely support to our allies and friends around the world. Our interests in political pluralism, market-driven economic development,

peace-making, and strengthening alliances—all can be advanced by prudent use of bilateral assistance resources.

For FY 1992, our request for discretionary budget authority for bilateral assistance programs total \$13.1 billion. That marks a 6.5% increase over the \$12.3 billion appropriated by Congress for FY 1991. Highlights of this request by category are as follows:

\$4.65 billion in Foreign Military Financing (FMF), supporting a program level of \$4.92 billion.

\$3.24 billion in Economic Support Funding, up from \$3.14 billion.

\$1.3 billion in development assistance, the same as the prior year.

\$800 million for the Development Fund for Africa.

\$400 million for Central and Eastern Europe, a slight increase the FY 91 appropriation.

\$160 million for the Multilateral Assistance Initiative for the Philippines.

\$1.3 billion for bilateral PL-480 food aid, supporting the export of 5.9 million metric tons of U.S. commodities.

\$171 million for anti-narcotics assistance, plus additional security and development assistance resources to support these efforts.

#### MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE

For the multilateral development banks, we are requesting \$1.7 billion in FY 1992 budget authority, up from \$1.6 billion in FY 1991. This includes \$1.1 billion in funding for the International Development Association, the soft-loan window of the World Bank, which provides concessional financing to the world's poorest countries, as well as full funding for the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the other regional development banks.

Our FY 1992 budget request also contains \$12.2 billion in budget authority for the proposed increase in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund (IMF), as provided for in the Budget Enforcement Act. This is to ensure that the Fund has the resources necessary to fulfill its responsibilities as the world's principal monetary institution. In the Third World, IMF arrangements support market-oriented adjustment and underpin debt reduction operations in support of the Brady Plan. The Fund has also spearheaded economic reform in Eastern Europe, and responded vigorously to assist countries seriously affected by the Persian Gulf crisis.

In addition, we are seeking \$250 million for voluntary contributions to international organizations including the U.N. Development Program (\$115 million) and UNICEF (\$55 million).

#### REFUGEES AND OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

The United States continues to play a prominent role in addressing the plight of the world's refugees—through our international assistance and domestic resettlement programs, as well as our diplomatic efforts in support of permanent solutions to refugee situations.

For FY 1992, we are requesting \$491 million for Migration and Refugee Assistance, up from \$486 million in FY 1991.

For our refugee assistance programs overseas, we seek \$233 million in FY 1992 funding, a \$20 million increase over the FY 1991 level. These programs will continue to focus on basic life-sustaining activities for the most vulnerable groups and support lasting solutions through opportunities for voluntary repatriation and local integration.

To finance refugee admission and resettlement, we seek \$192 million in FY 1992 funding. This will cover the expenses of an esti-

mated 120,000 refugees—about the same number as last year. Most refugee admissions will be from the Soviet Union and Vietnam, but there will also be admissions from Eastern Europe, Africa, Latin America, and the Near East. Family reunification will continue to be a priority, as will the resettlement of persecuted religious minorities and former political prisoners.

In addition, we request \$20 million to replenish the President's Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund, to enable us to respond to unforeseen refugee and migration needs worldwide.

Another important component of our international development assistance request is our \$200 million request for Peace Corps operating expenses.

#### INVESTING IN DIPLOMACY

The Gulf crisis provides a vivid demonstration of the "front line" role played by the State Department in protecting American citizens and defending American interests abroad. This is an increasingly expensive responsibility, exacerbated by the demands on the Department to expand operations to meet new political and economic opportunities around the globe. Fluctuations in exchange rates, higher rates of overseas inflation, and the continuing need to enhance the security of our posts and personnel abroad further magnify the problem. Today we face a potential and worrisome weakening of our foreign affairs infrastructure at a time when we are being called upon to meet extraordinary and new challenges.

Since January 1989, we have placed a high priority on strengthening our ability to manage scarce resources:

To better match national interests to available resources, we are taking steps to better integrate policy planning with the budget process.

To strengthen foreign service personnel management, we have begun to implement key proposals made by the Bremer and Thomas commissions.

To conserve personnel and financial resources, we have set up a new center in Rosslyn, Virginia, to process hundreds of thousands of refugee and asylum applications from the Soviet Union, which can serve as a model to meet future consular and immigration demands.

To strengthen our physical plant abroad, we have put into place a professional property management system and begun implementation of a five year integrated plan which addresses new construction, rehabilitation, repair, and maintenance.

To enhance the cost-effectiveness of our security efforts, we have begun to implement reforms to link our wide-ranging efforts at over 250 posts abroad to country-specific threat profiles.

For State Department salaries and expenses, we are requesting \$2.05 billion in budget authority for FY 1992, an increase of \$179 million over the current year. This is the minimal level of resources we need to fund our overseas and domestic operations: over two thirds of the increase compensates for price increases and exchange rate changes. The remainder will be used to support several specific funding requirements:

Expanding our diplomatic presence in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe (\$25 million).

Responding to increased immigration processing requirements necessitated by passage of the Immigration Act of 1990 (\$24 million).

Strengthening our information and financial systems by improving our infrastructure (\$13.5 million).

In the Foreign Buildings account, we have requested \$570 million in FY 1992 funding. Of this total, \$440 million represents the first installment of a five year, \$2.35 billion program to address the Department of State's most urgent facility replacement priorities, including embassies in Bangkok and Bogota. Our goal is to restore the safety, security, and workability of our aging but valuable inventory of overseas facilities.

We are also seeking \$130 million in funding for the Moscow Embassy project. It is imperative that we make a decision now on a new building so we can begin to operate as soon as possible in appropriate, secure space.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The President has emphasized the urgency of restoring financial viability to the United Nations and other international organizations. After several years of effort on the part of Congress and the Administration, we are pleased to report significant movement toward budgetary and administrative reform within the U.N. and its affiliated agencies. No one who has witnessed the response of the United Nations Security Council to recent events in the Persian Gulf could deny the importance to U.S. interests of a financially healthy United Nations system.

We remain absolutely committed to full funding for U.S. assessed contributions, to the extent permitted by law, and to paying our prior year arrearages over the next four years. We appreciate the full funding we received for FY 1991, which included initial funding toward the necessary process of arrears clearance. For FY 1992, we are requesting \$750 million in budget authority to meet our current assessments to international organizations, plus an additional \$371 million for arrears clearance, to be paid out over the following four years. For international peacekeeping activities, we are requesting \$69 million to meet our full funding obligations, plus \$132 million for arrearages.

#### PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Public diplomacy will be one of our most valuable tools as we seek to encourage the worldwide tide of democracy and political pluralism. For the valuable work of the U.S. Information Agency and the Board for International Broadcasting, we are requesting \$1.3 billion in FY 1992 funding, up slightly from the prior year. Within this level, a new emphasis will be placed on information and cultural programs in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, and Islamic world.

#### CONCLUSION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We look forward to working with you and the Members of this Committee in the coming months to mobilize the resources needed to carry out our ambitious foreign affairs agenda.

#### FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Treasury Department released its long awaited study on Federal deposit insurance.

Unfortunately, what Treasury proposes does not go far enough, considering the problems in the financial industry.

Today, Congressman RICK LEHMAN and I are again introducing legislation which would, as the Treasury Department proposes, ban brokered deposits and establish risk based premiums.

But we propose to do more, because more needs to be done.

Treasury says we should study limiting deposit insurance. Our legislation requires it.

To further limit taxpayer losses, our bill makes Federal deposit insurance look more like an actual system of insurance. Specifically, we provide a 10-percent deductible—or haircut—for amounts insured above \$50,000, up to \$100,000.

We also require that banks disclose to consumers the safety and soundness ratings issued by Federal regulators. Consumers pay for these ratings, and they have the right to know which banks are safe, and which are not.

Most of my colleagues have heard that the FDIC Bank Insurance Fund will probably be broke next year. Incredibly, Treasury has no proposal on how to recapitalize this fund for immediate solvency.

Our bill does. The measure we introduce today closes a loophole and requires very large banks to pay FDIC premiums on foreign deposits. That would add hundreds of millions to the bank insurance fund.

As Congress considers overdue reform in our system of deposit insurance, I hope my colleagues consider the initiatives Representative LEHMAN and I offer today.

Let me describe in detail the various parts of this comprehensive proposal.

To limit losses to the taxpayer, the Federal Government should provide protection to savers only on one \$100,000 account. While this may sound like a restatement of current law, it most definitely is not. Contrary to popular understanding, the law requires the Federal Government to provide deposit insurance up to \$100,000 per account, not per individual.

Frankly, we cannot afford to provide such extensive coverage. The Federal safety net was originally designed to protect the smaller savers.

The most eloquent rationale for this protection was included in the committee report on the New York Assembly bill which established the Nation's first deposit insurance system in 1828. It said:

The loss by insolvency of banks falls upon the farmer, the mechanic and the laborer, who are least acquainted with the condition of banks, and who, of all others, are most illy equipped either to guard against or sustain a loss by their failure.

Those ill equipped to sustain a loss due to a bank failure should be our concern. Providing \$100,000 in deposit insurance coverage per person protects those interests. The interests of others, who are better equipped to provide their own protection, should not be a

Federal priority, especially as the estimates of the long-term cost of the FSLIC crisis continue to rise.

While the FDIC is not now able to provide data on the number of persons who hold multiple accounts in excess of \$100,000, a recent survey by the Independent Bankers Association of America sheds light on the subject.

In a scientific nationwide survey, the IBAA asked 838 respondents this question:

In all your savings and checking accounts, including CDs, money market accounts and IRAs, approximately how much do you currently have in total?

Of those who responded, 6 percent, or roughly 1 person out of 17, said they had accounts totaling more than \$100,000. Seventy-six percent had accounts totalling less than \$75,000.

As the FSLIC catastrophe showed, often institutions which pay the highest yields are those which are candidates for collapse. Desperate for funds, they pay a higher than market rate for big-ticket, insured accounts.

Let's take a look at history. According to the April 27, 1990 American Banker, the highest retail, 6-month certificate of deposit yields offered on April 18, 1990, less than 1 year ago, were as follows:

	Percent
Connecticut Bank and Trust, Hartford .....	9.00
Columbia S&L, Irvine, CA .....	8.87
Citytrust, Bridgeport, CT .....	8.84
Maine Savings Bank, Portland .....	8.78
Bank of New England, Boston .....	8.75

Of these five institutions, only Citytrust, of Bridgeport, CT, received other than the lowest rating by Veribanc.

What do we know about the other four low-rated institutions which paid such very high rates for funds, knowing full well that the taxpayer would pick up the tab on these CD's in the event of failure? What do they have in common?

All of them have failed.

Connecticut Bank and Trust, with \$4.4 billion in assets, had 49 percent of its loans tied up in real estate in a softening real estate market. The bank's problem real estate loans as a percentage of capital and loan loss reserves equaled 78.6 percent. Nationwide, the average percentage of problem real estate loans was 15.4 percent. It was seized by the FDIC on January 6, 1991.

The Bank of New England, with \$14.3 billion in assets, had 32.4 percent of its loans in real estate. Its problem real estate loans as a percentage of capital and loan loss reserves equaled 103.5 percent. It has, of course, since collapsed, at substantial cost to the taxpayer. The colossal collapse of this institution was widely reported.

The \$1.54 billion asset Maine Savings Bank, with an astounding 86.8 percent of its loans committed to real estate, had an even more astounding 438 percent in problem real estate loans when

measured against capital and reserves. Maine Savings Bank failed last week.

Still another institution paying a high yield on deposits, Columbia Savings and Loan, Irvine, CA, was very shaky. With \$9 billion in assets, if held substantial amounts of junk bonds. Columbia Savings and Loan failed last month.

Under our current system, the Federal Government encourages deposits in these institutions, rather than more prudently run enterprises, through an open ended system of deposit insurance. Limiting deposit insurance coverage to \$100,000 per person would be a step towards curbing a system in which profits, in the form of very high yields, are privatized, while losses, which accrue to the taxpayer when an institution fails, are socialized.

This measure also requires that Federal regulators institute a system of risk-based deposit insurance by the end of 1991. The current system assesses the same deposit insurance premium to well-run institutions as it does to those run by high-fliers. This provides a perverse incentive to engage in risky activities. A risk-based premium would measure the risk of assets, as well as liabilities, since the risk to the insurance funds clearly derive as much from the asset as they do from the liability.

The numbers tell the story about why we must reduce taxpayer exposure in our deposit insurance system. At year end 1989, federally insured accounts in banks, savings and loans and credit unions totaled \$2.9 trillion—a staggering amount of Federal liability. To cover that exposure, the combined amount of funds available from the Bank Insurance fund, the Savings Association Insurance fund and the National Credit Union Share Insurance fund was a paltry \$15.1 billion.

The situation has deteriorated rapidly since then. The total reserves now on hand is closer to \$9 billion. According to the January 25, 1991, American Banker, the Bank Insurance fund will have a \$4 billion deficit by the end of next year.

To further limit losses to the taxpayer, we should take a step toward making our system of Federal deposit insurance look more like an actual system of insurance. Specifically, a 10 percent deductible for amounts insured above \$50,000, up to \$100,000, is part of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the president of a very well-run Wisconsin savings and loan, who has long been an advocate of this "haircut" approach to the establishment of a financial discipline in Federal deposit insurance, reminded me of a quotation by financier Bernard Baruch. He noted that "the return of your money is more important than the return on your money." For larger depositors, this should be the operating principle, but under the current system, it is not.

Under this legislation, 76 percent of all depositors, according to the IBA figures, would have accounts 100 percent insured. The individual who seeks insurance on a \$100,000 account would face a maximum deductible of \$5,000. The effect of this tiered approach for the largest insured depositor is an effective 5 percent deductible.

The bill would also rein in a runaway expansion of the system of Federal deposit insurance which has occurred as a result not of congressional policy, but through administrative action. I refer to the policy by the FDIC in recent years which extends Federal deposit insurance coverage for large scale deposits of pension plans of \$1 million to \$100 million.

Banks have argued that the deposit insurance coverage passes through to individual participants in the plan. These participants, of course, do not have immediate access to their money, nor have they chosen to open accounts at a particular federally insured institution. If that institution fails, however, the taxpayer must pick up the tab for millions upon millions—all from a single account. By extending blanket coverage to such accounts, the Federal Government relieves the pension fund from the necessity of conducting a diligent review of the safety and soundness of a particular institution. This legislation would end this unsafe and unsound practice.

To establish a new discipline in our system of deposit insurance, the financial condition of a bank must be made known to individual customers. The Federal regulators have devised a system which provides some guidance in this area. The ratings which regulators use should be shared with those who, ultimately, pay the bills in the event of a failure of an insured institution—the taxpayer.

Formally known as the Uniform Interagency Bank Rating System, the more common name for the ratings is CAMEL. Five factors make up the acronym: Capital adequacy, asset quality, management, earnings and liquidity. Each factor is rated on a scale of 1 through 5. With 1 being the most favorable. Combining the five factor ratings brings about a composite rating of 1 through 5, with 1 indicating an institution sound in nearly every aspect and 5 indicating an institution with a high probability of failure in the near term.

This legislation simply provides that, upon request of any consumer, any insured depository institution shall disclose the Federal safety and soundness rating. That disclosure shall include a description of the meaning of the CAMEL composite rating. In addition, the insured institution would be required to disclose the safety and soundness rating by any private organization which compiles such ratings, if approved by the appropriate Federal banking agency.

The effect of this very proconsumer, marketplace oriented provision should be profoundly positive. I am certain those insured institutions which are rated highly by the regulators will make that known in their advertising, as well they should. Those which are not will have a powerful incentive to increase their soundness, and thereby their rating, an incentive which the deposit insurance system unaccountably lacks. The Consumer Federation of America strongly supports this approach.

Finally, the legislation would ban brokered deposits.

High yield deposits in shaky financial institutions are not the sole cause of our deposit insurance crisis, but they certainly contribute to the overall cost. Consider the following examples of institutions which failed which made use of funds supplied by deposit brokers in search of high yields.

Alaska National Bank of the North, Fairbanks, AK, had \$200.2 million in deposits when it failed in October 1987. Of this amount, \$66.8 million were in brokered deposits.

Resource Bank of Houston, which failed in December 1988, had \$43.1 million in deposits. Thirteen million of these were in brokered deposits.

First Service Bank for Savings, Leominster, MA, had \$678.6 million in deposits when it failed in March 1989, of which \$315.2 million, or nearly half, were brokered deposits.

The law now requires the taxpayer to bail out these deposits just as it extends protections to the average depositor. A recent study found that of the 50 most expensive thrift resolutions in 1988, 36 had more than twice the industry average proportional holdings of brokered deposits.

As an article on the collapse of the savings and loans in the September 1990 Washington Monthly notes:

Other evidence indicates that big investors accounted for an even greater share than that of the funds in collapsed S&Ls. According to Tom Schlesinger of the Southern Finance Project, a group that is doing the hard work of sifting through the records of failed thrifts, "In many instances the biggest institutions that have been bailed out have deposits of \$80,000 or more accounting for 30, 40 or 50% of all deposits." That money could have been brokered or it could have come in direct, but one thing's for sure; it didn't come from small savers. It came from investors hunting for high interest—interest that we're now paying off through the bailout. According to Schlesinger, brokered deposits at these thrifts account for 25 to 40% of all funds.

Mr. Speaker, by taking the steps included in this legislation, we can begin to limit the liability to the taxpayers when it comes to financial deposit insurance, while protecting the interest of the overwhelming number of average depositors.

This legislation, in tandem with legislation introduced in the two previous Congresses and will reintroduce in this

Congress, which provides for a single, well capitalized deposit insurance fund and a single, strong financial regulator, and which I intend to reintroduce in this Congress, ensures that those who pay the bills—the taxpayers—will be calling the shots.

I urge my colleagues to support the Deposit Insurance Modernization Act of 1991.

□ 1640

#### TRIBUTE TO COLIN J. TUGGLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure that I place in today's RECORD a letter from Colin J. Tuggle of Rhinebeck, NY.

Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you how proud I am of this young man.

I nominated Colin to the Naval Academy, and he has accepted the appointment.

His insight into Saddam Hussein's strategy, the gulf war, and the protestors is astounding for someone so young.

He wrote that when he sees broadcasts of protestors, he cringes.

And there is no doubt in his mind that the August 2 invasion of Kuwait was merely the first step in Saddam Hussein's grand plan of conquest.

He believes, like the overwhelming majority of Americans, that President Bush had no choice but to drive this madman out of Kuwait.

He closed his letter by telling me how proud he is of the U.S. flag I sent him, which hangs proudly in his bedroom.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the letter follows:

ONE WOLCOTT DRIVE,

Rhinebeck, NY, January 21, 1991.

HON. GERALD B. SOLOMON,  
Rayburn Building,  
Washington, DC,

DEAR MR. SOLOMON: I would like to sincerely thank you for calling me on 16 January 1990 and I acknowledge my support for the actions of Operation Desert Storm. 16 January 1990 is truly a day that I will remember for the rest of my life. There are very few days as dramatic as that. Five minutes after I finished by conversation with you, the first cruise missiles fell in Baghdad.

I was so excited when I told my father about our conversation. My father was about to turn the television off when we heard the reporter in Baghdad discuss the tracer fire shooting across the sky and the explosions in the distance. I realize that you must have been extremely busy that night and you cannot imagine how greatly I appreciate your call.

Now that Annapolis is offering me an appointment to the Academy, I can foresee myself in a conflict such as this. I of course worry about my own outlook after commissioning. However, I also have a cousin who is in the Army and is part of the second wave of tanks in Saudi Arabia, PFC George S. Tuggle. He is a tank driver in a Bradley Fighting Vehicle. My Aunt and Uncle are very worried about the prospects of their son in combat, but, like myself, they are ex-

tremely pleased with the job that the U.S. is doing and support the President's decisions.

As I watch the unfortunate reports of protest marches throughout the nation and even across the street from the White House, I cringe. These people are obviously confused. I do not believe, any more than you do, that this war is about the price of gasoline at the pump or the economic stability of the big oil companies. If these people stayed in touch with reality, they would obviously recognize that the economic stability of the entire world is being held hostage to Saddam Hussein's self-serving volitions.

I am 100 percent confident that if the President had not sent in some defensive forces into Saudi Arabia in August, Saddam Hussein would have enveloped that nation like he swallowed Kuwait. During the spring of 1990, Saddam Hussein made an announcement that he would conquer both Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates. He has already accomplished the first. The only way he could accomplish his second goal would be through the use of his air, sea, or land forces. Well, Mr. Solomon, in Operation Desert Storm, we have already seen the inferiority of his air and sea forces. That would have left him with one choice. He would have had to conquer the U.A.E. by sending his ground troops through Saudi Arabia. And we both know that he would not have ceased his advance until he destroyed his long-time nemesis, Israel.

Saddam Hussein's intentions were clear. This man had a dream. Through the use of his extensive and "mighty" military force, he wanted to create an Arab State with direct access to three great bodies of water, the Mediterranean Sea, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf. He was envious of the United States and the Soviet Union and wanted to create a third super power in the Middle East. He had to be stopped.

I believe that given more time, the sanctions would not have worked. We have seen in previous wars and in the current crisis that Mr. Hussein does not care about the welfare of his people. In the war with Iran, he used chemical warfare against his own Kurdish people merely as a terror weapon. In the beginning of the Gulf War he said that he would fight to the last Iraqi child. This man is sick.

Only the innocent Iraqi citizens would have suffered if sanctions were given more time. All of the available resources in Iraq would have been channelled to Saddam Hussein and his Army. If we had given sanctions more time, and after two years they hadn't worked, what option would we have had left? All of our public support in the U.S. would have dwindled and the morale and readiness of the troops in Saudi Arabia would have been hurt. Action was the only option.

On 16 January 1990, President Bush, as Commander in Chief, made a very wise decision to activate Operation Desert Storm. Nobody wants a war and clearly the President tried to avoid this one through diplomatic means. However, Saddam Hussein is clearly not a rational man and he would not listen to reason. As President Bush said on the 16th, "We have no choice but to drive Saddam from Kuwait by force. We will not fail." I salute you, Mr. Solomon. You are doing a fine job through your support of Operation Desert Storm and I thank you again for calling me on the 16th.

Sincerely,

COLIN J. TUGGLE.

P.S.—When I received my Eagle Scout medal in 1989, I was awarded an American flag that flew over the capitol building. I

have had this very special flag hanging on the wall of my bedroom ever since. If at all possible, could you please send me a signed photograph of yourself. I would like to hang such a photograph next to the flag in support of my Congressman and the United States of America. Thank you very much for your time and God Bless.

Mr. Speaker, with young men like this, America's future is in good hands.

#### HOSPICE COVERAGE UNDER MEDICAID

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation to make hospice coverage a mandatory benefit under the Medicaid Program. This compassionate and cost-effective service which serves the terminally ill and their families was made an option under Medicaid in legislation passed and enacted during the 99th Congress. At the same time, the hospice Medicare benefit was made permanent. More recently, in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, an increase in Medicare hospice reimbursements was enacted. I was proud to have been the sponsor of these pieces of legislation and I am pleased to introduce this bill today to extend the Medicaid hospice benefit. This measure had 82 cosponsors in the last Congress. In reintroducing this measure, I am very pleased to be joined by Mr. WAXMAN, chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, Mr. GRADISON, ranking member on the Budget Committee, and 40 other cosponsors.

Hospice is the practice of caring for the terminally ill in their homes and communities, in a familiar setting among family and friends. Over the past decade, there has been enormous growth in the hospice movement. Today, there are over 1,700 hospice programs in operation throughout the country, 1,000 of which are full-service programs certified by Medicare.

Through this innovative means of care and support a team of health care professionals and other specialists strives to make the remainder of a patient's life as comfortable and meaningful as possible by providing medical and therapeutic attention at home. In this way, hospice helps people cope with the physical, emotional, and spiritual hardships of terminal illness. This is enormously important, not only for the patient, but for their family, as well.

Just as important as the humanitarian contributions of hospice, however, is the fact that hospice programs save money. Hospice allows people to move out of acute care facilities, and into less expensive care arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, when the legislation making hospice an option under Medicaid was first introduced, it was with the aim of making this form of care for the terminally ill available to those with low incomes and their families. While the Medicare benefit makes hospice available to the elderly and disabled, who represent a large proportion of those who could benefit from hospice, Medicaid beneficiaries,

who are indigent, disabled, or both, still do not have needed access to the same services.

Unfortunately, the group without hospice coverage includes a large number of AIDS patients, and will include many more as this tragic disease spreads. As you know, AIDS is one of the greatest epidemics to strike this country.

There is obviously a pressing need to care for the rapidly growing number of persons who are dying of AIDS, and this must be done in the most cost-effective and compassionate manner possible. Hospice, with its combination of in-patient and out-patient care, provides the most appropriate means of providing for this group. Last year, hospices cared for 25 percent of all those who died of AIDS. Clearly, it is a highly desirable service.

The large and rapidly growing number of intravenous drug abusers among AIDS patients is a further incentive to expand access to hospice. These individuals are often homeless or come from unstable living situations which do not allow for appropriate care at home without outside assistance. Hospice is already providing the best possible care for this group. Expanding the hospice Medicaid benefit through this legislation will enable many more AIDS patients to receive the care they need in hospice programs. Otherwise, they will be forced into expensive acute care settings or, worse, into the streets.

Because of the AIDS epidemic, the cost savings of hospice care will be even more significant. Here, we may take a lesson from local efforts to cope with the disease over the past few years. The most recent data available indicate that the average cost of caring for an AIDS patient during the last year of life is about 3 to 4 times more expensive in cities which do not make extensive use of hospice programs as compared with those cities that do. Hospice care must be expanded to keep costs down as an increasing number of indigent patients seek treatment for AIDS.

Although it is encouraging that many states currently provide hospice care to Medicaid beneficiaries, I believe, along with the other cosponsors of this bill, that the current need is great enough to warrant making the hospice Medicaid benefit mandatory. The bill would become effective for calendar quarters beginning on or after July 1, 1992. If necessary, states would be allowed additional time to enact any required legislation. I urge my colleagues to give their approval to this measure to provide access to hospice coverage for those who need it most, while saving taxpayer and government funds in the process.

A copy of the text of this bill follows:

H.R. —

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

#### SECTION 1. REQUIRING MEDICAID COVERAGE OF HOSPICE CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1902(a)(10) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "(18)," after "(17)," and

(2) in subparagraph (C)(iv), by inserting "and (18)" after "(17)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The amendments made by this section apply (except as provided under paragraph (2)) to payments under title XIX of the Social Security Act

for calendar quarters beginning on or after July 1, 1992, without regard to whether or not final regulations to carry out such amendments have been promulgated by such date.

(2) In the case of a State plan for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act which the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines requires State legislation (other than legislation authorizing or appropriating funds) in order for the plan to meet the additional requirements imposed by the amendments made by this section, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of such title solely on the basis of its failure to meet these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act. For purposes of the previous sentence, in the case of a State that has a 2-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

#### PETITION TO RECTIFY THE CONDITIONS OF THE CHILDREN OF ROMANIA

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am here to present to the Congress a petition which was drawn up by students in the seventh and eighth grades at the Espirito Santo School in Fall River, MA. These young people became very concerned, as they have a right to be, about the fate of children in Romania. They read in school, under the direction of one of their teachers, Michael Vieira, who I am pleased to say was a member of my staff in my congressional district, about the children of Romania who were the most poignant victims of the Ceausescu regime. They are children who, when that regime was fortunately overthrown because it was one of the most brutal in recent memory, were left behind. They were children who were left without parents, children without resources, children without the basic decent minimum of existence that human beings have a right to expect, and to the credit of the young people at the Espirito Santo School, they have taken up the cause of these children. They are here in America. They are not able, obviously, in a physical way to respond to the needs of these children in Romania, but they understand what it can mean if you live in a democracy; they understand both the rights and responsibilities which can be exercised.

Mr. Speaker, these students have circulated petitions. These petitions have been important because they are not only in and of themselves an expression of interest, but they have helped a large number of people in Fall River with the problem.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to just read the petition. I am going to insert a copy of it here. They have got well over a thousand people to sign, and they are continuing to get signatures, I believe.

#### PETITION TO RECTIFY THE CONDITIONS OF THE CHILDREN OF ROMANIA

We the undersigned wish to express our deep concern of the abusive conditions which the children of Romania are forced to endure. These innocent children are treated worse than an animal, and are forced to live under inhuman conditions.

We, the undersigned, request that Congressman Barney Frank present our petition to President Bush and make a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives making the United States government and people aware of this inhuman treatment.

This is a request, Mr. Speaker, which I am proud to be able to comply with. My congratulations to Sister Mildred Morrissey, the principal of the school; Mike Vieira, but mostly to the young people themselves for their compassion. We, Mr. Speaker, with the leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], and others took some actions last year on behalf of these children. We provided some funds, and we tried to exercise some leverage. We must do more. There is no moral cause more compelling than responding to the needs of young people who are totally innocent of anything except living in the wrong place at the wrong time and being subjected, therefore, to the most brutal abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pledge to the young people of the Espirito Santo School, and I know my colleagues join me, that we will increase our efforts in the coming year to provide both material assistance and moral support to these children, that we will do everything we can to facilitate adoption and to pressure this Government to do more for these children. This is an important moral claim being made on all of us, and I am proud of the young people of the Flint neighborhood in Fall River and of the Espirito Santo School for putting aside some of the things that generally occupy the time of kids their age so that they can present this petition through me to the Congress of the United States and to the President, to whom I have sent the actual petitions.

#### WE NEED GROWTH IN THE ECONOMY, NOT GROWTH IN GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, imagine if in 1979 someone had come to you and asked you to imagine an economy that was starved for capital, a system in which that starvation for capital produced a mas-

sive public bureaucracy that was there to dig a serious part of the financial sector out of its serious problems. Imagine if you were told that this public bureaucracy was created to dispose of assets that could probably never be disposed of at a profit, that would subject both the government and the economy to massive losses as a result of those problems, and imagine if you were told that anywhere from 25 to 33 percent of that country's deficit would be consumed by the bailout of that sector of the financial system. If someone came to you in 1979 and asked you to imagine such a country in 1991, you would probably guess it was Poland, or Czechoslovakia, or the Soviet Union.

But in fact, Mr. Speaker, the country that I am describing today is our own country, the United States of America, and we are living through a recession that is not only short termed with its ravages of unemployment but that is also long term with its capital starvation.

We have received the President's budget message. We have begun the process of reviewing it. But the most poignant evidence I heard about the shortcomings of the President's budget message was from an employer near my district in southern New Jersey just last Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I went to visit this man's plant where he has 20 employees, and he told me that he would like to hire 15 more people to assist him in his business of fabricating electronic products for our space program, for our defense program, and for our weather control system. He is not going to hire those 15 people, and here is why:

Part of the reason is that his health insurance bill monthly is \$100,000 for 20 employees. Part of the reason is that he knows when he gets above 49 employees in his business that the heavy hand of OSHA regulations will come in and cause him untold grief. Part of the reason is the fact that he cannot borrow money, and that is the most important reason.

Mr. Speaker, the capital starvation has hit him, and it has hit my part of New Jersey. If it had not hit him, he would be hiring 15 more people on the private sector payrolls. He would be buying 15 more machines, machines manufactured in Bridgeport, CT, and Los Angeles, CA. Capital starvation has hit him, and it is the problem long term that is not addressed by our administration's budget message.

We need growth in the economy, not growth in Government, but growth in Government is what the President is proposing. We need relief from the confiscatory burden of taxation on individuals and businesses in this country, but status quo, burdensome taxation, as my colleagues will recall, is what the administration has proposed.

□ 1650

I hope Mr. Speaker, that all of us as part of this budget debate for fiscal year 1992 will start asking and answering questions about how to make our economy grow again and about how to relieve our people from the burden of oppressive and confiscatory taxation. I hope in the context of this 1992 fiscal year debate we will not only seek new answers but ask new questions about our economy in the years ahead.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S BUDGET LEAVES THE NATION UNPREPARED TO MEET TOMORROW'S CHALLENGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, the administration has now submitted its \$1.4 trillion budget for fiscal year 1992. Following last year's budget reconciliation guidelines, there are few major surprises in the President's budget. There remain, however, a number of significant questions about the effect current fiscal policy will have on our country and future generations.

Members may remember that only 1 year ago the administration forecast a fiscal 1992 deficit of only \$25 billion. With anticipated revenues of \$1.165 trillion, the administration now projects next year's deficit to be over \$280 billion, with the current 1991 deficit exceeding \$300 billion.

These numbers are no longer hidden. Both the administration and Congress have accepted the fact that factors such as Operation Desert Storm, the resolution of savings and loan problems, and the recession will cause the deficit to reach historic heights. Rather than hide this fact behind smoke and mirrors, the choice was made last year to control the growth in new Federal spending and adopt a pay-as-you-go fiscal strategy.

A pay-as-you-go policy assumes that new priorities will be addressed either by new revenues or cuts in existing programs. This administration clearly has a set of new priorities for domestic programs, some of which I applaud, such as increased funding for highways, but missing from the equation are any new revenues to realize these goals. Instead, the President's budget simply takes a bite here and a cut there from a host of existing domestic programs.

As a result, the administration's budget is largely an exercise in robbing Peter to pay Paul. NASA is targeted for a \$1.8 billion funding increase, with \$200 million set aside for the administration's priority Manned Mission to Mars project. At the same time, roughly \$1.4 billion would be cut from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with community development block grants to be reduced by \$300 million from last year's funding level.

Members should recall that Congress only last year provided the first funding increase for CDBG's in over 8 years. A long overdue step was being taken to reverse the trend of the past decade, during which Federal aid to cities

fell to 6.4 percent of city revenues, compared to the 1980 level of 17.7 percent.

Unfortunately, the administration's budget represents a zero-sum game for our Nation. A gain for NASA equals a loss for other domestic programs serving America's cities and communities.

The administration confidently predicts a short recession, and I hope that this forecast is true, but even a short recession does not seem to support the elimination of Federal assistance to workers put out of work due to unfair foreign competition. The President's budget calls for the elimination of the Economic Development Administration and EDA-administered programs such as trade adjustment assistance benefits.

The administration suggests that eliminating TAA benefits will simply mean that workers unemployed due to unfair trade competition will be served instead through existing Job Training Partnership Act dislocated workers programs. Unfortunately, the administration's request for dislocated worker assistance remains the same as last year's appropriation. The result is more work to do without the additional resources needed to do the job right.

Whatever budget savings claimed for eliminating TAA benefits did not go to serve dislocated workers, but, instead, went to advance some other administration priority. Again, the zero-sum game means that for every winner, somebody loses.

The administration's budget sends everyone scurrying about for a slice of the Federal budget pie, but the simple fact is that no matter how the pie is cut, vital American needs will go unmet. Our children and our communities will go unserved and undernourished.

At risk is the future economic growth of the United States. Our failure to invest in our country's physical infrastructure and our priceless human resources represents a far greater threat to this Nation than any foreign dictator.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the principle of paying as we go, but I also believe we must face our responsibility to provide new revenues sufficient to meet the vital needs of the United States. We can continue to argue over priorities, bound by the restrictions of a pay-as-you-go policy, but unless we accept the fact that we must bring more to the table, we will erode the U.S. position in whatever emerges as a new world order and leave to our children a weaker America.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH'S FISCAL YEAR 1992 BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President submitted his budget proposal to the Congress. While it is filled with thoughtful provisions for investment in America, such promises are constrained by economic realities.

The record \$1.45 trillion budget also estimates the largest annual budget deficit to date—\$318 billion. However, one positive aspect of this year's budget process is that Federal outlays will be controlled by the spending limits enacted under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. Defense, domestic, and inter-

national affairs categories are all bound by spending caps which, if exceeded, require automatic spending cuts in applicable programs to eliminate the added costs.

At the forefront of this year's budget debate will be our funding prerogatives. We are a country at war and in a recession. These events challenge our ability to craft a strong budget policy. Congress and the President must meet this challenge to steer the Nation's economy toward sustained growth.

The President indicates his desire for more investment in infrastructure, technological research, and human capital. Clearly, we need to direct our resources to these areas. He supports increased personal savings through family savings accounts and penalty-free IRA withdrawals for downpayments on first homes. I have sponsored similar legislation for first-time homebuyers.

One proposal which is not prudent during this period of economic stresses is the President's continued insistence on a capital gains tax cut. After a protracted battle last year between the administration and Congress over deficit reduction and tax fairness, this proposal undermines successes in both areas by increasing the deficit and providing a break that primarily helps upper income individuals, with little or no relief for many taxpayers.

Under the new budget process, we are going to have to do more with less. Vital Federal dollars should be earmarked for the most needed funding priorities.

I think it is important to point out where improvements need to be made. First of all, President Bush proposes a 120 percent increase in funding for the superconducting super collider. At the same time, his budget would slash energy assistance for low-income persons by 36 percent. It also would cut funding for community and regional development programs by 26 percent, which does not contribute to the investment theme advocated by the administration.

The President's budget also continues to hit Medicare beneficiaries by proposing \$25.2 billion in cuts, paid for in part by increased out-of-pocket costs for Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, the ink is still drying from the \$43 million in Medicare reductions agreed to in last year's Budget Reconciliation Act. I think the President should consider reductions in other areas where he has proposed huge increases before he asks Medicare beneficiaries to shoulder more budget cuts.

The President's budget does offer some medicine for an ailing economy, but it is up to us now to get this Nation back on its feet again. Much work needs to be done, including: Support and improvements in education, opportunities for our work force, renovation of roads and bridges so commerce can flow freely, protection for our environment, and financial soundness of Government services.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with you and our colleagues in the days and weeks ahead to craft a solid budget for the new fiscal year.

**A PLEA FOR FULL SUPPORT FOR OUR TROOPS IN THE PERSIAN GULF**

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, it is the feeling of some in the Congress and elsewhere that support for the troops without support for their overall mission in the Persian Gulf is somehow, equivalent to full backing. Not so.

Our soldiers in the gulf are standing on a rug, which is U.S. policy in the gulf. They know their safety and security—and their ability to be victorious—are directly related to the steadfastness and the decisiveness of our overall war effort. And that includes support on the home front.

To say one supports troops and not policy is to, on the one hand, back our troops and on the other, pull the rug out from under them.

It doesn't work both ways, and our men and women in the gulf are well aware of the difference.

So, with Saddam Hussein thanking our protestors, calling them "noble souls," it is obvious that he derives encouragement from our public dissent and holds out the hope that if he can hunker-down, bunker-in, kill enough Americans, send them home in body bags, take enough prisoners, the anti-war movement at home will grow, perhaps to Vietnam-era proportions.

All the while, our men and women are killed, maimed, endangered; all the while, their loved ones and friends are frightened and pained.

So I appeal to the protestors and demonstrators—thoughtful, patriotic Americans—to give peace a chance by volunteering to hold back on their public demonstrations against our policy and allow this war to be concluded in as short a time as is humanly possible.

I believe that is the greatest contribution they could make for peace at this time. Likewise, that is the kind of "support for our troops" that our troops really want.

**REPEAL TAX ON CERTAIN FUND-RAISING OF CHURCHES AND OTHER CHARITIES**

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which corrects an error of the 1986 Tax Act which has penalized charities in Nebraska and Minnesota. This legislation is identical to a bill I introduced last March, H.R. 4320.

The bill will correct a problem which has caused hardship for many churches, charities, schools, veterans groups, and service organizations which utilize

licensed gaming devices—known as pickle cards in Nebraska, or pull-tabs—to raise funds for their charitable activities. In the technical corrections part of the 1986 Tax Act, an obscure few words extended the unrelated business income tax [UBIT] to the gaming activities of charitable organizations outside North Dakota. Evidently, only nonprofit organizations in Minnesota and Nebraska are affected by this provision, because they are the only States that allow persons who sell these sorts of fundraising devices for nonprofits to be compensated.

Until last year, nonprofit groups were unaware of the change extending the tax. This has led to unforeseen back taxes, interest, and penalties against the charities, in situations where the proceeds of the pickle sales had already been spent for the charitable purposes of the organizations. In Nebraska alone, there are about 230 charities and nonprofits involved. One organization alone owes the IRS \$484,000 in back taxes and penalties due to this provision.

The UBIT was enacted in 1950 to prevent tax-exempt organizations from using their exempt status to compete unfairly with taxpaying businesses. However, in States like Nebraska and Minnesota where the gaming or pull-tab activities are conducted only by tax-exempt organizations, unfair competition does not and cannot exist. The affected organizations justifiably contend that their gaming activities are outside the intent, scope, and policy of UBIT.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a copy of the Joint Committee on Taxation's revenue estimate for H.R. 4320, which corrects this portion of the 1986 Tax Act, and also for an alternative that would merely repeal the back tax liability up until January 1, 1990, the approximate period when most nonprofits were unaware of the tax.

My colleagues from Nebraska, Senators JIM EXON and BOB KERREY introduced identical legislation on the Senate side (S. 2038) during the last Congress and will most likely reintroduce the legislation this year.

Unless relief is forthcoming, the impact of back taxes, penalties and interest will deal a severe financial blow to the affected nonprofit organizations. Service that these organizations bring to our communities will be negatively impacted in every instance and altogether eliminated in some.

Congress should repeal this tax on churches, charities, and other nonprofit groups. The Federal Government has cut social programs and increased burdens on private charitable resources. Our Nation's terrible drug problem has dramatized the need for the moral leadership of our religious organizations, at the same time it has

increased the need for the varied services of charitable organizations.

This is not the time to send delinquent tax bills to churches and to other worthy nonprofits in Nebraska and Minnesota on a theory that they have been competing with the private sector. In fact, Nebraska and Minnesota prohibit these activities in the private sector, and nonprofit organizations are the only ones conducting these activities. They are not competing with the private sector, and the unrelated business income tax should not apply to these activities.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION,  
Washington, DC, August 23, 1990.

HON. PETER HOAGLAND,  
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. HOAGLAND: This is in response to your request dated March 26, 1990, for a revenue estimate of a proposal to exempt from the unrelated business income tax (UBIT) certain nonprofit organizations running games of chance.

The proposal would exempt from UBIT income from games of chance conducted in States that, as of October 5, 1983, had a law in effect permitting the conduct of such games so long as the activities were run by nonprofit organizations. Two alternatives are proposed. The first alternative would eliminate UBIT liability from October 23, 1986, and thereafter. The second alternative would repeal UBIT liability from October 23, 1986, to December 31, 1989, only.

We estimate that these two alternatives would reduce Federal budget receipts by the following amounts:

(In millions of dollars)

Item	Fiscal years—					
	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1991-95
Repeal UBIT from 10/23/86 and thereafter .....	-53	-35	-4	.....	.....	-92
Repeal UBIT from 10/23/86 through 12/31/89 .....	-40	-21	.....	.....	.....	-61

I hope this information is helpful to you. If we can provide further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,  
RONALD A. PEARLMAN.

□ 1700

**TRIBUTE TO DANNY THOMAS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, the world is extremely poorer today because of the sudden death of one of the finest, most humane, greatest entertainers of all, an all-American man, Danny Thomas, who died early today of a heart attack.

Danny was able to bring laughter and smiles to millions of people over a career that spanned 50 years. But that is

only part of this remarkable story. There are generations of us who know Danny Thomas as a pioneer, not only in the world of the stage, screen, and live performances that he gave, but also as a pioneer with his series *Make Room for Daddy* and other television serials that were among the longest running in our country. He was also a pioneer in producing shows like *The Dick Van Dyke Show* and others.

It is very, very instructive as Americans to take a look at who and what he was. He was born in Deerfield, MI, on January 6, 1914, and raised pretty much in Toledo, OH, the fifth of 10 children. He was born of parents who were Lebanese immigrants. He was an Arab-American. His father was a laborer.

He was born Muzyad Yakhoob, and later changed his name to Amos Jacobs. But he took his stage name from two of his brothers, Danny and Thomas.

After he successfully traveled in the radio arena and clubs and films, he achieved stardom in television. I think one of the most interesting things about America's favorite television comedian was the fact that he was the type of performer who could appeal to every segment of the American family.

His entertainment was not only terrific, but it was very, very wholesome. I think that is one reason why so many people loved him as an entertainer.

But there is another side to Danny Thomas that should be told. Danny was appearing in a club years and years ago that was closing, and he did not have two nickels to rub together. Danny was a very religious person, a devout Catholic, and told the story that he slipped into church for a visit when he got his pink slip at the club. He took out a pamphlet given to him that extolled the virtues of St. Jude as the patron saint of hopeless causes, and, to quote Danny, he said, "Help me find my way in life." In exchange, he promised to build a shrine, he wasn't quite sure what that would be, to St. Jude.

The rest is history. In 1962, St. Jude's Hospital opened in Tennessee. That hospital has treated more than 12,000 children for diseases such as leukemia. They have actually arrested that disease in many ways.

Dr. Michael DeBakey, a renowned heart surgeon, coincidentally, another Lebanese-American, said that one child saved at St. Jude's means 1,000 other children who are saved, because of the gains that St. Jude's Hospital makes, not only in treating children, but in medical research. So we see that this facility that Danny was able to get by raising money personally, with its \$50 million annual operating budget, emphasizes outpatient treatment, with 20,000 visits annually, and, according to the *Los Angeles Times*, has the international reputation as a pediatric research center for cancer and other catastrophic childhood diseases. People

have estimated that Danny personally raised more than \$1 billion for this center.

One of the things Danny said when they were at one of the dedications that tells what type of fellow Danny Thomas was, they said, "What is your biggest accomplishment in life?" Of course, he was such an important entertainer and always sought after, and, as a matter of fact, in the TV series "Empty Nest" in which Danny appeared last weekend, which I saw on television, that apparently was his last performance. So he was still in great demand as an entertainer.

But they asked him what was his most important contribution. He said, "There is no question about it: That," meaning St. Jude's Hospital and Research Center, "is my epitaph." It is right on the cornerstone.

A while back he had a family coat of arms designed with the family motto. The motto is, "Blessed is he who knows why he was born."

He said he was blessed, and he was blessed. He was blessed as a devoted father and husband. He and his wife Rose Marie have been married more than 54 years. How is that for an example of devotion of an entertainer, who was unlike what sometimes is the so-called image in Hollywood. I know his wife was always by his side and always a tremendous help to him.

Danny has three wonderful children that I know he was very, very proud of. Marlo, who is magnificent and a fine actress and producer and activist for human rights causes; Tony, who is one of the outstanding TV producers today and very well-respected; and his daughter Terri, who carries on his work at St. Jude's and works there full time.

Danny was awarded the highest civilian award, the Gold Medal of Honor, by President Reagan not too long ago. But most importantly I think his legacy is the wonderful example. He was an entertainer, and his legacy, which will always live on, in my judgment, was the magnificent work he did for those who may seem to be hopeless, as he once found himself, by the magnificent work he did in honor of St. Jude, the patron saint of the hopeless, for the children of our country and the world.

God bless Danny Thomas, God rest his soul, and God bless all the people, especially his family, who cared so much about him.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to submit for the *RECORD* a recent article which appeared in the *New York Times* regarding Danny's recent autobiography.

[From the *New York Times*, January 1991]

DANNY THOMAS PUTS HIS LIFE AND WORK ON PAPER

(By Mervyn Rothstein)

Danny Thomas, 77 years and 1 day old, is sitting on a sofa at his midtown hotel comparing the comedians of today with the ones of his generation. "Most of the new comics have about six or seven great minutes," Mr.

Thomas says. "After that, they have to garbage it up to be out there for maybe 20 minutes. In our day, you did an hour."

He raises his left hand to his mouth, and gray smoke from the long cigar that is clenched between his fingers drifts over his not-as-gray hair. He reaches up to adjust the blackrimmed eyeglasses that somewhat disguise his trademark large hook nose, a nose that three movie producers—Jack Warner, Louis B. Mayer and Harry Cohn—could not persuade him to change.

"The new comics' subject matter is not deep enough," Mr. Thomas continues, "They don't get to the core of the people. There's really no substance, no universality to what they're doing. There's no artistry there." He takes another puff. "They have one big problem. They have to start on top. They go on the talk shows or to the big comedy clubs and the first time out they must be scared to death. They have no place to stink. We did. Oh, did we stink!"

#### AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY

The tale of the days in which he stank, as well as the years in which he soared, is told in Mr. Thomas's autobiography, "Make Room for Danny," which he wrote with Bill Davidson and which is being published by G.P. Putnam's Sons.

It is the story of Muzyad Yakhoob (his name was later changed to Amos Jacobs, and his friends still call him Jake), the son of Lebanese immigrants who was born in Deerfield, Mich., on Jan. 6, 1914, and grew up with his eight brothers and one sister largely in Toledo, Ohio. It is the story of a high-school dropout who went into show business with the dream of becoming a character actor. (It is a dream he still pursues; his daughter Marlo Thomas is working on a movie for the two of them to do together.) He was a character actor on radio, although one of his first radio jobs was making the sound of horses' hooves on a "Lone Ranger" show by beating his chest with two toilet plungers.

But he had a yen for comedy and after rough beginnings became a night-club star, with the encouragement and assistance of Abe Lastfogel, then the head of the William Morris Agency. He took the name Danny Thomas, combining the first names of two of his brothers, at the 5100 Club in Chicago in 1940.

Then came movies, followed by major success on television in the situation comedy "Make Room for Daddy," later known as "The Danny Thomas Show," which ran from 1953 to 1964 and is still seen in reruns. And he became a successful television producer, first with Sheldon Leonard and then with Aaron Spelling, creating such shows as "The Real McCoys," "The Andy Griffith Show," "The Dick Van Dyke Show" and "The Mod Squad."

#### NO ONE-LINERS

But through it all, he remained a comedian—a special kind of comedian. Danny Thomas does not deliver one-liners. "My people are inherently storytellers," he explains. "When I was a kid, the entertainment was somebody from the old country or a big city who came and visited and told tales of where they came from. And my mother was very good at it. She could not read or write in any language, yet she would see silent movies and make up her own scenarios."

Mr. Thomas laughs. "The story has the fundamentals of real comedy," he says. "Show me a man or a woman in trouble, and I'll show you a funny man or woman. People can relate to it. They have all been in situations where they suffered anticipation and

slow burn, and those are two great commodities in comedy."

#### A VOW FULFILLED

Through the years Mr. Thomas has been known for his deep religious faith. (Bob Hope's one-liner on the subject is that his friend Danny is so religious the highway patrol stops him for having stained-glass windows in his car.) The classic tale about Mr. Thomas is that early in his career, when things were not going well and after his wife, the former Rose Marie Cassaniti, had urged him to leave show business, he prayed to St. Jude Thaddeus, the patron saint of the hopeless, impossible and difficult cases, asking the saint to set him on the right path. He vowed that if the saint did so he would build him a shrine. To this day, Mr. Thomas says, he believes in the saint, and still has conversations with him.

"After that, everything happened to me so quickly that it had to be more than a coincidence," he says. "I never prayed for fame and fortune. I wasn't trying to do anything but make a living. I was hoping that the radio producers would have more faith in my ability to play character roles. All I wanted was to get a house in the country, buy a station wagon, raise my kids."

The shrine he built, with the help of many other people, turned out to be the St. Jude Children's Research Hospital in Memphis, Tenn. And, he says, there is no doubt in his mind that the hospital is his most important accomplishment.

"There's no question of it," he says proudly. "That's my epitaph. It's right on the cornerstone: Danny Thomas, founder."

He still spends much of his time raising money for the hospital. "We raised \$92 million last year," he says, "and spent only 22 cents on the dollar to raise it."

It is, he is convinced, the reason he was born. A while back, he had a family coat of arms designed, with a family motto. "The motto is 'Blessed is he who knows why he was born,'" he says. "And I am blessed."

In addition, the following letter was written by a mother whose daughter was treated at St. Jude's Hospital. The letter mirrors the beautiful work done there and the gratitude people feel toward St. Jude's Hospital and its founder.

On December 13th of 1983, when my daughter was 4½ years old, she was diagnosed as having Acute Lymphocytic Leukemia.

My husband and I were devastated. Doctors in our home city of Bogota, Colombia were unable to offer us any miracle that might relieve our grief and survival seemed to be an irrational hope, life \*\*\* a short period of debilitating illness.

From the depths of our sorrow recurring words of hope emerged \*\*\* the Saint Jude Children's Research Hospital. The hope of the young without National, State, Ethnic or Economic boundary. A place where love, dedication and the best in medicine meet to make miracles a reality.

On December 20th, we brought our daughter to Memphis and to this day memories revive as in a sad movie where my little girl plays the principal role \*\*\* fighting against death, fighting for life.

Surrounded by the barrier of an alien language, communicating by signs, we perceived the greater language of this institution \*\*\* LOVE!

As the days passed we learned that love cures many ills, that caring people shared our anguish, desolation, tears \*\*\*

Christmas came and with it a new understanding of its significance and a new per-

spective on the values of our life. From it a feeling of sharing that we had never given what we were offered and gladly received.

This was to be our only Christmas as a member of the St. Jude family, but since that time we have shared our Thanksgiving, Easter Day, and six years of hope with those parents and young ones who followed us in believing catastrophic diseases can be overcome.

In those years, even with setbacks, we hope that our concept of life, our "taking it for granted" has been tempered by a desire to give something back to the World \*\*\* an appreciation for six more years of full and meaningful life for Nathalia.

I feel strongly, as a person whose immigration to this country was dictated by our daughter's misfortune, who was accepted by this great country at the hour of our greatest need, that I must spread the word.

As Americans you should stand proud that an institution within your country can overcome local or national concerns and offer hope to the world.

We have had the privilege to know and to love fellow parents from far away countries, many countries \*\*\* almost every country! We joined together as common residents of the family of St. Jude Children's Research Hospital.

With your support, contributions and collaboration this will continue, and hopeless children such as Nathalia will have not only a future, but a bright future, a future in which we pray they will continue what we can offer today.

Warmest regards,

MAISSIE ARISTIZABAL.

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, I was privileged to know Danny Thomas. I first met him as a teenager when he came to Cleveland, OH, for a St. Moron's Day banquet. He was down to earth and kind to everyone. He tried to encourage everyone to help him in his mission to have a hospital and research center for honor of St. Jude. Our friendship has continued for many years. I attended a banquet last summer which raised thousands of dollars for Danny's humane, philanthropic concern; St. Jude's Hospital. There was Danny so happy for the children this assistance would aid. He was surrounded by members of his lovely family and friends. His loyal assistant Janet was again so happy at this success. He seemed so happy when he gave to others. I know I speak for millions of Americans when I say "thank you" Danny for doing so much for others and bringing us so much joy.

#### UPDATE ON THE PERSIAN GULF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the first of a number of speakers this evening who will seek to come to us at this moment in history with an update on the situation in the Mideast and the Persian Gulf war.

Mr. Speaker, there are a group of us who believe that although we have many disagreements and many various approaches and proposed solutions to the situation we face in the Middle East, that we can nevertheless, despite

our divergent viewpoints, come together on one basic fact at this moment in history. There are those of us who believe, and we have stated it in a short statement and asked other Members to sign on, and that is that it is our belief that there is no need to escalate the war in the Persian Gulf. It is our belief that there is no need to escalate the war in the Persian Gulf.

For many, those chose not to bother to elaborate on that statement. But what that statement means to me at this point is that we should not move from the present air war to a ground war. There is no need to escalate. There is a great deal to be gained by not escalating, because if we do not escalate, we do not risk hundreds of thousands of lives in addition to those that have been lost already.

I think it is important to note that we are at a point where if our claims, if the facts that have been stated by our own sources, by our own military leaders, are true, if we are winning, and winning in such an overwhelming fashion, then why go to another level, which will risk many more thousands of lives?

□ 1710

Why not resolve to try to make our military point with the air war that is now in effect?

I did not agree, I do not agree with the use of force in this particular situation at all. I still do not agree. My position is the same as it was on January 12. But that is not the point. The point is that the war has begun. We have made a commitment. Our air power has been used. I suppose we could say by now it has been used to its maximum, and we are claiming that we are getting good results. The information we get is that we are getting very good results, that the morale of the troops, the Iraqi troops, is at a very low ebb, that the capacity to make war has almost been destroyed. The air force has been wiped out. There are a number of facts that we are receiving on a daily basis which show that the air war has achieved its objective.

I want to join my colleagues, however, today in a statement I will call a statement of moral leadership. We are Members of the Congress and we were elected to make decisions. We were elected to provide leadership.

We are in the minority, those of us who consider it important now to make this statement of moral leadership. We had a full-scale debate. The majority overwhelmingly voted to support moving from the level of diplomacy and sanctions to the level of military force. That decision has been made. We lost.

The fact that we are in the minority, the fact that the dissidents are so few, does not mean that we do not still have an obligation to state our point of view. At this moment in history, the record should show that there were a

handful who disagreed. Not only did we disagree, but the handful had an alternative to propose.

It is important to note at this moment in history that most of those of us who would like to register our dissent and our disagreement, most of those of us who are now saying we do not need to escalate the war, we do not need to move from an air war to a ground war, most of us believe strongly, I certainly believe strongly that our cause is just, the cause for which we are in the Middle East is just. I agree with the U.N. resolution which condemned the invasion of Kuwait. I agree with the U.N. resolution which moved to take all measures necessary to remove Iraqi troops from Kuwait or to reach a solution where the Iraqi troops would be removed, would withdraw from Kuwait. I agree that that is necessary.

I agree that it is good to look forward to a new world order, and I would define that new world order as a world order which at least one element would be in place that I would greatly appreciate, and that is a world order where no great, powerful nations would ever attack smaller nations, a world order where no superpower would ever bully a small nation. That is a world order that I agree with. I look forward to it. I think that the U.N. action in the case of Kuwait will move us in that direction. We were moving in that direction. I applaud it. Our cause is just.

We had the possibility of moving to a higher level, and we still may have that possibility. I think, however, that we have lost a golden opportunity. We lost an opportunity when we refused to use to the maximum the nonmilitary means at our command, the peaceful and diplomatic means at our command to force a solution to the problem. We did not wait long enough, in my opinion.

I think that there is another point of agreement which reaches beyond those of us who choose to register our dissent today and those of us who want to make a statement of moral leadership today. There is another point of agreement which binds us all and even reaches beyond us to those who advocate a military solution and those who wanted to go ahead and use force. I do not think that among my colleagues here in the House, those who advocated moving to a military position, beginning the assault on Iraq and Kuwait, I do not think there are any among those who believe that war is a glorious adventure, who believe that war is something which is highly desirable. I think that we all believe, those who advocate the use of force and those of us who wanted to wait and continue to use peaceful diplomacy longer, we all agree that war is a necessary evil.

There are some savages in the streets who are yelling, "Nuke them and watch them glow." There are some peo-

ple who find some great joy in the bombs that are falling every day. There are a few. They do not represent the majority of the American people. They certainly do not represent the people here in this Congress.

I do not think anybody here believes that war is a glorious thing. Wars are a necessary evil. At the least, war is a necessary evil. It is always a necessary evil, and it is a situation which indicates that diplomacy and peaceful means have either reached their end and can no longer handle the problem, or somebody around the table has chosen just to not use diplomacy and peaceful negotiation anymore for various reasons. But it is a necessary evil. We are engaged in a necessary evil.

There is nothing glorious about our great air power that is raining bombs on Iraq every day. There is nothing joyful about it. It is a necessary evil to take care of another evil. Saddam Hussein happens to be one of the great monstrous evils of the world. Saddam Hussein has caused the problem from the beginning. Saddam Hussein and his ambitions have generated a situation which we have all been forced to respond to. He is an evil that must be dealt with. Make no mistake about it, none of us are interested in seeing the preservation of Saddam Hussein and what he stands for. All of us, however, realize that the nation of Iraq is composed of many more human beings than Saddam Hussein. The nation of Iraq is probably even composed of some generals and some top level leaders who want to live, who are not locked into the suicidal mission of Saddam Hussein.

One of the reasons I have always felt that sanctions would work, even without the pressure of the military defeat that is being suffered by the military forces of Iraq, was that even the pressures of sanctions, the collapse of the infrastructure of Iraq as a result of the sanctions, the inability of Iraq to sell its oil, its cash crop, the squeeze on the lives of all of the Iraqi people, leaders and laymen, average citizens, that all of that would lead to a point where the people of Iraq and the people in power would begin to put pressure on their Government and Saddam Hussein to change his mind. But certainly now in the middle of this terror there are human beings there who deserve to live, who want to live, and who probably will ultimately force Saddam Hussein to retreat.

Can we achieve the agreement which will ultimately be reached now that we have unleashed our power, and now that we are engaged in a war, which we are winning, a war which shows that the adversary, the forces of Saddam Hussein are no match for the superpower, modern military weapons and methods of the United States and its allies? Now that we are at war the question is: Can we still achieve the

agreement which will ultimately be reached without going to another level?

□ 1720

I still maintain we could have achieved a peaceful solution, an acceptable solution to the problem through sanctions if we had applied them for a longer period of time, but that is past now. Now that we have begun the war, could we not pause now, or could we not at least not escalate the war and seek some kind of agreement similar to what we are ultimately going to settle for anyhow?

There is going to be an agreement reached. There is going to be a point where this will all be over.

What will we have after it is all over? What kind of world will we have and what kind of negotiations are going to take place around a table to decide what the victors have achieved and what the future will be like? I think it was the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] who characterized it in more blunt terms at the beginning of our debate back in January when he said, "A deal will be made." A deal is always made. After the First World War, a deal was made, a deal was negotiated. After the Second World War, even though Hitler did not surrender, unconditionally, we had to go to the very end, and after the war they had to sit down and make some deals. Vietnam; Korea. You know, always in order for the world to go forward, deals have to be made, agreements have to be reached, terms have to be negotiated.

Could we not achieve the same kind of agreement if we were to hold at this point, cease the escalation of the war? I would like to see a cease-fire. But at least, at least we should cease the escalation; do not go to the next step; stop at this point in terms of the forward motion of our military plan. Do not engage ground troops at this point.

Why is it important in the face of the overwhelming majority decision that has been made in this country, why is it important for me to stand here at this point and make this plea? I make the plea for the same reason I made the plea on January 11 before we took the vote on January 12 to give the President the mandate to attack Iraq. I make the plea because human lives are sacred, and when you move to the point where you are risking human lives, then every deliberation possible should be undertaken to avoid risking those lives.

We are risking human lives. We are risking the lives of men and women who are dedicated, loyal. They are prepared to die. They will do their duty. That is not the question. The question is: since they are so dedicated and so loyal, they are great value to us, and we do not want to use up their lives unless we have to. We do not want to even risk their lives unless we have to.

I do not agree with the people who say that the rightness or wrongness of this war would be decided by whether or not we win. I do not agree that winning defines the morality of it, that it is an immoral war if we lose it, and it is a moral war if we win it; or it is an immoral war if it drags on and large numbers of casualties are realized, then that is an immoral war, but if we do not drag it on, get it over with quickly, then it is a just war.

The justness and the rightness of the war are determined by the ultimate goal we seek. Our cause, and as I said before, our cause is just. The ultimate goal we seek is the right one, as articulated, the articulated goals.

There may be some people in high places who have hidden agendas. This may be partially a war for control of how oil is distributed in the world. I will not get into all of that at this point, but the articulation of a new world order where large military powers will no longer attack and occupy smaller military powers is a desirable goal to work toward. A new world order which stabilizes the Middle East by letting it be known that allies in that area plus throughout the world will unite to prevent any powerful nation there from overrunning another nation is a desirable goal and a just cause.

A new world order which stabilizes the region, which guarantees the security of Israel and all other nations is a desirable goal. We do not need to wait until the body bags are counted. We do not need to wait until the history of the military campaign is written to decide what is right and what is wrong. Regardless of what happens, our cause is just.

Our methods, our means have been pushed too hastily. We are in a violent conflict which I do not think is necessary. We have moved into war unnecessarily. We should now pause before we move to another level. We should not risk thousands and thousands of more lives unnecessarily.

I come here as a leader. I was elected by my constituents to be a leader, to offer moral leadership on all kinds of issues, and if I cannot offer it at this time, I would never be able to offer it.

You do not need leaders to count body bags, and as a result of the number of body bags coming home to America, conclude that a war is right or wrong. Any sophomore in high school can count body bags and decide that the cost in human lives is too great after the body bags have started to come in. Any reasonable human being can look at that and make a judgment.

The judgment of leaders has to be made now. The judgment of leaders should be made before we risk lives, and certainly before we take lives unnecessarily.

This is an important point to make a moral statement, and we are here today to make that moral statement.

I think it is important to note that whatever I said on January 11 before the vote was taken I consider still relevant, and I would like to go back and repeat that statement.

But first I would like to remind all of you that tonight we are assembled as a small group. We intend to be here for a while to make a statement of moral leadership.

The one thing, as I said before, that we all agree on is that is our belief that there is no need to escalate the war in the Persian Gulf. We all agree on that. And by escalate for this individual, I mean we should not go to the point of a ground war. We should not engage ground troops.

I say this for all the same reasons that I gave before we commenced the war. Before we commenced the war, I said that the President would interpret our resolution as a mandate to attack. When we passed our resolution, that is exactly what happened. It became not just a statement that the President had the right to go to war, not just an affirmation of the United Nations resolution, but it was interpreted to the American people as, "Congress wants me to go to war," and we, of course, went to war.

I said the United Nations was wrong in setting a date, and that that date was part of the problem. By setting a date, they set in motion a situation which made it appear certainly to people out there who are just laymen that we had some kind of pressing timetable, and that it was wise to respond sooner rather than later. There was no virtue in responding sooner rather than later. We could have waited.

There were people at that time who said, "Let us get it over with. It will take 5 days, 10 days, and before the weather gets bad, let us do it."

□ 1730

Those were not the reasons to risk thousands of lives. I do not know why, when lives are at stake, we cannot wait.

I said at the time that the cost in human terms of a war with Iraq were too terrible to contemplate, so terrible that our Pentagon was backing away from making any estimates. That is still the case. They refuse to make any estimates of what the cost of a ground war may be.

Yes, there were people who cited 5,000 in a magazine, 10,000 in another. Jack Anderson citing some Pentagon sources that he had estimated that 30,000 Americans would be killed in the first 20 days of the ground war. I also stated, and I still think it is important, although it is not the reason I am against the war, and some people have made the mistake of assuming I am against the war because there are a disproportionate number of African-Americans who are out there on the front lines in the Middle East. That is very

important. However, even before we come to that fact, and even if there were not a disproportionate number of African-Americans out there on the front lines, I would still be against this war because it is unnecessary.

The violence and the escalation to military action was unnecessary to accomplish the goals. Our goals, the proper goals, our cause is just. However, we did not need to move to force in order to accomplish the goals. In the end, we will settle for an agreement which could have been reached. We will settle for a situation that could have been arrived at without the killing, the massive slaughtering of human beings.

It is important, however, to note that there are disproportionate numbers out there who are African-Americans. It is important to note because these same African-Americans are penalized by the fact that this war, every day it goes on, absorbs tremendous resources that could be used to help the families of these same soldiers who are on the front lines, fighting this war.

It is important to note that nearly one-third of our soldiers in Operation Desert Shield, now Operation Desert Storm, are African-Americans. Many of them who have families in districts like mine, my district being the 12th Congressional District, which is the 10th poorest district in the Nation. My district also has the second largest number of African-Americans. Percentagewise, there is only one district in the country, the First District in Chicago, which has a greater percentage of African-Americans than my district has. So there are large number of families who have relatives in the Middle East.

There are large numbers of families who have called my office. There are large numbers of families who are frightened. There are large numbers of mothers who are very upset by the fact that they encouraged their children—daughters and sons—to go into the military. They encouraged them to take advantage of the opportunities. Young African-American men and women are three times more likely to be in the Armed Forces and involved in the pending war as are young whites of the same age. There is a reason. That is because when people cannot get jobs, they look for another way to survive. They find the Army and the Navy and the other military units to be an opportunity to be utilized.

There are many very bright young men who never looked for jobs because they were recruited. They were overwhelmed by recruiters who told them what a great future they had if they went into the Army first, and came out later and were able to use the benefits to go to college.

There were many others who went into the military academies. The military academies of the ROTC's have absorbed a large number of the develop-

ing black leadership, not just young people who could not go to college, but many who were college material who qualified or did not have the money, and for that reason they were in the military.

There are many voices here in Washington and across the Nation who insist that you should not even bring up this consideration, as this observation is totally out of order, because we have a voluntary Army, Navy, Marines. Our whole military force is voluntary. Nobody made them go. Why do Members make an issue of it? They are there because they agreed to be there. There is something to that line of reasoning.

However, let Members look at the situation in this way: This country, which now depends on these young men and women to man the front lines in this war, has denied those same young men and women the opportunity to make a choice. If there was a choice of going into the ROTC or going into an alternative program which offers the same benefits, then I could see the argument that no person should complain about the disproportionate number of African-Americans. If there was a choice that a person could go to college and receive the same help from their Government as they receive when they go to West Point or Annapolis or the Air Force Academy, than I can see the argument that nobody has a complaint, that the choice was theirs. There was no such choice. Do Members realize that we spend on the officers who go to West Point as much as \$200,000 per person, per year?

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I just want to compliment my colleague for calling this special order, along with a number of our other colleagues, for calling this special order at this time.

It is important to understand why we take this extraordinary measure. That is, we are leaving here for several days. We will not come back until the 19th of February. Some Members have grave concern that this war could indeed escalate in the time that we are out in the February break. Therefore, some Members, with a great sense of consternation and not wanting to feel impotent in carrying out our responsibilities as public officials and representatives of our people, have chosen to take this time to talk.

I want to first go back historically. This gentleman and several of my colleagues, including the gentleman from New York, joined in a lawsuit where we asked the Federal Court to enjoin the President from going to war in the Persian Gulf, and we also sought declaratory relief in the court that would underscore what is clearly written in the Constitution of the United States:

That article 1, section 8, paragraph 11 of the Constitution states clearly that the Congress of the United States shall have the right to declare war.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do we do that? We had a conscious notion in mind. Number 1, we understood in reading the polls and reading the press and viewing television that millions of American people have come to believe that, to a moral certainty, the President was going to take the United States to war. So, strategy No. 1 was to raise the flag and say, "Wait a minute, America, you are being conditioned to believe that one person can inevitably take us to war." We were trying to say that the President is the President in the context of the constitutional form of government, based on the rule of law that the President was indeed not King George but President Bush, and that as the President of the United States in the context of the constitutional form of government, that only the Congress has the right to take the United States to war, that the Founding Persons of this Government felt that was such an extraordinary effort, that was such a major undertaking of the State, that it should be made too inconvenient for one person to be able to take the United States to war. Therefore, we wanted to say to America, "Wait, this is a democracy."

Number 2, we wanted to attempt to have the Congress exercise its prerogatives under the Constitution. Why do we want to do that? First, because we think that it is important to live within the framework of the Constitution, but beyond that as a political strategy.

I have served in the Congress now in my 21st year, and there are a few observations, a few experiences, a few thoughts that I have. One is that for the most part, the President of the United States, just by virtue of the awesome nature of that office, is isolated from public opinion, to some extent buffered from public opinion.

But my thought was, and the thought of the other 53 people who joined in the lawsuit, was that the Congress of the United States is not buffered from public opinion. Our thought was that we needed to get the decision of making war back within the framework of the Constitution. Second, we felt that the only way, and the greatest opportunity to stop the war was to put that decision in the people's branch of Government, where the Members of Congress are more sensitive to public opinion than the President of the United States, who in many ways is buffered from this.

□ 1740

We have to go home to our town hall meetings and citizens' meetings, direct phone calls, telegrams, and mail. This body is sensitive to public opinion.

Finally, we wanted to say to those people in America who did not want to

see us use force in the context of the Persian Gulf, to understand that on or about January 15 was indeed the drop dead date, and to say, "America, mobilize yourself."

We are struggling to make sure that the President assumes his responsibility in the context of the Constitution to seek approval from the Congress and challenge the Congress to stand up to its important prerogatives in this regard, and we are also trying to say to America: Focus your attention on the Congress. If you have strong feelings, say it to the Congress, because here is your greatest opportunity to stop the war.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, and to my distinguished colleague from New York, I believe that history will record that America lost a significant moment in the evolution of life in this country and life on the planet, because the movement did not activate itself quickly enough nor effectively enough. All of us must assume a collective responsibility. The educational process did not go forward.

I might add that an important factor in this was that I think millions of American people did not believe that we would go to war, that January 15 was an arbitrary date.

Many people said to me, "Mr. DELLUMS, not to worry. We won't go to war. Reason will prevail at the 11th hour. In some kind of way, a deal will be worked out that will preclude our young men and women from having to face the potential of death and destruction, killing and dying, in the context of the Persian Gulf."

Whatever the reason, the moment was lost, but our strategy, I would say to my colleague from New York, was totally correct, to say that this is a constitutional form of government, to challenge our Nation to live within the context of a constitutional form of government, to say to the American people, "Mobilize yourself in opposition to the use of force."

As the gentleman said so eloquently, I would say to my colleague from New York, life is precious and war is extremely expensive, a set of issues that I will try to enunciate and elaborate on a little later.

Focus your attention on the Congress, but we lost this moment because we thought that it would be easier to stop a war before it started than after it started, because the politics change very dramatically after a war starts.

The issues of patriotism, the issues of support, all these different matters become public and become an integral part of a decisionmaking, making continued opposition very difficult for a whole multiplicity of reasons.

But I stand with honor and pleasure with my colleague today in continuing our opposition to the policy of using war as an instrument of international

diplomacy, because it was correct then and it is correct now.

So where are we left at this moment? We are left at this moment saying that it is not necessary to escalate.

Now, some people will say, but you are now dissenting. You should not dissent.

My response, Mr. Speaker, to that is as follows: How can we as a great nation call for dissent in Tiananmen Square, in Beijing in China, how can we advocate dissent in the Soviet Union, how can we applaud dissent in Eastern Europe, how can we call for multiparty politics in other countries in the world where people have the right to dissent and then not support the precious notion of dissent within the Constitution of the United States and our form of government in this country? That is fundamentally contradictory.

And when people stand up and dissent, some say, but those people who are dissenting and those people who demonstrate are in the minority; but Mr. Speaker, where is it written in the Constitution that one must be in the majority in order to dissent?

I would argue just the reverse, that it is those persons oftentimes finding themselves in the minority, dissenting, that focus attention on issues in such a manner that they continue the educative process, thereby affecting public opinion and moving that position from a minority position to a majority position.

This is a precious right, Mr. Speaker, the right to dissent.

I would suggest that those of us who continue to raise our voices in dissent are really attempting to continue to be true patriots in this country, because to do less is to violate the spirit upon which this entire Government is based, that is the right to speak out.

So we continue to speak, but then some people have said, well, if you dissent, you are not supporting the troops; but I would suggest, and I know the gentleman from New York would agree, that the most powerful statement of support for our young men and women serving in the Persian Gulf is to not place them in harm's way, or at this moment not seize them unnecessarily going forward in harm's way.

Why escalate? Those persons who argue on the other side of the issue say let us allow sanctions, that sanctions alone will work. Well, it is not sanctions alone now. We have created great destruction and devastation.

Some people were concerned about nuclear, chemical, and biological production capability. That has now been destroyed, as articulated by our own briefers, by our own leaders.

They talk about supply lines devastated, oil production devastated, economy devastated, to say nothing of death that we have no knowledge of at this point.

Our question is, why then do we need to go beyond that?

Mr. Speaker, I have a very ominous feeling, an ominous feeling difficult to put into words, but I feel very strongly that if we go beyond what we are doing, if we escalate, I have a great fear that we are going to pay an enormous price. In the context of the Persian Gulf, there is a potential for chemical weaponry. There is a potential for biological weaponry.

I would add with great fear and great trepidation, even the potential for the use of nuclear weapons.

The potential death and destruction that can be reined down in the context of an escalation that could indeed include massive destruction conventionally, use of chemical weapons, even nuclear weapons, is so awesome to contemplate that it frightens this gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues, I have shed many, many tears of sadness and fear on this issue alone. This in my opinion is the great price that we may very well pay.

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize for interrupting the gentleman's eloquent statement, but on that point, I could not help but want to add my concern. We are going into another recess and it seems like there is always an escalation when we are in recess.

I went to visit the young men and women in Saudi Arabia in late November and early December. It is out of concern for them and loyalty to them that I really hope and pray that there is not an escalation of what is going on there.

We know that if there is some kind of a ground warfare, we know that unfortunately thousands of young people are going to lose their lives, let alone the ramifications globally.

I honestly think that it is as patriotic to warn our brothers and sisters in this country about what the ramifications of warfare are all about as it is to say nothing, and that is why I wanted to just say that I am deeply concerned, and I am going to pray for the President because I want him to make the right decision.

□ 1750

But I want him to listen to hearts and minds of the American people, not just to his military advisers or the few people who have insulated him.

I want him to really reach out and understand the ramifications of the awesome responsibility that he has at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I again thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for her timely and significant remarks.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] we are not here to send any mixed signals. As the gentleman so eloquently stated, we must continue to oppose force and violence and aggression as a way of solving political problems.

We are no friend to what happened; Iraq should not have invaded Kuwait. A world crying out for maturity, a world crying out to go forward with a sense of reason and compassion must come together to oppose this kind of aggression, no question about that.

So there are no mixed signals in that regard.

But what we are saying is how you solve that problem, there can indeed and must indeed be differences.

If we oppose the use of force from Iraq to Kuwait as a way of solving their political problems, then what we were trying to say was that the best example to give was to demonstrate that as we chose to solve political problems, we did not resort to force and violence ourselves.

So there are no mixed signals.

Again, to return to the ominous feeling that I have that death and destruction will reach extraordinary proportions—it certainly has the potential to do that. The American people have been given a sense of euphoria around the highly technical nature of the weapons that we are using. I will say to the gentleman from New York that my hope is that the American people would not become enamored of this high-technology weapon capability but become frightened of it.

What am I saying? This is an opportunity, unfortunately a negative one, but an opportunity for America and the world to look into a window into the future of what war could be like if we were even more involved.

Contemplate with me for a moment what would war be like if we were facing an adversary who had the same capacity to destroy life that we have, could match missile for missile, bomb for bomb, smart weapon for smart weapon; that bombs were landing on Oakland and Berkeley and New York and Washington, DC, and Bogalusa, MS, and Richmond, VA, and Philadelphia. It staggers the imagination.

What I am trying to say is that we must come to terms with the fact that war is too expensive and too frightening and too dangerous an instrument to use to solve political problems. We are going to pay a high price in human casualty; we are going to pay a high price in financial costs.

The gentleman from New York and I came to this Congress not so much to talk about missiles and bombs but to

reorder the priorities of this Nation. The gentleman and I had the audacity to talk about solving the problems of poverty, hunger, disease, pain, and human suffering.

Martin Luther King used to say in standing up in opposition to the Vietnam war that we are dropping bombs on North Vietnam that are exploding in the ghettos and the barrios of America.

I would suggest the difference here is that we are dropping bombs on the Persian Gulf that will explode in every community in America because the budget priorities are going to impact on every single citizen in this country, disproportionately upon some, but it's going to fall on everyone because several months ago, in these very Chambers, in a rancorous and painful debate, we finally came to a budget resolution in what is called, in the vernacular of Washington, a limited-dollar environment.

We are now waging war, spending billions of dollars, rendering us further impotent—and I use the term thoughtfully—impotent in our capacity to address the human misery of our people and suffering people in the world in the various forms in which it is visited upon them.

Mr. OWENS of New York. If the gentleman will pause at this point, I will yield to him again. I yield, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for yielding. I thank the gentleman from California also.

I could not pass up this moment to, first of all, thank the folks who are here today and those that will follow us long after I am gone from this Chamber tonight, in expressing our concern about what is happening or what could in fact take place.

You know, I have had to come before this body twice in the last 2 weeks to eulogize and the mourn the deaths of two members of my community, Capt. Manuel Rivera, Cpl. Ismael Cotto, Jr. This is two losses for one congressional district, if you will, prior to that part of the war, of the action that we know will inflict casualties beyond anything that we can imagine. And already our community has taken the kind of pain which, when joined with the pain which has already been taken by other communities throughout the country, is enough for us to at least consider what our next step should be.

I, of course, was one of that group—so were the rest of you—who felt that we should not do this at all. But again, the fact is that we are in a state of war now. The fact is that we support the safety of our troops.

Where we go next and how we handle ourselves will not only serve as an issue for us to deal with now but cer-

tainly as one for people to look at in years to come.

I find, when I go back home to my district, that there is a manifestation by my community that is misunderstood by the media. You will see in the South Bronx more American flags than you have ever seen before and more yellow ribbons than you have ever seen before. But when you go to the apartments that are showing the flag, as I have done, to make sure that I am in step with my community, you find that the flags are in support of the troops and the yellow ribbons are a reminder of the fact that we want them to come back safely, but in no way is it a support for the action that is taking place.

That is something that we have to remember very seriously.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] that it is important for us to express how we feel now because we will be gone from this body for a week and a few extra days. And I suspect that that would be a wonderful opportunity for some decisions to be made, absent our being here to be able to rise on this floor and deal with that issue on a daily basis.

So I would just hope that the message can go from here that we should be very much concerned about what our actions are now, that we take the time to reflect, to think, to understand what it is that we are committing ourselves to.

Do I want, as the gentleman from New York says, to continue the bombing? If it was up to me, we would call for a cease-fire right now and allow the United Nations to come in and work it out.

But since we are doing this, for God's sake, we should not go to a situation where more and more and more young people will be lost.

We can stop it now, we can come to our senses, we can negotiate. We have made our point; there is no need to make any further point.

Just to finalize, and I thank the gentleman again for yielding to me: any time any person loses a child, I grieve, whether it is someone I never met in California, someone I never met in Brooklyn, a person from any ethnic group, or from any religious group throughout the country, I grieve.

But when you have to go into a Sunday mass in South Bronx and see on the first row the family of a lost captain, when you have to call a family so poor that they do not even have their own telephone and you have to call a neighbor to pay your condolences to the family on the loss of their son and you realize that your community has already taken two losses, you have to not only pray, but you have to demand that we stop now.

I would rather do down in this war as a Congressman whose district lost the most children, if we could stop tomorrow. I take no pride in spreading the

loss across the Nation to make it equal amongst 435 Members.

□ 1800

Let the South Bronx take the heaviest toll up to today. Let no one else die after tonight. We can stop it now, and I am so proud of the fact that so many of us gathered to do this today.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the last 9 months for me, my first 9 months in Congress, have been very difficult in that I failed to actually analyze whether this position was a position that would cause any problem for me, but it took me about 2 minutes to understand that I have to be true to myself, and if I believe that this is wrong and that this is not the way to go, then it really does not matter whether I have been here 9 months or 21 years. I will continue to say that this is not the way to go and we can stop it now.

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. Speaker, I would like just to briefly comment before I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to close out this segment, and that is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], from the South Bronx, my colleague, has talked about two human beings and two families that have experienced this war. There is a great effort being made by our leaders to depersonalize the war, to have the soldiers who die become faceless, unknown individuals. I would just like to repeat a statement that I made on January 11.

The Vietnam War Memorial is a magnificent monument because the Vietnam War Memorial makes war a personal matter. Never again should we erect monuments to the tombs of unknown soldiers. Why should soldiers be unknown? Dead heroes should not remain unknown. One by one we should know the names of all of our dead heroes. One by one they should be memorialized. This is what the Vietnam Memorial does. All Americans who are generals, or Congressmen, Senators, decisionmakers, should be required to spend some time each year reading some of the names from the Vietnam Monument. It is a pity that on that monument only the dead are listed. There are many, many more who should also be there. They should also list the names of those other people who are dismissed as casualties, but they are not dead. The names of the wounded, the amputees, and those who were driven mad by the horrors of combat.

Mr. Speaker, war is a terrifying experience. War is hell. And the more we personalize it and make certain that all of our leaders understand that the soldiers out there who are cannon fod-

der are also human beings, the more likely it is that we will never have wars in the future.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to sum up this segment, close out this segment of our discussion.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. Speaker, let me in closing again thank my colleague for leading off what I think is a terribly important and in this gentleman's humble opinion a very significant discussion at a very important moment in the history of this country, the history of the world, and as issues unfold in the context of the Persian Gulf.

To summarize, we are here because we are concerned about the fact that we will be leaving for several days, and many of us have a very strong feeling that it is highly possible that there will be a major, major escalation in this war and that what we are trying to do is focus the American people's attention on this issue. We recognize that, given the policy, the position we personally articulate may not necessarily be in the majority. The odds may indeed be against us; the policy may not necessarily be with us. But it is important, it is important for us, to raise these issues because we are part of the educative process.

Perhaps the most risky process that a public official can engage in during a moment of controversy is to mount the podium to be educative, but in this gentleman's opinion it is the highest responsibility of the public official, to engage aggressively into the educative process, and that is what we attempt to do.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for his generosity in providing this gentleman with an opportunity to make some random comments. I hope that in the context of the special order under this gentleman's name that I will be able to articulate it with even a greater degree of order. Again, I am privileged to have stood with my colleague.

Mr. OWENS of New York. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that we are here because it is our belief that there is no need to escalate the war in the Persian Gulf. There is no need to move from where we are now into a massive ground war and risk the lives of thousands and thousands of soldiers unnecessarily.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] is through with his special order, or whatever order is preceding me, of course.

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask for an explanation of what is happening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has asked to be recognized by unanimous consent for 10 minutes after the 1 hour which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has asked for has expired.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I inquire of my distinguished colleague [Mr. DORNAN] and just say under my reservation that what we are attempting to do here is focus on the Persian Gulf, and, as the gentleman knows, this gentleman is certainly not here to impede or inhibit public discussion because that is our prerogative here. But I would just like to ask my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], what is the subject matter that the gentleman is going to touch upon?

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

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is the same subject matter to which my distinguished colleagues were addressing themselves with such heartfelt articulation, but I thought I would speak up for the majority viewpoint in the most recent votes we had and accentuate that I do agree with them totally on not beginning a land war for weeks, if not months, into the future.

Mr. DELLUMS. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciate the fact that the record will show on this particular subject, and I think my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], and I am certainly more than pleased to see my colleague speak.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes after the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has used his 1 hour.

#### LESSONS FROM A PREVENTABLE WAR

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, my comments are on the same line as the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] but in a slightly different perspective. But I want to begin my comments tonight by reciting the famous quotation by George Santayana, the philosopher who said:

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.\*\*\* This is the condition of children and barbarians, in whom instinct has learned nothing from experience.

On January 12, 1991, I voted with the majority of Congress to give President Bush authority to use force in the Persian Gulf in accordance with U.N. Resolution 660. While it was the most difficult decision I have made in 14 years in Congress, I do not regret my vote. With the size of our forces on the ground, the weak thread of common interests which bound our coalition, the U.N. deadline of January 15, the President's oft-stated commitment to drive Iraqi troops out of Kuwait, and Saddam Hussein's determination to not back down under pressure, we had no practical choice.

Further, Saddam Hussein is now, and has always been, an evil force in the Middle East; driving him out of Kuwait and destroying his immense military power, particularly his nuclear, chemical and biological capabilities, are legitimate United States objectives.

What I do regret are the foreign and domestic policy failures over the last decade which have involved us in what I believe to have been a thoroughly preventable war. We must examine these failures, examples of our inability to learn from experience, and take steps to avoid repeating them.

#### AN UNHOLY ALLIANCE

In terms of foreign policy, the United States and rest of the Western world helped create the Iraqi military monster. Our alliance with Saddam Hussein began with the Iran-Iraq War and evolved over the following decade. Somehow, the lesser of two enemies came to be treated as an ally. Napoleon said that an army travels on its stomach, and nearly \$5 billion in subsidized United States agricultural products kept the Iraqi Army's belly full from 1983 to 1989. As late as of July 1990, despite grave foreshadowing of the war to come, the Bush administration vigorously opposed an amendment I offered in the House and Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM offered in the Senate to cut off subsidized grain to Iraq. The amendments were intended largely to protest gross Iraqi human rights violations which had been clearly documented.

Tragically, in opposing these and other anti-Iraq human rights measures, United States policymakers bought into the ancient Middle Eastern axiom that the enemy of our enemy is our

friend and, once again, cast our lot with a ruthless dictator. Similar past decisions have almost invariably hurt the United States in terms of lost lives, lost opportunities, and damaged credibility as a force for democracy and freedom in the world; Somoza, Noriega, Pinochet, Marcos, and the Shah of Iran come to mind as recent examples from which, it appears, we learned nothing.

In addition, the Reagan-Bush administrations left to private contractors the decision to sell high technology and computers to Iraq. Honeywell, for instance, sold Iraq technology used in the development of fuel-air explosives. Bell and Hughes sold Iraq helicopters which were later converted to military use. Since 1985, nearly 700 licenses for shipments of 1.5 billion dollars' worth of goods with both military and domestic applications have been authorized to Iraq.

An ironic example became evident last week as American soldiers on the front lines were told that they would have to step over United States-made landmines if our troops cross into Kuwait. We were friends with Iraq until August, their instructor told them, now we aren't.

The lesson we must learn is the United States should base its alliances and foreign policy on shared principles of democracy, freedom, and respect for human rights, not simply on trade or common enemies. The decline of the Soviet Union as a superpower should free us to look at our relationships with individual countries on a case-by-case basis instead of an East-West calculus. Trade sanctions should be imposed on countries which threaten those ideals in a region and the Commerce Department must exert strong oversight and control over exports of American technology and weapons to those countries.

#### THE UNCHECKED GLOBAL ARMS MARKET

We did not use our international leadership to stop the Soviets and our Western allies from supplying Iraq with lethal weapons. The Soviets sold tanks, Scud-B, Frog, and possibly SS-12 missiles to Iraq. West German firms supplied most of the equipment and technology for Iraq's chemical weapons arsenal of mustard and nerve gas. In October 1990, 3 months after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, President Bush threatened to veto legislation imposing trade sanctions on those companies. The French supplied Dassault Mirage fighters and Exocet missiles. China, Brazil, Egypt, Belgium, and others provided weapons and or technology. For the most part, lethal arms are available to whomever can pay for them.

Our leadership in the new world order should be used to halt the proliferation of arms on the world market rather than to round up a posse after the shooting has started. Such measures should provide enough collective secu-

rity to outweigh the economic loss of foregone arms sales.

With the end of the cold war, the United Nations should assume a more prominent role to negotiate international treaties, resolve conflicts, and impose multilateral economic sanctions.

#### MIXED SIGNALS FROM THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

In terms of diplomacy, the events leading up to the August 2 invasion of Kuwait are shocking examples of failure to protect or even recognize American interests. President Bush and Secretary Baker received warnings from overseas and at home, including ominous reports of statements from Saddam himself, that Iraq would invade Kuwait. The Israeli Government had warned us for years about Saddam's ambitions and ability to carry them out. Nonetheless, as Iraqi troops began organizing for an invasion, Baker sent the message to Saddam through high-level State Department officials and, most poignantly, the hopeless United States Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie, that the United States took no position on border disputes in the area. In late July, State Department spokesperson Margaret Tutwiler echoed that policy, stating that the United States had no defense treaties or special defense or security commitments with Kuwait.

These statements must have been calculated to appease Saddam because they represented a departure from assurances to Kuwait by the Reagan administration and, most recently, a statement by Secretary of Defense Cheney on July 19 of last year that the United States was committed to defend Kuwait if attacked. According to press reports, the White House "cut the Secretary down to size rather quickly" for committing the United States to a war it might not want to fight. In hindsight, the actions of the State Department during the time period prior to the invasion look depressingly incompetent. Diplomatically, the administration rolled out the red carpet for Saddam. Understandably, he was reportedly very surprised by President Bush's reaction to the invasion and the United States' overnight conversion from neutral observer to staunch Kuwait ally.

Some Members of Congress, too, participated in sending a mixed message to Saddam. On April 12, 1990, Saddam met with a delegation of U.S. Senators. According to press reports, members of the delegation conveyed the message that President Bush opposed efforts in Congress to impose economic sanctions on Iraq in response to human rights abuses. One Senator reportedly blamed the American press for negative reports about the Iraqi leader. When the Senators returned to brief President Bush about their trip, they are said to have counseled forbearance toward Saddam. Furthermore, as late as July

of last year, Congress was still divided on whether to impose economic sanctions on Iraq.

The White House, Department of State, and leaders in Congress must clearly convey American interests, applying to world events the fundamental principles of foreign policy stated above. Mixed messages, missed signals, and principles ignored for political convenience do not advance U.S. leadership in the world, but confuse and cheapen it. The United States cannot promote peace and stability in the world when allies become enemies and enemies become allies overnight.

#### FAILURE TO USE TIMELY CONFLICT RESOLUTION

The negotiations to deal with Saddam should have started before he moved one troop into Kuwait. Once the invasion began, traditional methods of conflict resolution were for less likely to succeed. I have complete faith that the President expected his statements and threats would yield the peaceful withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait, but he was obliged to follow through on those threats when Saddam's troops dug in rather than withdraw. Congress met on January 12 during the last hand of a high-stakes poker game; the bets were on the table and we had no choice but to show our cards.

The science of conflict resolution is slow and painstaking, and difficult to practice in a climate of deadlines and threats. As the only remaining superpower, the United States must use its world leadership to promote peaceful resolution of regional conflicts, even if it is costly in terms of time and money. It is impossible to say now whether negotiations ever would have yielded a settlement of the Persian Gulf crisis. In fact, I have grave doubts that economic sanctions alone would have ever worked on Saddam Hussein. But early on, the United States had an opportunity to negotiate from a position of military and moral strength. The process of conflict resolution should have begun last spring, or earlier, when the signs of war became evident and the stakes on both sides were considerably lower. The opportunity for peaceful conflict resolution was effectively lost in early November when the number of allied troops on the ground was doubled and the January 15 deadline was set.

#### THE LACK OF A NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

In terms of domestic policy, the United States has forgotten the lessons of the 1970's. The oil embargos of 1973 and 1979 revealed the Achilles' heel of the world's largest economic and military superpower; our economy's fragile lifeline of imported oil. President Jimmy Carter recognized the threat of our dependence and responded with an alternative energy program which sought eventual American independence from foreign oil. Carter understood that national security was not a concept limited to arms and soldiers

and declared U.S. energy policy "the moral equivalent of war." For our Nation to be secure, he reasoned, our vulnerable economic flank had to be as well protected as our military.

Carter's program was abandoned and scorned by President Reagan, who never liked to dwell on painful lessons, or learn from them. Reagan redefined national security as raw military might, and left energy policy to the market, which, when totally unrestricted, has proved a poor arbiter of policy.

While oil prices remained high in the early 1980's, the market pushed us toward conservation; oil consumption actually dropped as the economy grew. Oil imports fell below 30 percent of national consumption by 1985, then began to increase rapidly as the world price of oil declined. By 1990, oil imports had increased to 45 percent, one-fourth of which came from the Persian Gulf. The market has left us way out on a limb of foreign energy dependence, yet the policy vacuum in the White House persists. Conservation provisions are reportedly absent from the President's long-awaited energy plan.

In the future, we must remember that energy is an essential component of our national security. Our economy, not military, is our greatest strength and it depends on an adequate energy supply at a stable, reasonable price. The oil shocks of 1973, 1979, and the turmoil in the Persian Gulf demonstrate that the market is subject to nonmarket forces like embargos, cartels, and wars.

We need a long-term national energy policy which promotes energy independence through conservation, alternative energy sources, and domestic oil and gas production. Where the market alone will not support such a program, Government policy must do so. We do not leave other aspects of our national defense to the market, so why take an economic purist's laissez-faire approach to our essential energy needs?

Now that we are in this war, the Commander in Chief has the support of Congress to fight and win it. Our troops are in harm's way, doing their heroic best to preserve American interests and they deserve unified support back home. But in rallying around the President and our policy, we should not lose sight of the myriad lessons of this crisis. Will we remember our mistakes next time, or are we condemned to repeat them?

□ 1820

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] for his very thoughtful presentation today. I know that as he looks back a few months, he saw some lost

opportunities. The gentleman has laid those out on the table. They are critically important.

Mr. Speaker, I think when history is written, history will show that we built up this tyrant, only to bring our young people into the area to slay him, and that we built up a tyrant named Noriega, only to send our young people into an area to slay him.

This is not a foreign policy, this is a dangerous policy, and this is one that does not bode well for this country.

I think what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has pointed out is that this administration is the one before it was winking and nodding at Saddam Hussein, literally a few days before Saddam Hussein went into Kuwait. How well I remember the gentleman on the floor of the House, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], as if it was yesterday, saying yes, it would be good to help our trade problems, but we cannot trade with a man like Saddam Hussein. This man gassed his own people. We have to take a stand, a moral stand here. And the administration opposed us. I will never forget that. I will never forget April Glaspie winking and nodding and giving the go-ahead to this invasion.

Mr. Speaker, I would only hope, and I say this to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], that the gentleman might see this phase of the war as another possibility to save a lot of lives. We have seen many phases. At the beginning of this war, when Congress was not involved, we fought to get involved, we had the debate, and we lost it, some of it. We have seen the air war do tremendous damage, damage which has led our military people to say we own the air. We have air superiority. We have knocked out their chemical and nuclear and biological capabilities.

I only hope that the gentleman might step back and perhaps see another window of opportunity here before we get into this ground war.

I will say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], as he has so well pointed out, that this administration has dealt with Saddam Hussein. In essence, somehow we even created him. They have talked to him, they have dealt with him, and, as my friend from California has said many times, they have used diplomacy with him. They have even given him help.

Surely there has to be a way, before we see thousands of our young people in a ground war, and out of love for those young people and love for our country and love for peace, that we somehow can see that window of opportunity just one more time, to try and resolve this, short of a ground war.

Finally, I would say to the gentleman, his points about an energy policy are extraordinarily important to this debate. Energy policy means national security. Energy policy means

an economy that thrives, an economy that is not dependent on tyrants in the Middle East or unstable governments throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to join with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], because I know he is going to be pushing, for example, for fuel economy, something I have worked on for many, many years, so that we can achieve a policy that allows us to be completely independent of foreign oil. We can do this. We know that we can do it.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] for putting a historical perspective on the crisis. It is a very important contribution to the debate.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER]. Of course, I replicated her legislation to a large extent on the fuel economy for cars, because I do believe that it is critically important to get at the most significant source of energy utilization, which is transportation fuels, as a way to become more self-sufficient.

Mr. Speaker, I would just make a couple of comments. I think the gentlewoman made some good points.

I offered this today because I think the American public needs to reflect on the historical reasons for a lot of our involvement in the world.

I think for the most part our motives are not so bad. I just do not think as a country we look at all the ramifications of things we do. I think over the years we have not based our foreign policy on clear, consistent signals, particularly on how countries treat their people.

Sometimes I think if we did that across the board, it would make it so that we would do clear, consistent things. As a matter of fact, Saddam Hussein clearly and consistently did pretty terrible things to his people. You cannot say he is in any sense of the word other than a brutal murderer, in terms of how he has treated his people. Had we as a country reflected on that and dealt with it, then I suspect that we might have taken action before the invasion, which would have not let him believe that we were opening the door.

I do believe that he started this war, however, and not us. That is, he is the one that invaded Kuwait. He is the one that has brutalized the people inside that country and treated them without any sense of dignity whatsoever.

So once the decision was made to go to war, I am kind of a traditionalist. I hope that all of us together can unify and get this thing over the fastest way possible, losing the least amount of people possible. Right now I feel uncomfortable about telling General Powell or Secretary Cheney specifically what to do. I never served in the military. I do not have experience with it. I hope that they understand their

decisions will affect conceivably lots of lives.

I do not think they and the President want to gratuitously put more people on the chopping block than need to have happen. So I hope and pray that standing together in a unified sense, this country can stand together and finish this war as quickly as possible, killing as few people as possible in Iraq and among American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I guess what I further hope for is that if we go forth from here to build a new Middle East, a new world order, whether it is in the Middle East or the Soviet Union or Latin America or Asia, wherever it is, that we recognize that we need some clear principles of what we stand for. If we keep those, and if we keep our eye on the ball there, then I suspect we will not have the Saddam Husseins around as much as serious forces.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I talked about looking at the whole issue of arming the world, looking at the issue of having some human rights orientation, looking at the issue of an energy policy, and also making sure that we have a State Department that is up to speed, that knows what is happening. I think there are a lot of failures in the past. But what my treatise today is, is to say here that I think some mistakes were made, so we can correct them in the future.

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

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

□ 1830

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleague's remarks in every single phrase, every dotted "i" and crossed "t," everything he said during the thoughtfully prepared statement. But to make this crystal clear, because I was with the gentleman as a conservative Republican from the other side of the aisle on every fight against Saddam Hussein, with the gentleman just within the last few months before he invaded your Glickman amendment to cut off all of the agricultural subsidies, and was very frustrated with administrations that I worked as hard as anybody did to help bring to office because I see an institutional State Department, institutionalized State Department, there under President Carter or for Presidents immemorial, and I was thinking of an old expression that is a burden that is put on Members of the Senate and the House from both parties, and from our proud new Socialist Member, that war is far too important to be left to the generals. I scribbled down here a paraphrase that State craft, foreign relations, foreign affairs, is also too important to be left to the professional diplomats. That is our role here, and I know I joined with my colleague from California, Mr. DELLUMS,

in October, in September, in August when this invasion was first unraveling and I said on a national show, "Phil Donahue Show" from the American Legion Hall at Kennebunkport, "Call us back in, and give our lameduck Members on both sides of the aisle one last shot at the honor of serving their constituencies to debate this in December."

I enjoyed immensely the thoughtful, spirited debate here on both sides based on principle and eloquence, but I just wanted to ask the gentleman a couple of questions, and I think he will appreciate them, to make this crystal clear.

This man who you have delineated as evil incarnate, from gassing Kurds to murdering his friends and associates in the Baathist Party, including, a strange term, Baath Party, immersing them in baths of acid, up to what he is now doing.

Here is what I want to ask: Is this not a Dark Ages situation where one frail human being, Saddam Hussein, one man, with his electrical circuitry and his little tiny gray matter, about 1,400 cc's of brain matter, he could end this war tonight. It is darkness still over there now. Does the gentleman believe that? I do.

Mr. GLICKMAN. He clearly could end the war in connection with the aims of the U.N. resolution by just leaving Kuwait. That is absolutely clear. And I think that he will have to recognize that if he does not go down that road he faces continued military destruction.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Is he not killing far more of his own people, he, himself, and as Hitler said, the German people were not worthy of him, "I am taking them down with me," is he not responsible personally, the individual, not in the spiritual sense before God—that is a given—but before the whole world, and despite what King Hussein, his noncousin said over in Aman, is he not responsible for every Republican Guardsman in his country who is dying tonight as we speak under B-52 raids? He is killing them, not us.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I always have said that he started this war, we did not. He invaded Kuwait, and his unwillingness to leave, of course, is putting his people at enormous risk of loss of life and injury.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman so much for yielding.

I am so tortured by what is coming, and as I look back, before the President chose the force option, the whole world was against Saddam Hussein, this tyrant who gassed his own people, this aggressor who walked into Kuwait, the whole world, even the Arab world. He had very few on his side. When my

colleague from California, Mr. DELLUMS, says he has a nervous feeling—

Mr. GLICKMAN. Ominous, I think was the word.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, ominous, he said it so eloquently, and I share that ominous feeling, particularly tonight, because I do not know if the gentleman is aware of this, but King Hussein of Jordan made a statement tonight, and it makes me feel that perhaps this strategy that we have taken and this Congress passed, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is so correct, that we debated here, and it was one of our finest moments. We stood up to those who said it would be unpatriotic to debate this, and we held our ground, and we made our case, and those of us who lost, lost it and those who won, won it, and we will move on, the United States as a country, to try and end this.

But I want to put in the RECORD, if I could, just a quote from this AP story.

King Hussein tilted sharply toward Iraq on Wednesday, describing the Persian Gulf War as an effort to destroy Iraq and calling on Arabs to demand a cease-fire.

As developments of the war have proved, they want to destroy Iraq to prepare the situation in the region in a much more dangerous way for our nation's future and present," Hussein said in a televised speech to his nation.

He accused foreign powers of plotting to carve up the Arab world's resources and to control it politically.

This war is a war against all Arabs and all Muslims and not against Iraq alone," said the king, who has been a bulwark of pro-Western moderation for his 37 years on the throne.

The speech was a radical shift in approach for Hussein. While before the war he favored a negotiated settlement to get Iraqi troops out of Kuwait, recently he had been critical of Saddam Hussein and essentially neutral in the war.

He urged Arabs and Muslims to support Iraq against the "fierce war imposed on brotherly Iraq," and bitterly denounced Arab countries allied against Iraq.

The speech echoed the strong pro-Iraqi sentiments of Hussein's 3.4 million subjects, many of whom are Palestinians.

Hussein accused allied forces of trying to subject his country to unfair pressures.

He goes on,

And although Baker said Jordan was not the target, the fact is they have been bombing some trucks in that area.

King Hussein said Jordan was "not willing to dance to the tune others play without being able to freely express our opinion, which we will not give up."

"If the battle is imposed on us we will be up to it," Hussein said.

Let us join our efforts to stop this tragedy and to save the people of Iraq from what is planned for it and to end this war.

I bring this up to the gentleman because I looked back as to when we had the moral ground with the sanctions, and using force in a defensive way to enforce the embargo, and in case there was further aggression we were set to use force in those circumstances. And we had the whole world against this ty-

rant. And now we have King Hussein, for all of these years a friend, really, a moderate Arab state, one which got along with Israel fairly well. They had no Camp David accord, but they got along, and here we see as a result of this war, which is going on for too long a time in my view, and perhaps much longer than King Hussein thought, here we have a situation where Jordan is now reversing course. I think it adds to the ominous feeling that my colleague from California talked about, because I had the privilege of going to the Middle East and spending a few days with our troops in Saudi Arabia. I cannot get their faces out of my mind. And I love them, and they are wonderful. They said, "Congresswoman, we'll do our job, but just get us home as soon as you can." It keeps coming back to me, they will do their job, but get them back as soon as we can.

Mr. GLICKMAN. If I may just reclaim my time, I am moved by what the gentlewoman is saying and by what the gentleman from California is saying. I am reminded that one of the greatest Kansans of them all, General Eisenhower, said that you can never anticipate the consequences of war once you enter the battlefield. That is, of course, why Eisenhower was always rather careful, I was going to say timid but that is not the right word, careful about going down that road.

He had a lot of other good things to say, particularly toward the end of his term. But I guess that right now it is useful talking about these things, it is useful generating the debate among the American public.

□ 1840

People are unified in support of this country's effort. They also are not objecting to genuine debate on the issues, as some might say. That is ridiculous. Americans love to talk about this, and I think their focus, fixation with Cable News Network and other things indicates that they are yearning to know more about it.

I just hope, and I know that the gentlewoman will have many other comments after mine, that when this war is over, when we have won it, which I think we will militarily, that generations to come will not see the need to do it again based upon the mistakes that we have made in the last 10 years.

### THREE CATEGORIES OF ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, at the height of the Vietnam war, one of America's beloved intellectuals of the left, and he liked to describe himself as a radical more than a liberal or someone of the left, I.F.

Stone, a gentleman who proved his intellectual depth by in his seventies learning to speak and read Greek including ancient Greek so that he could write what some people think is his best work, "The Trial of Socrates," Mr. I.F. Stone, a great opponent of our rescue effort in Vietnam, and that is my characterization, trying to rescue the southern half of Vietnam from communism the way we rescued the southern half of Korea from communism, to turn it into one of the economic powers of the Pacific Rim, and the Olympics held in Seoul in 1988, and Garden Grove, my home city, one of North America's largest headquarters for the Hyundai automobile, but in that rescue operation, he certainly had every right as an American to attack particularly the poor way the politicians were manipulating the rescue effort and structuring it in such a way that we could not possibly win.

We had 47,356 men, 8 of them were women, die in combat. Overall we lost 58,151.

I am one of those Members who feels great pain at the loss of American life. I am also a passionate person who occasionally pauses to see evil being faced off and think, "I wonder how the parents of Bob Stethem feel right now when they see an evil despot in the Middle East who encourages terrorism, I wonder how they feel." Those are the parents who live out here in Maryland of the young Navy diver, one of their several sons in the United States Navy, who was slowly beaten to death. They jumped up and down on his chest in the cockpit of that TWA airplane that had been hijacked, until they had broken all of his ribs, never let out a sound, and as he lay there in the arms of the German-born American stewardess gasping his last breath, he said, "Tell my parents, my family, I love them."

We have seen terrorism spread around this world borne from frustration, and there is a lot of frustration that has been expressed in this House.

So let me come back to I.F. Stone and his characterization of demonstrators during the Vietnam war. He put them basically in three categories, and although there are subcategories of categories, I find no quarrel with his triple category, and I find some parallel here. He said, "Of those demonstrating against the effort in Vietnam, group 1 is democratically motivated, group 2 spiritually motivated, and group 3 are the anticapitalists." Now, by democratically motivated, he meant people, for example, who debated in this Chamber who said in a democratic system there has got to be another way than, to quote one of my colleagues from California tonight, using force, violence, or aggression.

Certainly meeting force with military might is force. It is certainly violent. The aggression in this case, I think, is the aggression of Saddam

Hussein met with just force, but that was a noble debate in this Chamber, and depending on how you call votes around here, 250 to 183 could be called a walkaway for the majority. It would be on most domestic issues. But I accept the characterization that it was close. That is a division when you are talking about using force and losing the lives of young Americans in this struggle, and almost 100 were killed as we trained up to this, and some still die in operational training missions. We lost several helicopter crews this week on friendly soil, and we have 5 allied prisoners, 8 U.S. prisoners, and that is 13 out of over 30 Americans now, and the majority are now missing in action due to that AC-130 Specter gunship that went down. I am sure there were great rescue operations mounted, but those 14 crewmen are still listed as missing. So there has already been great loss of life, not as much as were lost at L.A. International Airport, my main airport, in one crash the other night, but these are people that are not struck down by an accident. They are following orders, so they march to a drum where politicians have control over the military in our democracy.

In Mr. Stone's second category, the spiritually motivated, he said, "This is not to be confused with people who are basing it on any specific religion, although that plays a part. They are spiritual people." I would add those that have memorized St. Francis of Assisi's great prayer, "Lord, where there is hatred, let me sow love." The spiritually motivated cannot ever bring themselves to see the use of force in any situation, even sometimes if it is a local police matter that ends up in a shooting where life is lost, either the loss of a police officer's life, a policeman's life, or the loss of some lawbreaker's life. And those people are certainly to be respected. These are the gentle people of our society, what is written about from Christ's Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes, the peacemakers, "They shall be called the children of God."

His third category, the anticapitalists, these are the ones now, I think, dominate many of the demonstrations, certainly the more passionate moments of the early days of demonstration where they will take to the podium and talk about America's sins, that we are the aggressor nation around the world, that we, in trying to force capitalism down the throats of foreign nations or different cultures, we are the ones in this situation who are the aggressors, and although these are the ones who loved Ho Chi Minh and praised him to the skies, another Communist dictator with a false name who in the guise of nationalism and colonialism was just turning his nation of Vietnam over to what we now know is the great evil of our century, way be-

yond the evil of Nazism and loss of life or destruction of the environment or economies, has been the curse of communism, but these people will always look to America, the opposite of what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] said, the preceding speaker, where he said that he believes our country's motives are honorable and well-meaning, but these people see the United States as the most evil force in the world.

It is a real tragedy to see King Hussein of Jordan move with some of his rhetoric into the camp that the United States is the problem here, not his namesake but no relative. Saddam Hussein, and his move was dictated, I think, not so much by principles, because he has been all over the lot the last 20 years trying to sustain his Hashemite minority rule over a country, Jordan, that has become more Palestinian in great numbers, almost 65 percent, than it is Hashemite. The Hashemites did come out of Saudi Arabia, the northwest corner of Saudi Arabia, and were put in power by the British in those colonial days when people in backrooms in London decided what countries' boundaries would look like and what commerce dictated as far as what would be a country and what tribes would be split apart to better suit rule, and what Tamil people would be moved from India to the island of Ceylon which now rolls out in violence, the shuffling of people all around the world in the sub-civil-servant class to satisfy a colonial empire; those sins of the past are still being played out before us, sometimes in violent forms.

But to make the United States the aggressor or the guilty one here and to say that we are trying to destroy Iraq is just plain not only wrong, it borders on vicious lying.

King Hussein, if he were visiting with us in the Foreign Affairs room over tea and crumpets, as he does often, would be hard-pressed to explain why he and the United States and France and Germany, and Great Britain is the least guilty in this, why we all played footsie with this lesser of evils and why the world did not speak out as forcefully as it should have when we had the people to be interviewed in Switzerland who were dying of all the various poison gases that Saddam Hussein used on the Iranian teenage soldiers in their mad suicide charges led by their religious fanatic leader, the Ayatollah Khomeini, or his own Kurdish people, 5 million out of his 18 million people, he has attempted to genocide for the sin that we only see in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia today.

□ 1850

Nationalism in the good sense, pride of your own ethnicity, to rule your own people in their own land of Kurdistan.

The image out there in the streets that is going right up to the satellites

and downlinked through CNN equipment and to Saddam Hussein's frail little 1,400 cc cavity filled with his brain matter, is that if he holds on and bides his time, he will get what the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has a great sense of foreboding about, ominous feeling. I do too. I do not want a ground war. He wants his mother of all wars because he thinks he will replay in a Ho Chi Minh type blood-letting where, like France and Vietnam and the United States later, predicted Ho Chi Minh, we could not take a body count. One of the sick words that came out of the McNamara designed war.

I say the air war can solve this, that we must see it through to its conclusion, and that my prayer is that months will go by, as the propaganda continues that we are bombing hospitals. One of his officers will have the decency to put him out of his misery. Like Hitler, he sees the "German people are not worthy of me. I will take them down with me." That is what Saddam Hussein is doing, taking his people and his nation down with him.

King Hussein, your namesake is destroying this country, not the United States of America or the coalition.

#### THE PERSIAN GULF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Ms. PELOS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, let me just say before yielding to a few Members and prior to making a more comprehensive statement, I would like to direct a couple of remarks to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

I would not attempt to comment on any of the statements the gentleman has made, with the exception of one, and simply ask my colleague to reconsider the strategy of characterizing "dissent." The beauty, at least the ostensible beauty of this Nation is in the right of people to raise their voices and to articulate a point of view. Now, each American, we may agree or disagree with that point of view, but it seems to me where we should not debate, where we should be in total unison, is on people's right to raise their voice in the name of dissent.

In one sense, it is rather patronizing and paternalistic to the American people to feel the need, as a public official, to attempt to characterize the other person's position. This gentleman chooses not to do that. I would rather take on the gentleman's point of view, let people characterize the perspective. People are wise enough and mature enough to listen carefully, to form their own opinions, and attempt to impact the decisionmaking based on those opinions. It is not necessary to characterize.

In the course of this gentleman's remarks, I will say to my colleague from California that I would go back 20 years, because this gentleman came to this Congress, I raised my hand to uphold the Constitution in January 1971, representing at that time the seventh Congressional District in California, a district that sent this gentleman here to raise my voice in the name of peace, social and economic justice. However, there are only a handful of Members in the Congress who were prepared to stand up at that time in opposition to the war in Vietnam, to raise their voices in dissent, and so those Members who did have to suffer the challenges, to suffer the epithets, to suffer the fundamental challenges to our right to stand up and exercise our prerogatives within the framework of our form of government, to express a point of view.

What I would say to my colleague from California is to please stay focused on the issues themselves. I think to engage in the extraneous debate of characterizing dissent takes Members, and we descend into Never-Never Land that is reminiscent of where we were 20 years ago. It raises the specter of the national security state. It raises the specter of oppression of perspectives and points of view.

I would say to my colleague, how can the gentleman from California join this gentleman in saying, allow the young students in Tiananmen Square to rise up in dissent, and then not allow the students of this country to rise up in dissent? I would say to my colleague from California, how then do we say to the Soviet Union, why does the Soviet Union not have competing ideas, then competing perspectives and points of views and analysis? Why does the Soviet Union not allow for dissent? Then we are not willing to allow for dissent in our own country.

When the Berlin Wall fell, the gentleman from California and I stood up in unison, side by side, to cheer the fact that tens of thousands of human beings brought down the Berlin Wall by the sheer power of their dissent, and the sheer power of their spirit, and the sheer willingness on their part, to take into their own hands their own destiny and their own future. How can we applaud that dissent, and then take the stand to characterize dissent in our country?

Finally, I would just say someone wiser than this gentleman, perhaps more eloquently than my colleague said, "I may disagree with what you say, but I would die defending your right to say it." That is the beauty of what this is all about.

I would hope that my colleague would move away from characterizing dissent. Let people's ideas stand or fall on the power and the weight of the majesty or the wisdom or the lack thereof of those ideas on their own terms, rather than introducing this

second force, and that is to start mobilizing public opinion in opposition to fellow citizens simply because they choose to articulate a different perspective and a different point of view. That, in this gentleman's opinion, is a dangerous practice, and I hope my colleague would not pursue it.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLUMS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I also enjoy any discussion with the gentleman on the House floor because we have both expressed much frustration that rather than moments of dialog in this House, it is more often a series of monologs and written statements and 1-minute statements and special orders delivered sometimes in a read monotone. I appreciate the gentleman using the vigor of his mind to focus on these ideas.

In my 10 minutes, perhaps I was not precise enough to address myself to the quote of Voltaire, that I will deny to defend your right to dissent. I was trying to express the honorable dissent that was in this House, that continues in this House in various ways, that is in the street, like the sign "No Blood for Oil." That does not offend me. It is simplistic, but in simpleness it is a pretty direct economic argument. What I am saying, what King Hussein has done, a longtime ally of rationality in the world, and what some people are doing out there at some of the demonstrations is emboldening Saddam Hussein by saying that we are the problem in the world, not a totalitarian dictator that took advantage of the weakness in our State Department and evil German businessmen selling his weapons of war. As I said, all of the countries are to blame mostly, and Great Britain the least of all, but what I feel is that those dissenters that brought down the Berlin Wall—and this is where the gentleman and I drew sabers quite often, or crossed quills, pens, tongues—that without America's military might during the cold war, that dissent would never have been allowed to rise. It would have been crushed by an all powerful Cheka, NKD, KGB, that it was the United States and the free world and not standing as a beacon developing high-technology weapons so that we could do away with the draft, at least in our country, and make our army smaller, that that is what enables the dissent to flower.

I venture that if a Member dared to come to the House floor and praise apartheid in South Africa, not just argue about whether sanctions will work. I was with the gentleman on the weak sanctions, I was not with the gentleman on the strong sanctions. The gentleman from California was probably right and I was wrong, and now with that debate still going on, and as we see the European Community start-

ing to remove all sanctions because de Klerk is amazing lots of people, but if someone came in the well to defend apartheid, the gentleman would rise in a fury. I am guessing, that although the gentleman would tolerate the dissent, the gentleman would say this dissent goes beyond human decency in the norm because it is racist and it demeans a fellow human being.

□ 1900

I think it is demeaning when, as the press says tonight, the intellectual elite—get that expression, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]—the intellectual elite of Morocco now sees Saddam Hussein as a hero. It is like a policeman in Chicago saying, "You know, I have come to see Al Capone as a hero here. You know, he is trafficking in booze. I like my drink, and I think this Volstead Act is terrible."

You cannot have decent people getting up in dissent and praising a monster, just as the American Bunde in this country that praised Adolf Hitler. Yes, they had their right to be wrong in this free country, but those types of dissenting voices, because they were the minority in America, emboldened Adolf Hitler to bite off one little country after another until he bathed Europe in the blood of 55 million people.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I might reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I think I have made my point. Perhaps off the floor my colleague and I will continue our debate and discussion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief, because there is not a lot that I can add to what so many of the previous speakers have said, except that I want to come here to express my solidarity with the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER] and all the others who have been down here who are raising some deep concerns about what is going on in the Persian Gulf.

Let me just touch on a few points. Now is not the time to discuss the causes of this war. Others have done it better, or to even ask the question of what will be the long-term impact of this war.

Frankly, however, I have deep concerns as to whether the day after the war ends, the day after the United States and its allies win this war, I think we do have a right to ask whether in fact the deep-seated problems of the Middle East will have in fact advanced one step forward in terms of long-term solutions.

Will the Israelis and the Palestinians be getting along better the day after the bloodshed is over?

Will the gap between the rich and the poor in the Persian Gulf, between the Sheikhs and the Kings of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia and the very poor people all over that region, will that essential and very deep problem have taken one step forward in terms of a solution one day after this war is over? I fear not.

In terms of the causes of this war, it is not necessary to get into the whole question of energy policy. We had that debate in the early 1970's. Apparently we have learned nothing. We have the capability to break our dependence on Persian Gulf oil. Will we in fact do it? Will we put tens of billions of dollars into mass transportation? Will we demand that our automobiles get 50 or 60 miles to the gallon as technology allows us? Will we do that, or will we continue to be dependent on Persian Gulf oil? Frankly, I am not of the opinion that we have yet, despite this war, learned that lesson.

Others have talked about how the day before Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait, the illegal, the immoral, the brutal invasion, there was the Bush administration urging more money for Saddam Hussein. Might we begin to learn that the man who one day was our friend and our ally and the next day becomes our Hitler, that maybe there is some problem in terms of this foreign policy? Will we learn that? I am not sure that we will learn, Mr. Speaker, because today, as you know, one of our allies in this great fight for freedom is that other freedom fighter, Mr. Assad of Syria.

Now, the debate may rage as to whether or not Mr. Assad is a worse dictator than Saddam Hussein. There are those who say "Yes." There are those who say "No." But I fear that 2 or 3 years from now our great ally, Mr. Assad, may be our enemy and we will be at war with him. Have we learned that lesson? I fear not.

Mr. Speaker, some also make the point that one of the functions of this entire war; one of the manifestations of this war is that while every single day the newspapers are full of war news, that in fact in this body, the Congress, the President, are focusing on this war out of necessity, that we are losing focus on some of the enormous problems facing this country.

How many of the viewers understand that today, yesterday, in the Senate, the Senate Budget Committee appropriated \$82 billion more for the S&L bailout—\$82 billion at a time that we have 2 million people sleeping out on the streets, a \$3½ trillion national debt, a health care system which is falling apart, an educational system that is in desperate need of funding, \$82 billion more as a result of the thievery on the part of the S&L people and the inaction of the White House and this Congress, focusing attention on that.

Are we dealing with the fact that the standard of living for working people in

this country is declining as this Nation continues its deindustrial policy so that the new technology, the new manufacturing capabilities are developing in Europe and Japan, and our kids learn how to flip hamburgers at minimum wage. Are we focusing the debate in this body and in the White House on those issues?

Are we talking about why it is that half the American people no longer even bother to vote, they are so disgusted and frustrated at the political process. Where is that debate to say to the American people, the poor people and the working people, that this is your country. Participate, and if the people in this body and the White House are not representing you, throw them out. But we have got to ask the question why it is that this Nation has far and away the lowest voter turnout of any industrialized nation on earth. Are we debating that issue? I fear not. We are looking at the Persian Gulf and many of us have those concerns, that while enormous problems exist here, all of our energy and attention goes to the Persian Gulf.

It has been said earlier, another issue I will not get into at great length, what does it mean in terms of long-term policy, not only that King Hussein of Jordan turns on us, a long-time ally, but that 300,000 people in Morocco march against us.

What will it mean if the American flag flies in Baghdad? How many years and how many troops will we need in that part of the world to protect us there? If you think the British are having a problem in Ireland, I hesitate to see what kind of problems we will have amidst all the Arab nationalism.

Those are all issues that other people have talked on and gone into at great length and have discussed better than I can.

I just want to express briefly one or two concerns that I have for the immediate moment, and that is that I agree and I think virtually everybody who has spoken here agrees that it is absolutely imperative that we do everything in our power to avoid a ground war.

Now, nobody can estimate what the casualties will be in a ground war, but there are those who say we are talking about tens and tens of thousands of Americans and probably 10 times that number of Iraqis and other people.

Now, it seems to me that in the last 3 weeks Iraq has suffered terrible, terrible punishment as a result of the Arab war.

Now, at this moment is Saddam Hussein willing, is he smart enough to finally say that maybe now he should withdraw from Kuwait to stop the further bloodshed?

The truth of the matter is I do not know the answer. Nobody in this room knows the answer, but I think it might be a very good idea if the United Na-

tions or some other international body proposed a cease-fire, proposed negotiations to say to Saddam Hussein, "Out of Kuwait. You have suffered terrible punishment. Get out now before there is worse punishment and worse bloodshed."

I would hope that the United Nations would be activated, call for a cease-fire, call for negotiations and demand that Saddam Hussein get out of Kuwait now before worse bloodshed is caused.

That is about the only point I want to make. We are into something that is terrible. I think we all agree that we want to end this horror with a minimum amount of bloodshed.

I simply want to congratulate and commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the other people who are raising these very important issues.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

I have been very impressed and moved by the debate and the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], and my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. They have all been thoughtful.

I wish to add my voice to those who hope and pray and urge the President that we not get into the horror and the bloodbath of a great war.

#### □ 1910

I was one of those who felt early in January that we should not get into a shooting war at all. I was one of those who, after considerable study, felt that sanctions could do the job.

Iraq is uniquely vulnerable to economic sanctions. Iraq does not have a lot of different kinds of products that she exports and a variety of routes, by air, by land, by sea, by truck.

Iraq has only one cash crop: petroleum. It leaves Iraq by only two routes. Iraq is land-locked. It leaves Iraq, this petroleum, by pipeline to Saudi Arabia and by pipeline to Turkey. Both Saudi Arabia and Turkey are cooperating with us 100 percent.

So all of Iraq's oil is cut off from the outside world. None of it is leaving and entering global commerce.

Ninety-seven to ninety-eight percent of Iraq's foreign earnings are absolutely shut off. Over 90 percent of her imports also.

We do not know if there is some smuggling in of spare parts; replacement parts, precursor chemicals that are needed to fuel the Iraqi economic machine and her war machine.

If there are such products being smuggled into Iraq, we can close that down, virtually 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we have had well over 100 cases of sanctions in the last half-century.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a young economist at the Board of Economic Warfare, my first job in 1942 for about 6 or 8 months before I went into the service, I had the bottom job in the professional ratings, P-1, \$2,000 a year, and vastly overpaid at that. But it was a wonderful experience for a young man just out of college.

On the Board of Economic Warfare what were we doing? Well, we were buying up balsa wood over in Latin America, particularly in Ecuador, wherever we could find a stick, branch, tree, we bought it.

We were up to our kazoo in balsa wood. Not that we needed balsa wood; but the Germans were using balsa wood to make the airframes of their Messerschmitts, their fighters.

So we engaged in preemptive buying or preclusive buying in order to deny a vitally needed product to an enemy.

We did that successfully. Then our friends, the noble Swedes, they were selling very high quality steel ball bearings to the Nazi war machine.

We negotiated with the Swedes. They were neutrals at the time. We asked them to cease and desist, and they did not respond to that. But they did allow as much that if we would buy their entire output of high-quality steel ball bearings and pay a significantly higher price than the Nazis were paying, they would sell us their entire output.

So, again, we were up to our kazoo in steel ball bearings. Our whole country was rolling around on the ball bearings that we bought, not because we needed them but because we wanted to deny them to the Nazi war machine.

So we are quite sophisticated and very experienced in this business of preemptive or preclusive buying. As time goes on, I want to assure my colleagues that we can get to those Kurdish traders who are carrying spare parts or replacement parts, the small trickle of them, into Iraq by muleback, by donkey, because we can outbid the Iraqis. It is all that simple.

Saddam Hussein is on his last legs as far as the viability of his economy and his foreign-exchange holdings are concerned.

So, my friends, I along with a lot of others, including seven out of the last eight last Secretaries of Defense, counseled patience, counseled patience, counseled patience in early January on the ground that we were going to gradually erode Iraq's war machine, erode Saddam Hussein's capability of intimidating and terrorizing his neighbors and threatening the peace of the Middle East region.

Now I hear President Bush telling us that he does not have much confidence

that we can get the job done without a ground war, without invading on the ground.

Now I do not know what "getting the job done" really means. To me there is one job that far overshadows every other conceivable job, and that is: removing Saddam Hussein from being the 900-pound gorilla perched over the Middle East as a threatening, intimidating force terrorizing his neighbors and, as I say, threatening the peace of the entire Middle East region, being the latter day hero of the region, the Gamal Abdul Nasser of the 1990's.

I want to wipe him out. I want to remove him. That is the No. 1 goal, and we can do that, we can remove this man as a serious military threat to his neighbors and to the region if we stick with the incredibly accurate high-precision bombing that we have carried on for 2 weeks now, at very low cost of human life. If we continue the strategic bombing and continue the sanctions, we will have this man on his knees in a matter of months with very little loss of life. We will remove him as a threat to peace.

Now, if you say "getting the job done" means getting him out of Kuwait, I do not know if we can do that by bombing and by sanctions. Nobody knows that, of course.

But what I do know is that if we can remove him as a source of threat and destabilization and terror in the Middle East with very little loss of life, as we seem to be doing with the bombing, and if it takes an exponential increase not only in Iraqi deaths but in American deaths, in body bags coming back to this country, that is sad and an awful and tragic and horrifying prospect that we must face up to in a ground war, then I ask my colleagues, is it worth it? And what is the hurry? What in the world is the hurry? Why can't we show that patience, show that character and stick it out with the bombing and the sanctions to bring this monster to his knees without the horrors of a ground war that will produce tens of thousands of body bags?

We have been in four wars recently where we had to go on the ground: World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the Vietnam war.

Eighty percent of our casualties were on the ground in the infantry. They do not come from casualties of our airmen, not at all.

For us to engage now in a ground war before we give the President's policy the chance—that is, air bombardment cum sanctions—I think would be the height of folly. I hope Mr. Bush will finally show the wisdom and the judgment to counsel with these seven out of the last eight Secretaries of Defense and 2 recent Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Jones and Admiral Crowe, nine wise men, the wise men who counseled patience, forbear-

ance, sticking it out, hanging tough with a policy that may be high in cost but low in human life comparatively for the United States, rather than going to a policy that is far higher in cost, astronomically higher cost of life; namely, a land invasion.

I also think how a land invasion would complicate matters for a peace.

If the United States goes into a land war and wreaks even greater havoc than we are wreaking with a comparatively surgical air war, with far higher casualties on the ground in terms of Arab fatalities as well as American fatalities, think how that is going to embitter and poison the postwar atmosphere. Think of the hatreds, the viciousness, the aberrational Moslem fundamentalism that the horrors of a large-scale ground war is going to inflict in the postwar atmosphere.

It seems to me that when we unleash the forces of unreason, the forces of aberration, we make it difficult but not impossible for cooler heads to prevail. And it seems to me that the United States will lose its credibility.

As the proponent of this last savage act of ground war, we would lose our credibility to be a leader in bringing the postwar Arabian land and peoples to some kind of a peace, some kind of consensus.

□ 1920

One last word: There are two absolute essentials: First, if Saddam Hussein were willing to say, "All right; I give up. We put up a wonderful fight, the Iraqi troops. Now we'll get out of Kuwait. Let's sit down at the peace conference," there are two things that we cannot permit. One is Saddam Hussein's getting out of this thing with his skin intact and his military power intact simply at the cost of giving back Kuwait. He was in a 9-year war with Iran and, as a consequence of his desire to solve that war, all of a sudden he gave back all of the sacrifices that Iraq has gained, all of the benefits of the settlement with Iran, in order to be free of that war and to concentrate on the war with the United States and of course the war with Israel. So, we cannot permit him to escape the judgment of history, that he be removed as a tyrant, a mad tyrant, in the Middle East. He cannot get out saying, "OK; I'll move out of Kuwait."

The second thing that we must have is a consensus among the developed countries of the world that there must be an absolute embargo, and absolute prohibition on all the developed countries of the world, including some developed countries like China and others, and Brazil, against supplying weapons of lethal destruction to the mad, despotic tyrants who are in seats of power in the Third World, not only in the Middle East, but in Africa as well, across the length and breadth of Africa as well.

Mr. DELLUMS. If I might reclaim my time for a moment, I certainly want my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] to conclude his remarks. There are other Members that I want to try to recognize within the context of the time.

Mr. SCHEUER. May I have 1 minute?

Mr. DELLUMS. No problem. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may take more than 1 minute. I just want to say that I would like to recognize a few other people.

Mr. SCHEUER. There are approximately 40 or 50 countries who are selling Iraq weapons of mass destruction, private companies in these countries, 86 companies in the Federal Republic of Germany, 18 companies in the United Kingdom, 18 companies in the United States of America, 17 companies in Austria, 16 companies in France, 12 companies in Italy, and down the line, including Belgium, Brazil, Switzerland, Egypt, France, Greece, Holland, India, Italy, Japan, Jersey, Monaco, Poland, Sweden, Spain; 207 firms that have sold lethal arms to Iraq. It is pure, unadulterated human greed.

Now it could be understood, having such a policy, why we were in cold war with the Soviet Union. While we were arming ourselves to the teeth against the Soviets and they were arming themselves to the teeth against us, it was almost understandable that each would want to sink the economies of scale, my colleagues, to sell or give away arms to developing countries. But now that we have solved our problem with the Soviet Union, it is absolutely a criminal offense against humanity for these greedy merchants of death to continue selling arms to Third World tyrants.

We must have an arms embargo. We must have a treaty, a binding treaty, preventing any developed country from selling these arms to a Third World country anywhere in the world.

The United States has the greatest market in the world. It is much sought after. We should deny access to our market, to our consumer market, to any country that does not prohibit its own nationals, its own business firms, from selling arms to the Third World.

Here we spent hundreds of billions of dollars a year arming ourselves against the Soviet Union. Now there seems to be a likelihood that we can vastly reduce that. So, because our own private firms and all of these countries in an excess of greed want to continue making profits selling arms, these merchants of death, to the Third World countries, now are in the process of spending more billions, perhaps a half a billion dollars a day to a billion dollars a day fighting Hussein who is armed by 18 American firms, and 18 British firms and 86 German firms. What kind of madness is it that we are encumbering our budget, we are underserving our own people—we have unmet needs in

the field of education, in the field of housing, of the homeless, in the field of health service, in the field of infrastructure, in the field of environment? We are spending \$500 million to \$1 billion a day if we get into a ground war, all of which could have been prohibited.

So, No. 1 on our postwar agenda must be a binding arms denial treaty involving all of the countries of the world, or the developed countries, making it absolutely a heinous crime against humanity to continue arming Third World tyrants.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], my colleague, for this opportunity to contribute to the debate which he has so nobly led.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], thank him very much for his major contribution to these proceedings, and at this time I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for yielding. I thank him for taking this special order and for his leadership on this issue. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] for his very eloquent remarks. I think he made a very good statement about what our goal should be and a good review of what brought us to where we are today, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the idea of those who advanced opposition to the escalation of the war. I do so for two reasons, an idealistic reason and a practical reason.

Idealistically, of course, I want to join with all of my colleagues in urging that we limit the amount of loss of life involved in this war. We think there is a better way to solve our problems than going to war, but we had that debate. The use of force prevailed. We are at war, and the best we can hope for now is that we minimize the loss of life on both sides.

But I have a practical reason, rather than just idealistic reason, for advocating that because I believe that it is in furtherance of one of the stated goals of the administration, of the President, in this conflict, and that is that we are there, among other things, for other reasons. Among them is securing and insuring the stability of the region.

I believe, as we approach the next phase of this war, if we wish to have as our goal insuring the stability of the region, we must act in furtherance of that goal. We can take our lead from the church which has advocated a policy of proportionality and discrimination. In that proportionality we mean that the gain must be worth the risk. We must not squander the courage of our fighting forces in the Persian Gulf by having them risk their lives out of

proportion to the gain hoped to be achieved, and discrimination says that we should not be indiscriminate in how we bomb Iraq and, indeed, Kuwait, that the collateral damage, the loss of civilian lives, is not in furtherance of our stated goal of insuring the stability of the region.

So, for practical reasons, as well as idealistic reasons, I believe that it is very important that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has taken this special order.

Another point I want to make about escalation is that I am very concerned, not only about the escalation of the war, but the escalation of our goals.

□ 1930

Originally our goal was to defend Saudi Arabia. We sent a defensive force there. Then that was escalated right after the election to an offensive goal to free Kuwait, and then to take out the weapons production. The ante kept getting higher and higher.

I was pleased to hear the Secretary of Defense say over and over again that as soon as Hussein was out of Kuwait the war would be over. However, I am concerned when I hear the President say that, well, there is that question of reparations and the restoration of the emir, and I am just very concerned about the escalation of the goals in this war.

The U.N. resolution addresses the issue of freeing Kuwait. It does not mention taking out nonconventional weapons production, but that was one of our goals. Perhaps a case could be made that if we were going to war with Iraq, it was necessary to do that. But that has been accomplished. It was accomplished even before the freeing of Kuwait.

I am concerned, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] pointed out and as other speakers have said this evening, that we simply have not kept ahead of the game in the course of world events. There are certain steps that were taken that brought us to this conflict which were predictable. That which is possible we have to be concerned about avoiding; that which is predictable we have to feel some sense of responsibility for avoiding. It was predictable when the arms race in the Third World escalated and the proliferation of nuclear and nonconventional weapons escalated, and none of us has clean hands in this. We and our allies sold the factors of production and the means to produce these weapons to Iraq. We have heard other speakers before this evening going on about Hussein's violations of the human rights of his own people and his naked aggression, as the President called it, in Kuwait. And I agree with him. But we could have avoided this, and I hope that in the future we will. I hope, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] mentioned, that as soon

as this is over we will call for some nuclear disarmament, some arms embargo, and take whatever steps are necessary so that we do not have to go to war for something that was predictable.

In addition to that, we can use an improvement in the diplomatic measures that were taken, and we must put a heavier focus on diplomacy in our foreign policy rather than deterrence and mobilization.

And sad to say, the President's budget came out on Monday and there was no formula in there for an energy policy which could have kept us out of war when we are so dependent on foreign oil. I still will never get over the fact that we are in Kuwait fighting and risking American lives to stabilize the price of oil so that the economies of our economic competitors can rely on a low cost of oil, and we are borrowing the money from those same economic competitors to do it. I am concerned that we have not received the money that the President has said we would receive from our allies. We talk about the \$30 billion and \$40 billion that will be coming in. The fact is that we are lucky if we have \$6 billion. When it comes to their economic participation, it is a question of "the check is in the mail."

I would like to make one suggestion to this body. It really is just in the form of a resolution that we are going to be presenting to the California Democratic Party State Convention, but I think that it captures some of the spirit that may be useful in this body as well. This is a proposed resolution for the convention, and it reads as follows:

Whereas the Gulf War has illustrated that durable peace will not come to the Middle East until the myriad conflicts in the region—including those between Iraq and Kuwait, Iraq and Saudi Arabia, Syria and Lebanon, the Arab States and Israel, and the Palestinians and Israel—are addressed.

Whereas the recent unprovoked Iraqi missile attacks on Israel's populations centers have demonstrated that the threat to Israel's security posed by the continued state of war by 21 Arab states is real and compelling;

Whereas in the aftermath of the Gulf War, it is imperative that efforts be undertaken to discourage the forces of extremism which serve to destabilize the region; and that efforts be undertaken to encourage and strengthen voices of moderation in the region who seek peaceful solutions and democratic forms of government;

Whereas the only successful, lasting peace treaty in the history of the region has been the 1979 Peace Treaty between Israel and Egypt, the Camp David Accords negotiated by President Carter, which came about as the result of party-to-party, bilateral talks between the two countries and saw Israel give-up the entire Sinai in exchange for peace;

Be it resolved that the United States government work toward direct party-to-party, bilateral talks to achieve peaceful resolutions to the Arab/Arab, Arab/Israeli, Palestinian/Israeli conflicts.

Be it further resolved that we encourage efforts aimed at social and political democratization in the Arab world.

Mr. Speaker, in the course of our debate on whether we should use force or not, I think the debate was marked by a genuine respect for the opinions of our colleagues on both sides of the issue. I had hoped that would serve as a model for our constituents across the country as they expressed their views on the issue, and for the most part, it has.

I am very pleased that in my district there is some division on the issue, and we have had some large demonstrations in the streets of San Francisco. They have been 99.44 percent peaceful demonstrations. There has been a little bit of hooliganism, but no one who was there advocating a peaceful resolution was there advocating it in a forceful way. Some on the periphery of the demonstrations may have had some publicity from their involvement, but for the most part, tens of thousands of people showed up week in and week out to say that they were pro-peace, that they supported the troops, and that they were anti-Hussein. Our opposition to the use of force in the gulf did not mean that we were not anti-Hussein.

I want to say that I really regret that as I was reading my resolution, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] was not in the room, but perhaps he is within the sound of my voice. I say that because I wanted him to hear me say that on behalf of my constituents, many of whom disagree on this issue, that I take offense at the remarks that he made earlier when he characterized people who were demonstrating in the streets as sympathetic to Hussein or anticapitalist. He does not know those people. He does not know how much they love America or how much they care about our country or how much they support the troops, how much they first and foremost would be against somebody like Hussein who violated the human rights of his own people, somebody like Hussein who marched into Kuwait and drew himself outside the circle of civilized human behavior, somebody like Hussein who would send missiles to kill innocent civilians in Israel. His activities are abhorrent. We all abhor them.

That has nothing to do with whether we agree on the method of dealing with him. It was agreed that he needed to be stopped. We were only discussing the means. I had hoped in the course of my closing remarks here that the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] would have returned to the Chamber so that he could have had an opportunity to respond to me, but since he has not, I will say that I believe that the gentleman from California—and I use the term in the strictest sense of the protocol of this House—owes an apology or an explanation to my constituents, because I think he has departed from the

decorum of this body by misrepresenting and mischaracterizing the motivations of patriotic, freedom-loving Americans who came to the streets to demonstrate, as our Constitution guarantees, their love of their country, their support of our troops, and their disagreement with the use of force.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for a very powerful and very thoughtful contribution to these proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, in the few remaining moments I have I would like to frame my remarks within the same context that my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] framed her remarks. She pointed out that we had the debate as to whether we should not give the President authority to use force in the context of our activities in the Persian Gulf. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct, we had the debate. In that debate some of us stood up and said that there is indeed an alternative to the use of force and war as a way of solving international disputes. There is a political solution, using diplomatic efforts, functioning within the context of peace, having the audacity to think beyond the violence and the pain and the agony that is the reality of war.

□ 1940

Some said in this particular situation that war in the Persian Gulf is not necessary. But we had the debate. Congress acted, and we are now at war with Iraq in the Persian Gulf. But I want to add parenthetically, to just focus for a moment, the fact that the vote was 250 voting in favor of providing the President with the opportunity to use force, and 183 Members voted no.

Some of the 183 Members, as I said, thought that peace was an appropriate approach. Some said that war was not necessary. Some said let sanctions work. There were a variety of opinions.

The difference between 250 and 183, I would say to the Speaker, is 67 votes, which means that if 34 Members of Congress had changed their vote from aye to nay, this discussion would be taking place in a very different context.

Now, I do not know about you or others, Madam Speaker, but I took the time to look into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to review the remarks of my colleagues in a debate that has been characterized as eloquent and high powered.

One will come to an interesting observation, that more than 34 Members of the House of Representatives in the context of that debate said in their remarks, "I am not voting to go to war. I am not voting for war. I am voting to stand with my President and/or I believe this is the last opportunity to seek peace."

This means on the one hand that they felt compelled to stand with the President on political grounds, to close ranks, as it were, and/or that they bought into the strategy of brinksmanship, which is a high-stakes gamble. That is, if you say get out by a date certain, and if they do not get out, you have lost the high-stakes gamble, and suddenly several hundred thousand troops are in harm's way, as we presently are.

We are at war. Earlier today a young man approached me and he said, "There were many of you who raised your voices in opposition to the use of force in the Persian Gulf, in opposition to the war. What do you do now?"

I said to the young man, become a vital and active part of the educative, adjudicative, educative process; to try to educate the American people in some humble desire to affect public opinions.

Most elected representatives would rather follow the consensus, because in the context of controversy it is risky to attempt to mold a consensus. But I believe that it is on the one hand a courageous act to attempt to mold a consensus in an atmosphere of controversy, and the highest responsibility of a public official is to actively engage in educating the American people.

That is what we are attempting to do in these series of special orders this evening, to get American people to focus on the implications of not only what we are doing, but what we are about to do.

Madam Speaker, most of us believe in our heart of hearts that we are within a few days, to perhaps a few weeks, from escalating this war to a much higher level of intensity, person to person, rifle to rifle, tank to tank. A major, major escalation.

Many of us in this body believe that the price that will be paid for that escalation will be absolutely mindboggling, staggering in dimension. Because escalation could possibly include the use of weapons of mass destruction, even nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, biological weapons, major activity resulting in catastrophic death.

There are many of us here who do not believe that that in any way, that we should not escalate in a massive fashion, to send thousands of young people in harm's way, when it is not absolutely necessary, staggering this gentleman's imagination. We, as public officials, have the responsibility to stand up and say America, pause for a moment. Consider what we are about to enter, this dark, incredible phase of an escalated war, that could send thousands of our young people to die in the Persian Gulf, to say nothing of the thousands of non-Americans that will also die, and probably have already died, in the Persian Gulf. We have no knowledge of that, because in one sense

we are looking at war as if it were a Nintendo game. We have not seen the stench, the pain, the bleeding, the dying, the broken bodies and spirits that are the reality of war.

War is ugly. War is gruesome. I was shocked today when I read an article in the newspaper where American psychologists are worrying about the children of this country, believing that many of them are becoming conditioned to think that we are bombing cardboard cities; that there is no pain, there is no death, there is no misery.

It frightens me to think about how we are potentially conditioning our young people for what all of us in these Chambers know is awesome and ugly, and that is the reality of war. And escalation is only going to multiply that by an enormous factor.

So when we say we should not escalate, we are not attempting here to be generals, to say do this kind of war as opposed to that kind of war. What we are saying is that we have looked into the future, to the best of our ability, not as generals, but as policymakers, and we are saying to ourselves and to the American people this is an awesome price, one that I do not think we really want to pay, particularly when it is not necessary.

People on the other side said sanctions alone will not work. Well, these are not sanctions alone any more. This is sanctions plus awesome destruction. Even our military has said we are 95 percent effective here. We have knocked out nuclear and chemical and biological productive capability. We have destroyed  $x$  percent of the economy. We have knocked out the infrastructure. We have cut off supply lines.

So sanctions are no longer sitting there alone. Sanctions now are coupled with massive destruction. Heaven only knows how many people have died. We call it collateral damage. When people die, we do not say killed in action, because that is gruesome. We call it KIA. We use ephemerisms for gore and pain, which is the reality of war.

We do not think that that is a price that has to be paid as policymakers. It is not necessary now. Why can we not pause and try to find a diplomatic way that precludes loss of life, incredible danger, and destruction to our environment, megabillions of dollars that will harm our priorities for years into the future, to say nothing of the terror that is potentially going to be unleashed around the world and even in this country. All of these things, instability in the region, are enormous prices that we are about to pay.

So there are some of us Members who said before we get out of here, we have a responsibility to try to focus in. This may not be the great effort that could stop the war, as many of us would like to believe, would like to hope that we could engage in. But this in one sense is almost a frustrating act on our part,

to say America, we are on the verge of great destruction, and we are on the verge of paying an enormous price that we do not necessarily have to pay.

Let us not escalate this war. Let us continue to find some political and diplomatic solution.

Madam Speaker, just one final comment, a comment that I made in an earlier set of remarks when the gentleman from New York had a special order.

I have been in the Congress for 20 years, 18 of those years on the Committee on Armed Services. I know of our enormous capacity to destroy, our highly technical capability to destroy.

What American people now have the opportunity to see is in the future, because we are looking on the verge of what war in the future will be like. And it is frightening and it is dangerous.

□ 1950

I do not think that we ought to become enamored of all of this high-tech capability. We ought to become frightened of it, because tomorrow we could face it unless we have the audacity now to assert our responsibility, to assume the leadership, to think beyond war as an instrument for solution.

What would it be like if we engaged an adversary that had the same technological capacity to destroy us as we have to destroy them? Suppose, Madam Speaker, we engaged an opponent that met us cruise missile for cruise missile, smart bomb for smart bomb, B-52 for B-52. Then where would we be? If we were not watching on television to see Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, and Baghdad, feeling the incredible pain of all of these incredible weapons, and it was our Nation—suppose the targets were Andrews Air Force Base—Madam Speaker, and someone casually said on some other television show that, well, that was a military target, collateral damage, and we know thousands of people live on that base. We know that thousands of people live nearby. What will war be like in the future?

Can we continue to wage war without paying an enormous price of the destruction of millions of human lives, devastation to our environment, total disruption to our economy and great impact upon our priorities? All of these things are real. I do not think we do.

I continue to raise my voice, Madam Speaker, as a voice of peace. We lost that battle several days ago, but we are now in a situation where we are on the verge of escalation, and we stand up once again to say let us pause. It is not just sanctions alone, even if you accept the other side's arguments now. They have joined several issues. This thing collapses from its own weight. Why not give it a chance? Why send troops in harm's way to pay this enormous price?

Madam Speaker, I thank you for your generosity and I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to speak. We are simply once again trying to raise the flag of alarm and concern, and my hope is that the powers that have the capacity to make the decision over the next several days that could potentially lead us to escalation, that wisdom will visit them, compassion will visit them, understanding will visit them, and we will back away from the brink of what I perceive to be awesome capability to destroy life.

#### ESCALATING THE WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

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

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Madam Speaker, first, let me compliment those Members who have joined this evening in attempting to convince those who have the power to make the decisions in this Nation that it is time to sit back and contemplate the consequences of the decisions that we are going to make in the next few days or few weeks. I want to compliment most especially my colleague who preceded me, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his articulateness, for his compassion, for his feeling for his fellow human beings, and for leading this discussion for peace, for humanity, and for the salvation of many lives.

Madam Speaker, for 3 weeks we in Congress have stood by as our brave young men and women have put their lives on the line in the Persian Gulf. We have watched CNN, we have read the newspaper reports, we have listened to the briefings.

We have seen the tone of the reports shift from unbridled enthusiasm to cautious optimism and concern.

We have seen encouraging reports of the air war. United States and coalition pilots have flown 47,000 sorties.

General Schwarzkopf has said that we now control the skies, that we have destroyed Iraq's chemical, biological, and nuclear production capabilities, that we have cut off almost all of the Iraqi Army supply lines.

By all accounts, we are winning the air war.

Why then, are we preparing for a brutal, bloody, and unmerciful ground war?

Make no mistake about it, I believe a ground war may take place within a matter of days.

I fear that to many people, this war seems bloodless.

We have been shielded from the death, destruction, and havoc raining across Iraq and Kuwait. But that will change with the ground war.

By the time we come back to Washington following our district work period, things may be very different. We

could see thousands of American casualties.

Remember, Saddam Hussein lost 1 million men and women in his 8-year war with Iraq. And he didn't flinch.

Remember, although we may have destroyed his chemical weapons production capabilities, Saddam Hussein still has 2,000 pounds of chemical agents in the field. And he is ready to use these on American and coalition soldiers.

Remember, Saddam Hussein has over 5,000 main battle tanks, including many Soviet T-72 tanks.

Remember, Saddam Hussein's Republican Guard appears to be virtually unharmed from the bombing.

By the time we reconvene, Americans may be returning in body bags by the hundreds. I don't want to see that happen. And I don't think the American people want to see that happen.

According to a poll by the Vietnam Veterans of America and Operation Real Security, public support for this war declines drastically when it means losing thousands of lives. In fact, both Pentagon and independent analysts estimate that a ground war could kill 30,000 to 40,000 Americans. And that doesn't even consider the deaths of our coalition partners and the Iraqis. I ask: Is this necessary?

Aren't there other options available to us?

The President seems to believe that there are no other options.

He has flatly ruled out diplomacy and communication.

I disagree. Don't we owe it to those men and women—our troops—in Saudi Arabia to try to prevent this ground war? Don't you believe that those 10 or 40 or 50 thousand young men and women deserve more? Deserve more time, more consideration, more flexibility?

I do. And I think the American people agree with me. According to a recent poll, almost two-thirds of the American people believe that diplomatic efforts should be made to get Iraq out of Kuwait.

□ 2000

Nearly four out of five Americans choose options other than a ground war.

What is wrong with exploring the diplomatic options? During the Vietnam war, negotiations continued while American bombs rained down on the Vietnamese countryside.

Diplomacy can and should begin immediately. We support our troops. We support our troops wholeheartedly. We stand by them and pray for their safe arrival home. An escalation into a ground war will not achieve that end, and it could be a catastrophe.

I also do not believe we can start a ground war when American objectives have still not been clearly defined.

Is our objective to force Iraq to completely withdraw from Kuwait?

Is our objective, as was discussed in the joint statement released last week by Secretary Baker and the Soviet Foreign Minister, an Iraqi commitment to withdraw from Kuwait?

Is our objective the total destruction of Iraq?

Or is our objective the removal of Saddam Hussein?

What will happen when our soldiers reach the Iraqi/Kuwaiti border? Will they stand in defensive positions? Or will they continue on to Baghdad?

These questions must be answered. Our strategy and our goals must be defined.

The lives of our soldiers are too important to risk with such undefined goals. I hope and I pray that our soldiers are not forced to fight and suffer the consequences and the casualties of an unnecessary ground war.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier, and I would like to just take a few minutes to complete certain points that I was attempting to make that were not finished.

Before I do that, I do not want to repeat that we are here because we think that the escalation of the violence is another giant step into the abyss. To move from the present state of military action which involves mostly air power into a ground war is an escalation which will risk many more lives than are at risk at this point, and that is the essential question in this war. Do we have to expend thousands of human lives to accomplish the objective we want to accomplish? That is the essential question.

The question of morality: Is it moral to ever expend human lives except for the highest purpose? Our cause is just. I agree that Saddam Hussein is a maniac. I agree that Saddam Hussein is the real cause of the war. He started it. We led him to believe that he could do it, but, nevertheless, Saddam Hussein started the war. Saddam Hussein has the wrong objectives. I think Saddam Hussein is in love with the idea of martyrdom and suicide, and Saddam Hussein has to be stopped.

I agree that no nation should be allowed to use its military might unchecked against a smaller nation. I agree that the new world order, if it is going to contain a guarantee that large nations, superpowers, are no longer going to be allowed to attack smaller nations without some action being taken by the rest of the civilized world, it is an important step forward. I agree with these objectives. They are good objectives.

My problem is that these objectives and all the other articulated objectives, worthwhile objectives, could be realized without the resort to violence on a massive scale. Massive killing is unnecessary. Massive commitment of the lives of young men and women who are dedicated, who are loyal, who are ready to do their duty is unnecessary.

The fact that sanctions were in force in an unprecedented manner, that all of the nations of the world had come together and decided to cut off Iraq's one cash crop, the oil crop, the one way that they were able to build their empire, military empire, the fact that the infrastructure of Iraq does not produce very much on its own; it buys most of its parts and most of its raw materials from the outside, the fact that Iraq has had to buy most of its technical know-how from the Western countries including our own, all of these facts combined led me to conclude, and many others, that a continuation of sanctions would have accomplished the purposes that we wanted to accomplish.

We did not continue the sanctions. We have started an air war. By our own facts, if we accept our own facts, produced by our own leaders, it is a highly successful war. We are succeeding. If we are succeeding, if we have destroyed the capacity of the enemy to make war to a great degree, if we have destroyed the communications network, if we have destroyed most of the bridges in Iraq, if we have destroyed their capacity to make additional biological weapons or chemical weapons, if we have proceeded in a manner in which this enemy is on the verge of collapse, then why not wait a little longer before we move to another level and risk large numbers of lives unnecessarily? Why not have more reverence for human life?

I said before that one of my concerns with this war, not my primary concern, and my primary concern is that this is a war for a just cause, but it is a war which involves unnecessary risk of human lives, unnecessary killing, killing of the so-called enemy, unnecessary killing of our own troops, unnecessary risking of our own lives, and that is the primary cost. The objective could be achieved without going to the military option. The objective could be achieved without massive terror, massive violence. My primary concern is that.

But ancillary concerns are very important also. The fact that on the front lines in the Middle East, an overwhelming number of the soldiers there are men and women who are of African-American descent. At least 30 percent are of African-American descent in a situation where African Americans comprise only about 12 percent of the total population. The fact that they are there is of great concern.

There are people who argue that they are there because they volunteered. This a Volunteer Army, and that they

have no cause for complaint. As I said before, it is very important that we understand that those people who are there are there because they had no options.

If we had a situation where, in their decisionmaking process, they had options, that they could go to college and would have their college education financed without having to go to a military academy, without having to join the ROTC, then the officers who are there in large numbers who are African-American would have no complaint. They have no complaints. I am concerned about the overwhelming preponderance and the large percentage who are African-Americans. My constituency are concerned. Mothers and fathers who encouraged their youngsters to go into the armed services are concerned about having urged their youngsters to make that decision, and now they are in danger of losing their lives in this war, mothers and fathers who have said to their young people:

The only way you can go to college and the only way you are going to be able to achieve your goals in life is to take advantage of this set of benefits that are offered by the military.

They are quite concerned.

You know, if they had been given an option, then we would have no complaint. But they have no option. They have no option, because they could not say:

If I do not go the military route, I will have my college education paid for. I will have my tuition paid. I will have my books paid for.

The benefits that are offered by the ROTC are quite considerable. The benefits that are offered certainly by the military academies are considerable.

We do not have an option, a peace service corps, patriots-for-peace service, as an alternative to the military. We do not offer full tuition, books paid, stipends, summer jobs. We do not offer all of that to people who are going to study for some kind of occupation which might be very much important for the national security or important in the improvement of our Government or important in the improvement of our society as a whole. Just teachers we need in large numbers. We do not offer those kinds of alternatives and those kinds of opportunities. If those opportunities were offered, then we could say that they had a true choice.

□ 2010

These are people that understand no choice. The rampant discrimination and prejudice in private industry closed the door to many of them, and we had a situation where just this past session we had a civil rights bill which was seeking to correct some of the discrimination and the effects of prejudice on our work force, shutting out young people from opportunities. That was vetoed by the President. The President

vetoed and said it looked too much like a quota bill.

Quotas can work two ways. We have a very sick kind of quota in motion when 30 percent or more of the soldiers on the front line in the Middle East are African-American while those same people are only 12 percent of our population. If we are worried about quotas and balancing things out, we should have a balance out there. We should have a balance in terms of classes. We should have a balance in terms of college graduates. If we are always worried about balance, here is an opportunity to execute that. The fact that they have no opportunity is a fact that stands out and should be corrected. We should make certain that in the future the poor and the minorities always have a choice.

Next week, as soon as we return from recess, I intend to introduce legislation which will provide a choice for young people who want to serve their government. I want to introduce legislation which I called Patriots of Peace Service, where the same kinds of opportunities offered by the ROTC's and the military academies will be offered to young people who want to go to work in some area that the Government may select in the future. I would like to parallel what happens with the training of young officers, the training of our military leadership follows a certain course. The training of our military leadership is the best that we can offer. We give them stipends. We give them paid tuition. We give them summer employment. We do everything possible. I would like to see an equal number of civilians trained who would later do exactly what the military leadership are required to do, serve somewhere in accordance with the Government assignment for 5 years, or 7 years, or whatever is required of the West Point graduate, should be required of a young person who wants to serve his government or serve his society in some military option. However, they should have the opportunity to choose. They should choose on an equal basis. The same benefits should be offered, and the same requirements, the same obligations should be there. Then we could say that we have a volunteer army that is made up of people who did truly have choices, and they are there because they wanted to be there and made that choice.

The other point that I would like to make is that the cost of this war will go on and on for years after it is over. The costs of this war are great indeed. We want to be a first-class nation. The United States wants to continue to lead the world as a super power in every sense. The President has even articulated certain goals for education by the year 2000 which will prepare the United States to provide that kind of leadership. I am all in favor of a Nation that wants to be first in math and

science by the year 2000. I am also all in favor of a Nation that wants to have a 90 percent graduate rate by the year 2000. I am all in favor of going forward to provide leadership in the area of commercial development, industrial development. We can compete. We can continue to be a great Nation.

The future of the Nation really lies in the ability of the Nation to educate its people. An educated populace is the key to future world greatness. Nations will be measured by their ability to commit brain power to various kinds of tasks in the future. This will not happen if we are digging deeper and deeper into the morass we face in this war. The costs will be so great until there will be no funds, and no resources left to deal with education. There will be no funds or resources to deal with the numerous problems we have of joblessness and homelessness, et cetera.

Let me give Members an example of what some of these costs look like in credit terms. I will take just a few minutes and conclude. The cost of the war to the taxpayer of the United States will far exceed the conservative estimates that have been made. Even the conservative estimates are high. The President's own figure is \$30 billion. \$30 billion will be the cost of this war to this Nation; and that \$30 billion is equal to the total amount that the President has requested for education in the budget this year. He has arrived at \$30 billion because they expect other Nations to pay some part of the costs, but to this Nation the most conservative estimate is the President's estimate. It will only cost \$30 billion this budget year. In this budget, the President only budgeted the same amount, \$30 billion, for Federal aid to education. That is higher education. That is Head Start. That is Chapter 1. Every aspect of education aided by the Federal Government, when we add them all together, it is \$30 billion. That same \$30 billion is 2.5 times the budget for the Children's Health Care in Medicaid. It is more than 1.5 times the entire budget for all of our child nutrition programs. The President has been held in his increases in the WIC program, Women, Infants and Children's Program, and in the Head Start Programs. He has been boasting about the fact he has given increases, but the so-called increases are actually a mere \$200 million for the Women, Infants and Children Program, the WIC program, and \$400 million for Head Start. Very small amounts.

If we put it another way, what we could buy in terms of programs and services for the American people, if we want to use this \$30 billion estimate of the President here at home, if we want to take that \$30 billion, we could use it to fully fund all of the chapter 1 eligible children. There are 8.5 million children who are eligible for chapter 1 remedial education programs in the

schools. If we funded it and covered all of the eligible children, it would cost the United States \$2.3 billion. Only \$2.3 billion. At this point, we are covering less than 30 percent of the children who are eligible for chapter 1 programs. If we fully fund the Education of the Handicapped Act, and that is, we require that States and localities pay part of that cost, we are supposed to pay 40 percent of the costs for all the eligible children under the Education of the Handicapped Act, it would only cost the United States \$6.5 billion to fully cover every eligible child. If we fully funded Head Start, and Head Start if it were fully funded would serve 2.8 million, that is the number who are eligible. At this point, after more than 25 years of Head Start, we are serving less than 30 percent of the eligible children. But that would cost the United States \$6.3 billion if we fully funded it. If we fully funded the Pell grants for a maximum of \$2,900 for every high school graduate who qualified, that would be \$6 billion. If we fully funded health care, extended Medicaid coverage, to all persons who are below the poverty line, that is about 11 million persons, a full funding would cost the United States \$9 billion. If we extended Medicaid coverage to all pregnant woman and children under 8, with incomes less than 200 percent of poverty, it would cost \$1 billion. If we provided WIC, nutrition, supplements, Women, Infant and Children Program supplements to all the pregnant women, infants, and children who are eligible, it would cost the United States \$1.9 billion. If we fully funded the senior citizens SSI benefits so that no senior citizen has less than a poverty level income, the current benefits are about 77 percent of poverty, then that would cost the United States \$2.5 billion. We could do all of those things if we did not squander this \$30 billion on an unnecessary war.

The morality of the issue expands on and on, millions of hungry children in this Nation and millions of hungry children across the world, the needs that are not being met by people who deserve to have a better life and could have a better life if we had less war. All of those things are part of the morality of this decisionmaking. So we are here for one plea before the escalation begins. While Congress is on recess, most Members anticipate there will be an escalation of war. It will go into a ground war and cost millions of more dollars, but more important than dollars will be the cost of thousands of lives. We are here to make that plea for human life, human life that is sacred. We are here to provide moral leadership, moral leadership that is much needed at this point. We do not want to wait until we start counting the body bags. We do not want to wait until people wake up and the grief has touched them in an individual way.

□ 2020

Our job is to provide leadership, and our leadership tells us that now is the point to pause. Now is the point to consider the high cost of what we are doing and now is the point to slow down. Instead of escalating to a ground war, we should pause and thoroughly look at what we have accomplished so far and where we are going.

Our cause is just, but the question is, when all the dying is ended what kind of agreement will be reached? What kind of settlement is going to be reached? Could we not reach that agreement and that settlement right now at this point? Could we not stabilize the Middle East, guarantee the security of Israel, liberate Kuwait and all of the stated articulated objectives for this action, could they not be achieved without massive killing? I think they can be, and I join my colleagues to urge that we do not escalate this war any further. Do not go to a ground war. Let us stop at this point.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I rise to reiterate the position stated so eloquently by my colleagues who have joined in this debate over the last 3½ hours; namely, that we, No. 1 and most importantly, support our men and women, our troops who are in the Persian Gulf. We support them to the extent that we want to limit the number of casualties, the number of wounded, the number of maimed, the number of killed in that area.

We all realize that we do have strategic objectives for the security of this Nation. Some of us may differ as to what those objectives may be.

Our President has not clearly defined some of those objectives, so many in this Nation are puzzled as to what we are trying to accomplish; but whatever our objectives and whatever our differences may be, we are united in one objective, and that is to save as many American lives, to save as many American casualties, to save as many lives and casualties among other peoples of the world as we possibly can. That is our plea this evening. That is the plea of the group who came before us this evening to say to the administration, to say to the American people that we support our troops. We support our troops to the extent that we do not want to escalate this war. We do not want to escalate this war into a war which will cause the deaths of literally tens of thousands of American soldiers.

I thank and I compliment my colleagues for what they have done this evening, the courage that they have shown in expressing their beliefs, the courage they have shown in letting the administration and the people of this nation know where they stand on this so very vital issue.

And most importantly, I want to compliment a person who is articulate beyond any person's expectations in this body, a person who is sincere, a person who is emotional to the point almost of tears when he talks about wanting to save the lives of people throughout the world, the leader of this coalition, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. It is a privilege and an honor to serve with him. I believe that he will be shown to be a person who is talking for the future of the world and the future of civilization when he says that the legacy that we must leave our children and our children's children is a world where disputes between nations and among nations no longer must be settled by mass murder, by suffering, by killing, but a future where disputes between nations can be settled by reasonable people sitting, talking and coming to peaceful solutions. I salute the gentleman from California.

#### THE COSTS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being here this evening so that we who feel so keenly that now is not the time for this altercation in the Persian Gulf to be expanded into a ground war, and I would like to speak on this issue now.

There are some costs of this war that I believe ought to be considered in addition to the normal ones. There is the cost of the war, and we do not know what that is going to be yet. We hope that through burdensharing that our allies are going to pick up more of those costs so that our taxpayers, our citizens, will not be burdened with that in addition to the loss of life.

In our investments that this country makes for our future, there are some costs that are being paid for the military buildup that has taken place in recent years. We are all proud of what the Patriot and the Tomahawk missiles have been able to demonstrate in the way of technology, but since America began developing that stunningly effective ultra-high technology, America's hold on the global consumer electronics production has shrunk from 70 percent to just 5 percent of world markets, and that is our future.

I am afraid that we may see that we lost our focus and that we at this time are expending and are not investing in our future ability to be able to compete in the global markets at the same time that our allies in this war are not having to put up the kind of resources and personnel that we are and that they, Mr. Speaker, are beating us in the global marketplace.

There is another aspect of this that as we engage in a shooting war with

Iraq, it is time for this House and this country to stand united behind our troops and to stand united in our determination to show them our respect, our gratitude, and our love, because what they are doing without question for the most part, what they are doing for this country goes far beyond what most of us in our lifetimes will be called upon to give or to serve. In standing behind our troops, I believe we have a responsibility to do everything in our power to minimize the casualties in this tragic war.

Recently I joined many of my colleagues in asking that President Bush exhaust every option for peace before turning to war, and I join many of my colleagues tonight in expressing deep concerns about thrusting our troops into what could become a drawn-out ground war.

A few months ago when Congress left town to face the 1990 elections, our defensive posture against Saddam Hussein suddenly became an offensive posture. As Congress prepares to leave town now to go back and talk to our constituents in our home districts, I would hope we do not return to find that an air campaign has turned into a costly ground campaign.

Surely before we thrust the men and women of this country into a ground offensive, we have got to question the ends that would be achieved by these costly means.

The commander of our allied forces has stood before the American people and declared that we have established air superiority over Iraq.

□ 2030

We have destroyed Iraq's nuclear, biological, and chemical making capability. We have cut into the very heart of Iraq's military might. So is there any need to rush into a ground war that could end thousands of young American lives?

If we are truly committed to forming a new world order, I believe we have got to set an example by resolving conflicts through peaceful means, not violent means.

I would like to describe, Mr. Speaker, what took place about a week ago in a school in Los Angeles, a very special school.

A lot of individual attention is given to the students, and they do a lot of thinking about topics way beyond what we generally think children are considering.

These students, I believe ages 10 to about 14, took on a mock debate, taking the side of Saddam Hussein and the side of our President. They compared what was going on in the Persian Gulf with life as they saw it in ghetto streets and gang wars.

One of them, a 13-year-old, Muhammed Lugman, said, "I think Saddam Hussein is like one of the gangs. He wants more territory. He

wants more land." But the students said, "Bush is like another gang, he wants to keep his territory."

These students, five on each side, debated back and forth, and they finally concluded, and one 13-year-old said, "Do you want a man like Saddam Hussein with nuclear power?" he asked sarcastically. "He is crazy, we should stop him, or he will become another Hitler."

Later the teacher called up some unrehearsed roleplaying, and called upon one set of youngsters to play Hussein, Bush, and their cabinet members, and another set to play the Bloods and Cripps.

The Hussein/Bush encounter ended with Bush stalking away, vowing to wage war. The Bloods/Cripps exchange quickly deteriorated into a mock fistfight.

A 14-year-old said, "I have got a lot of gang-banger friends," he explained afterward, "and with them there is rarely negotiation over disputed territory. It is all or nothing."

Another student volunteered that gang members "already got their minds set on fighting."

The teacher then asked how many students thought the same was true of Hussein and Bush? And every hand in the classroom went up.

Mr. Speaker, what are our children learning from the example and the actions of the adults, their role models, in 1991? This war is particularly hard on children. Children are learning more about war than they have probably ever learned at any other time in history, because television so immediately brings it into their consciousness.

Children are faced with the dilemma, either to see what is going on on television and to respond with fear—how could they but not be terrified by what is going on and watching and asking, "Are children being killed in this war?"

The damage, the long-term damage to those young psyches we have no way of knowing at this point, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the alternative that may happen, as a protection, we humans shut out pain and we may have many of these children viewing war truly as merely a television game and protecting themselves from the pain and the blood and the horror that war really entails.

We face in this war, for the first time, and if we have a ground war it may come to pass, that children could lose both parents because we have small children with both parents in the Persian Gulf.

I read recently that a nursing mother has been told to report for duty. Her husband is already in the Persian Gulf, and yet this nursing mother is being required to take that infant from her breast and go to war.

What is going to happen to these children, these infants and toddlers separated from their parents during the period in their lives where the formation of human relationships and the need to bond with a parent is the strongest?

What this war is doing to our children we have no way of knowing. If we were truly committed to a new world order, we need to remember the words of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, who said, "Violence never brings permanent peace. It solves no social problems. It merely creates new and more complicated ones."

And as we adults, as we in the country make the decisions that our children are seeing as an example, we have to ask ourselves what, Mr. Speaker, are we teaching them about how the human species solves our differences with each other?

Now, ultimately there is no question, ultimately we will win this war. But if we win it solely, Mr. Speaker, on a military level without working on the diplomatic level, we may lose it on a political level.

Ultimately we have to recognize that international peace coalitions and not quick-draw diplomacy hold the key to ending long-held hostilities and insuring the long-term postwar stability in the Middle East.

I am also concerned that as we play world rent-a-cop and exert our military strength, we are undercutting our real strength.

Ironically, as we win military battles, we seem to be losing those economic and trade battles with many of our allies whom we are defending.

Military strength in the Persian Gulf may be coming at the expense of our internal strength at home, our families, our communities, and the relationship to the health of our economy. No matter how many allied contributions we receive, we will have no money to win the wars of affordable housing for young families, affordable and available health care for our people, adequate education. All of these are benefits that many of our allies whose men and women are not in the Persian Gulf at this time are providing to their people.

□ 2040

When we see the real horror of war, we also must recognize, and again I want to repeat, how it is affecting our children, and many of our adults also see this more as a Nintendo computer game, and they do become desensitized and dehumanized by the shooting and killing.

Mr. Speaker, if we get into a ground war, the horror of war will only be beginning, and that is why our troops must be first in our hearts tonight, and that means giving our troops everything we can possibly give them, both during and after the fighting.

It does not mean cutting vocational rehabilitation funding and housing assistance of veterans of previous wars. It does not mean trying to cut back and skimp on the commitments that we made to veterans of other wars. And it does not mean remaining silent while a few military leaders decide to charge into a ground offensive.

Mr. Speaker, it does not mean stifling peaceful protest on the merits of this war while we endorse the prodemocracy protests in Germany, in Poland, and Lithuania and China.

The best thing we can do is educate the public on one thing. We, who have disagreed with the policies that brought us to the shooting that is now going on, who disagree with the policies that may take us in the next week or two into a ground war, those of us who have disagreed with that policy, we are supporting the troops when we speak out, not undercutting them. We are not speaking for any appeasement of Saddam Hussein. We are standing with our troops and urging the policies that will end the war as humanely as possible with the loss of as few lives as possible, that that policy, that strategy, be pursued, now.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. UNSOELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for yielding. First, I simply want to compliment my distinguished colleague for a very powerful and very thoughtful statement.

Mrs. UNSOELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. And I say to my colleague that it is a privilege to serve with the gentlewoman for many, many reasons, including the fact that the gentlewoman in the brief time that she served in the Congress has consistently raised her voice in the name of peace, and she has done so tonight in a very eloquent and powerful way at a very sensitive and potent moment in the history of the evolution of life in this country and in the world.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] would further yield, I would like to say to the gentlewoman and to my colleagues that I have often said on a number of occasions that what makes the political process what keeps the political process, honest, is not when we are all walking in lockstep. But what keeps the political process honest is when there are competing ideas and competing analyses that stimulate and prick the conscience of our people, that attempt to mold and shape public opinion so that the decisions that we make are in the best interests of our people in this country and in the world. Mr. Speaker, we simply have sought to do that today, to say to America that

there are other voices out there who at this moment have the audacity to offer competing ideas, to offer different analyses, in the hopes that we can rally public opinion.

As I said before, Martin Luther King said once that there are two kinds of leaders, one that waits until the consensus is formed and then runs valiantly to the front of that gathering to articulate the consensus, and then there is another kind of leader that has the audacity to attempt to step forward in a moment of controversy to attempt to shape and form a new and different consensus. Tonight we have tried to do that. We have raised our voices in the name of peace. We did that on January 11 and 12. Many of us fought to return this country to a constitutional form of government.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress acted. It made a decision. We are now in the throes of war. But we continue to raise our voice, collective voices, to offer different ideas and a different analysis. We continue to say that escalation is not necessary, that we should not go forward. Let us now pause, and even against the backdrop of our opposition analyses, it does not make sense to go forward now. Let us pause. Let us say to our children and our children's children that at this moment we were willing to stand up and suffer whatever the consequences to try to get our people to focus on a different idea: peace, a different idea: political solution, a different idea: diplomatic efforts, a different idea: move away from force and violence as a way of solving human problems.

Mr. Speaker, if we do that, we have served not only ourselves and our constituents, we have served our Nation and our country as well.

I thank the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for her generosity.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. I would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from California for his leadership, and although this Member may be older in years, I have taken leadership from this gentleman for some time, and I believe he has come to this body to try to direct this country's policy in how we interact with other nations, how we deal with our own people.

Mr. Speaker, my path to here has come out of the similar experience, but it took a lot longer. The war that influenced the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] so much had a very strong effect on one of my children. We had been overseas for 5 years in a small country, in Nepal, with the Peace Corps and AID. No television. My children learned what it was to be part of a world community, to be an American in another country, a country that had so few advantages.

Mr. Speaker, when we came back to the United States, the Vietnam war was going on, and for a period of time I, as a mother and someone who had been very active in the international community there, felt that I did not know what was real, I did not know how to translate my feelings, but it was even more so for our 16-year-old, an idealistic age, had never been exposed to television, and suddenly here were the starving children of Biafra that Thanksgiving thrust into the living room on television and the war that was going on.

Over the dinner table we had many, many talks, my husband, and I and our children, and this 16-year-old was struggling to translate that anger, that pain, into something constructive, and we could not come up, as parents, with a suggestion for him of how to change things. In fact, we suggested that some of his ideas probably were not a good idea.

Then he turned to us, his parents, one night and said, "Well, Mom and Dad, what are you going to do about it?" What are we, as parents, going to do about it?

I ask my colleagues, "What do you do as a parent when you're given that ultimate challenge?"

That was the first determination we had as parents to become politically involved, and now I feel an obligation as a parent and as a Member of this House to speak out so that those other young people out in the world who are seeing for the first time the humanity that man, the human species, can wreak upon itself, can find that there are others who believe there is a better way to solve our differences. And now, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] said, now is the time to pause and search for those other ways while we recognize that the men and women who are there we are fully, fully supportive of and wanting them to feel our love and our high regard for them.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for sharing that.

□ 2050

#### HISTORICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE WAR IN THE PERSIAN GULF

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

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, before we leave for this next week, I think it is appropriate that we make a couple of observations as to where our Nation stands and what is happening at the moment. We heard a great deal of discussion some weeks ago about the sanctions and how we ought to let the sanctions work. It is not inappropriate that we now take a stand and make a

check on it as to how the sanctions would have worked.

We see that some 40,000 sorties have been flown over Iraq. We have seen that the command and communications have been virtually destroyed. We have seen that the water system has been virtually destroyed. We have seen that the electrical system has been virtually destroyed. We can go on and on with the success of taking out the bridges and the railroads, as well as the enemy's supplies and all the armaments that the Soviets had supplied to Iraq. Now, what is the observation as to the reaction from Saddam Hussein? He has not moved an inch.

Saddam Hussein has not moved an inch. I am sure that concerns some of the people that said by merely twiddling our thumbs and sending nice letters to Mr. Saddam Hussein, he would voluntarily, along about September or maybe October or maybe this summer, just suddenly wake up one morning and voluntarily extract himself from Kuwait. We see that even the heavy bombardment of the allied nations, the 26 nations, using all the air power they have and all their high technology, has not moved him.

It is absurd and it is really stretching the capacity of one's generosity to believe that sanctions would have worked. Being a liberal means never having to say you are sorry, so I doubt that those who had advocated somehow or other sanctions would have moved him would apologize. They are not going to apologize, yet it is only fair that we make a record of it.

No. 2, I have had the opportunity to go to Dachau and I have gone to Auschwitz. I have seen the prison camps of the 1930's under Nazism, and the question that rings through all those places is this: How could this have happened? Who would have let this go on? What happened to people's values? What were they doing when people were being murdered in such mass numbers and being gassed and when young children and we should close our eyes and our ears and pretend like it is the 1930's. If we could sit by and watch them murder millions during Nazism, then certainly we ought to be able to do the same thing in Kuwait.

So they stand up here and say, "Look at me. I want to go on record, and I want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to show 20 or 30 years from now that I was one of them that wanted to sit by and do nothing when we saw Iraq doing everything to murder and destroy the independent people of Kuwait."

Mr. Speaker, I do not want that on my conscience, and I want to make it abundantly clear that I think the moral high ground, I think the issue of saving lives, I think moral leadership, I think all the terminology we have heard over the last few minutes applies to those who are willing to risk their lives for independence and for the free-

dom of and talented old people and parents and all the rest were murdered in the gas chambers of Nazism?

Well, very simply, it is easy to find out what was going on, because we can just listen to the chant that is going on about what has been happening in Kuwait. As the occupation army came in from Iraq, they bayoneted pregnant women and murdered children in the presence of their parents and raped women repeatedly in the streets and then murdered their limp bodies and took anything of value, went into hospitals and threw the babies in the corner and stole the incubators. The list goes on and on of the atrocities that have taken place. Yet we can still hear people say that we should not be involved, that we do not want to touch that. They say that American lives should not be placed at stake to help others, that what we should do is ignore it, that we are an independent nation.

The Scriptures tell us that "greater love hath no man than that he lay down his life for his friend." What America and what Britain is doing—and they are certainly the bulk of it—along with the other 26 nations combined, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] said at the beginning, typifies democracy's finest hour.

It has always been said that the tyrant is 2 years ahead of democracies. In fact, there was an article this week from Strobe Talbot, and it states the fact that the tyrant always has the advantage, but he concludes with the sentence that "this is a war that had to be fought and it must be won."

It is absolutely essential that regardless of how low people's values have sunk and how easy it is for people to ignore what is going on, America does not feel that way, that in time of crisis in 1991 America not only participated but America led. Saddam Hussein placed all he had at risk. He bet all that he had that George Bush was a Neville Chamberlain, and that when faced with the issue, he would opt for temporary peace, that he would let the rape and the pillage go on, just as we allowed Hitler to take Czechoslovakia and take Austria. He bet all that he had that George Bush and the United States would allow him to keep Kuwait if he promised not to go on into Saudi Arabia. But he was wrong because George Bush is not Neville Chamberlain. George Bush is another Winston Churchill that sees the ultimate consequences of what happens when you refuse tyranny at its first instance.

Every person who has gone to Iraq or Baghdad or met with Saddam Hussein has come back with the same answer. I do not care if they are a Muslim leader, I do not care if they are a Communist leader, I do not care if they are an Arab leader, I do not care if they are the foreign ministers of all the Common Market nations, I do not care if they are

the General Secretary of the United Nations, they all come back with one response, that Saddam Hussein tells them, "I don't care what you all think, I know America. I saw America in Vietnam, and I know that America will not stand for its values, that America will collapse, that when the going gets tough, America will stand for nothing, and I'll be the hero and I will have turned her down because America is what I saw in the late 1960's and the early 1970's. America is weak."

Weakness invites aggression. History is full of it. The textbooks are replete with examples. On April 5, 1975, this Congress voted to abandon the 1973 peace accords, to throw them aside and say, "I don't care that we have won independence for South Vietnam, and I don't care if we have won independence for Thailand and for Laos and Cambodia." The Watergate class of 1974 said, "We are going to go back to the 1973 accords, we are going to throw them out the window, and we are going to turn it over to communism and you can have the killing fields of Cambodia. You can murder at will." And they murdered anyone who could read or write, anyone who wore glasses, anyone who had the audacity to be able to read a textbook. They were all murdered at will, and that had become the legacy.

Had the 1973 accords been left as they were in place, South Vietnam would be just as prosperous as South Korea is today. But they chose to abandon that, and so subsequently an entire generation of leadership looks at America through Vietnam, and that has invited the situation that we see here.

This is not my conclusion, it is not my idea, it is not my observation. It is the statement of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein is writing a new textbook for America, and 3 years from now and 15 years from now, when anyone thinks about running over another independent nation, now with the new world order of democracy being supreme, not our fellow travelers and friends of communism and socialism, as in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Bloc nations, now that that is collapsing and what is taking place is a new world order of democracy and free markets are triumphing, from now on when they think of running over a neighbor with their tanks and their bullets and murdering and stealing and pillaging, they are going to remember Iraq and they are going to remember the United States of America standing firm with our allies and saying that we are not going to permit it to happen. Then we can have peace, and then we can look forward to a future of stability as opposed to inviting aggression.

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

Mr. MCEWEN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, and I were sitting here exchanging observations about the whole course of the last few months of this debate, and we were listening respectfully to some of our colleagues expressing all sorts of givens and viewpoints about the horrors of war. Let me ask the gentleman a series of questions to kind of share with people who track by technical means and electronic means the proceedings on this House floor. But let me say by way of footnote that I am circulating a petition to have all Members sign—and I have not had a no yet—that the camera coverage of the House of Representatives should be the same from gavel to gavel.

□ 2100

In other words, when you are down there speaking alone, you have to address everything through the Speaker, or whoever is the Speaker pro tem in the Chair. But when two Members have a dialog, such as we are having, we can ask one another questions, refer directly to one another, or outside people.

I think we should have more of these dialogs, rather than monolog special orders.

But it is my understanding 1 million people will be watching C-SPAN at any given time. Yet, I think a mean-spirited ruling, put in two Speakers ago, before Jim Wright, spans this empty chamber.

Mr. MCEWEN. It is a ruling by the majority party. It is a ruling by the Democrat Party. It is not a ruling by the House. I am on the Rules Committee and I looked into it specifically. I have spoken with the Speaker about it. I have asked that it go back.

The fact is, it is an effort to diminish what you and I are trying to accomplish here. No if's, and's, or but's about it. They will tell you why they decided to do it and why they are doing it now.

It would be just as if I were the floor manager for the CBS Evening News with Dan Rather, and every time he would start to say something I was not interested in, I would switch to a camera in which you saw the curtains and the backs of the cameras and you saw the people walking around. Then when you switched back, you could see him so you could follow the story. Then if you wanted to diminish what was being said, you would start panning around inconsequential things.

It is very unfortunate. It is not the topic that we have here, but you raise an excellent point. It is a Democrat Party leadership rule, that that is the way the cameras are being used as a method of humiliation.

Mr. DORNAN of California. The reason I brought it up is to say you, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], and me, BOB DORNAN of California, from getting a few calls and mail, it

happens every time I participate in a special order, "What Mr. MCEWEN was saying was so significant, Congressman DORNAN. It is a shame that none of your colleagues were there to listen to him and I just happened to tune in."

If these people know there is 1 million people listening, they would not feel so uncomfortable when the cameras pan an empty chamber.

The chamber is mostly empty in the morning when we do 1-minute, but the rules then are you focus in on the speakers.

During most debate, particularly in the early part of the year until we get down to real tensions and passions at the end of the year, there are only eight or nine Members on the House floor when we are doing legislative business, or suspensions, as we have been doing the last couple of weeks.

The camera does not pan then.

The ruling should be similar coverage. Either pan all the time to show how many Members are here, and then we have to explain Members are listening at their TVs back in their offices, which most are; or, do not pan during special orders. Similar television coverage from gavel to gavel.

Now, here are the questions I wanted to ask you, and hopefully 1 million people are listening.

Would you have thought, with all the friendships we have on both sides of the aisle, of every ideology and belief, that some Members would have come to the floor and said during the last week or two, since the Scuds have killed women and children, brought about heart attacks, since wildlife is dying in that whole small basin called the Persian Gulf, since we have seen POWs brutally tortured, and he said some have been killed and wounded by his staking them out as human shields, wouldn't you think that some liberal in this chamber, they are in the majority, would have come to the well and said, "You know, I guess maybe I was wrong. If this guy won't submit to reason and logic and save thousands of lives of his own people, under heavy strategic, pinpoint, high-tech bombing, then how would sanctions have ever worked?"

What is your observation on that?

Mr. MCEWEN. My observation is that being a liberal means never having to say you are sorry. You can be wrong time after time.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts held up funding for the Patriot missile for 3 years. You and I have not the capacity to fashion an explanation as to why we should not shoot down a missile coming at our soldiers. You and I are incapable of doing that.

But, nevertheless, liberals opposed it for a long time. Fortunately, we were able to override them. However, we are now able to defend Israel with a Patriot missile. We are able to defend Israel with our Patriot missiles. We are able to defend our F-14s parked at

Dahran Air Base with Patriot missiles. That is a missile that shoots down a missile coming in.

But as you and I stand here in Washington, DC in February 1991, we cannot defend this city, we cannot defend New York.

Saddam Hussein said 2 years ago, long before he was on anybody's radar screen as to even who he was, said, "If I had one missile, one, that went across the ocean, I would hit the United States. I wouldn't hit China, I wouldn't hit Argentina, I wouldn't hit India. I would hit the United States."

Ladies and gentlemen, if he has one, if he gets one, it will hit, because this Congress has made absolutely certain that it is against the law for the President to deploy or to fashion a missile that shoots down a missile coming at the United States of America.

I would be more than pleased to go back with the gentleman, who knows this absolutely as well as I, a member of the Intelligence Committee, who knows that the report language from the Committee on Armed Services was very explicitly written, that those intricate tests that were already to be taken were expressly prohibited.

Now, that shows that this was not just accidental. They knew full well what they were doing. They do not want the United States of America to be able to defend itself against incoming missiles.

Now, you would think that having seen what is going on with the Scud and with the Patriot, that they would come forward and say, "I was wrong." The well is open for those over the next 6, 8, or 10 months that may wish to do that. But I am not holding my breath.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Do you know what just occurred to me? You will have to help me with this and we will get the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] and some other Members, we are going to have to get pictures from the streets of Tel Aviv and Safad and Haifa, and the West Bank, where they fell short upon their Arab brothers' heads, we are going to have to get pictures of some of the victims, like that beautiful young woman lying on the stretcher with her hands mangled and the soldiers looking down at her with her hands bleeding, that had been torn apart by a Scud missile.

We are going to have to have these big pictures in the well when the SCI debate comes along.

Mr. MCEWEN. Well, hope springs eternal. I appreciate that. But a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still. Rest assured, these votes weren't by accident. They weren't out of naivete. They weren't out of a lack of information. They deliberately do not want the United States of America defending itself. A position that if you went to any coffee shop tomorrow morning at 6:20 in the

morning, in any coffee shop in America, and go to any booth or any stool and ask anyone there is it better to shoot down a missile prior to the time it hits you, or is it safer to have a missile hit you?

Rest assured, the unanimous response of every taxpaying, car washing, lawn mowing American, would be that it is better to shoot a missile down before it hits you, rather than allowing it to hit you.

If you pick up that magazine, this week's Newsweek magazine, in which there is an interview with Robert "Strange" McNamara, a man that invented the idea that allowing them to hit you somehow makes us free, makes us safe, that he is still advising us, this man that has concocted this appropriately termed mad philosophy in the 1960s that we should not defend ourselves, he is still giving us directions on how to conduct the reclamation of Kuwait.

So I appreciate his generosity. I appreciate the optimism of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], that putting the pictures there and explaining it. But I repeat, a man convinced against his will is of the same opinion still. I am not sure that one who believes that allowing missiles to hit you makes you secure is going to be persuaded by the evidence.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I am an optimist, and I hope we can turn the freshman class. I agree, given some of the strange speeches we have heard here over the last couple of months, that there are some people that will resist even the blatantly obvious.

Let me ask this: What does the gentleman think about the moral equivalency argument, where some people will say kids in school are equating Saddam Hussein and George Bush?

Now, in one of my daughters' schools, little grade school kids, a prayer was constructed, for the best of intentions, by sweet little nuns: please pray for Saddam Hussein and George Bush. No title for President Bush, and I guess you would have to call him President Saddam Hussein, president for life by self-appointment.

I thought, wait a minute. Did we have prayers during the Second World War that said please pray for Adolf Hitler and Franklin Roosevelt? As though there is some moral equivalency here, that simulates gang warfare and that both are equally guilty.

How do you respond to this argument that says George Bush, by turning to military force, just or unjust, has contributed to violence in the world?

Mr. MCEWEN. Well, I would say to the gentleman from California, that you and I believe that there is right and wrong in the world. We believe that there is evil and that there is good. And as a result, we base our opinions thereupon.

I remember when Jimmy Carter went to Notre Dame and stood there and lectured the world that we in America, as he was a new President, we in America have gotten over our inordinate fear of communism.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Pre-invasion of Afghanistan.

Mr. MCEWEN. Absolutely. We were giving the backs of the hand to all the captured nations that were struggling to be free, Czechoslovakia and East Germany and Yugoslavia and all the rest. We had gotten over our inordinate fear of communism.

I had the opportunity just a few months ago to be in Soviet Georgia, in which we were having a dinner, a banquet put on by the mayor of Tbilisi, the capital of Soviet Georgia. And during the course of the dinner people began to stand up and make toasts.

I remember one fellow stood and toasted Ronald Reagan, who recognized that this was an evil empire.

Mr. DORNAN of California. What city is this?

Mr. MCEWEN. It is Tbilisi, Georgia, back in the middle of the southern Soviet Union, where there are no magazines, there are no newspapers, there are no radio or television communications. They are absolutely locked away. There has been no printing or even translation of the Scriptures for 200 years, no printing of the Scriptures for 83 years. As far off from anything that you would ever be able to be. And he stood up and toasted the United States of America and Ronald Reagan, who understood this was, "an evil empire."

I thought to myself, two words, "evil empire." March 1981, first press conference, East Room of the White House.

No wonder the left went bonkers. Because after having all of this expression that there was a moral equivalent, that there is no right or wrong, America is no better than the Soviet Union, we can all work together because we all have the same goals. And suddenly someone recognizes that there is a difference between what they do to people and what they do to rob the people, and I wish I had the quotes that I carry so often, from Vaclav Havel and Lech Walesa, who described what communism does, how it ruins the environment and how it destroys men's souls and destroys their future and self-worth, and creates poverty and death wherever it goes. That is what communism is all about.

□ 2110

That is what communism was all about. That is what Vaclav Havel said right there, the poet from Czechoslovakia. Here were these people, clear locked away back in the Soviet Union that took no hope, and took no encouragement who said finally the United States has a leader that understands that something is right in the world

and something is wrong in the world and is willing to identify it, and they took some hope from it. That was 11 years, that was 10 years before I heard him make that toast.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Did not Ronald Reagan go back to Notre Dame after he defeated Jimmy Carter and he made a much shorter speech, and he said what?

By the way, tonight is his 80th birthday. Let me hear his words if the gentleman can recall.

Mr. MCEWEN. Do not lose your train of thought. He said very simply, he said not only would communism be ascribed to the ash heap of history, but we would not contain communism. The gentleman remembers the long postwar policy of containment. He said the goal of America and the goal of freedom is not to contain communism, but our destiny is to transcend communism.

So from that beginning in 1981, from a time when we were losing jobs at a rate of 50,000 a week, when we had a declining standard of living and were told that we had to learn to live with less, it was the era of limits, we had to think small, the head counsel of the economic advisers, Alfred Kahn, adviser to Jimmy Carter, of all people, said the question in the 1980's was not whether or not America would have a declining standard of living, he said, but the question is whether or not Americans will learn to adapt to their declining standard of living. So the fact was that we were going to be entering into an era of limits in which America was in decline.

In that condition Ronald Reagan came along and said that our best days were ahead, that "we have yet to see the greatness that is America. We will transcend communism." And by the end of the decade what is happening? We are transcending communism in America. Two out of three jobs created on this entire planet since 1982 have been created in one country, the United States of America. There is investment in opportunity in this country and people are climbing over walls, people are tearing down walls, establishing freedom. In this decade in which we were supposed to be barely making it, we are not just barely making it, we are leading it and successfully so.

So when this one-time tyrant comes forward and wishes to challenge the new order, and he has the sick offense to come along and encourage him, as Saddam Hussein said, "To those who are demonstrating, let me express my sincere thank you's to them, to those who are supporting my cause." He saw America through the old prism. He saw the America that used to be. He did not see the new America that is today, and he is finding a rude awakening, and we will not go back, regardless of how much ridicule is put on what has been going on in the last 17 days. The fact of

the matter is that we are standing by our values, the world is standing by our values, and as the man said who escaped from across the border and was quoted in the paper on the associated wires this morning, he said very simply, "When you finish off Hussein, you will bring this thing to a stop."

Mr. DORNAN of California. To a stop. All right. In thinking about this I am going to declare this right now on this floor of this prestigious body, not the mother of parliaments, but the greatest son of the mother of parliaments, the greatest daughter of the mother of parliaments, the U.S. House of Commons, the People's House is going to declare February Ronald Reagan month since it is the first month of his biblical 80th year, a full four score, not three score and 10, four score down, and I sent him a message tonight and said may he live to be 100 and then some.

During this month I am going to get that President Jimmy Carter speech and that President Ronald Reagan speech at Notre Dame and put them both in the RECORD and let people read them, including I just had a nephew who graduated from there, and I have another one out there in the gulf on the Ranger, and I am going to send them this material and I am going to start to make the case for what Ronald Reagan was doing with a volunteer army, with his high-technology weapons, with precision to save lives. What lives? Not only the lives of the enemy, because the war will end sooner, but the lives of our precious men and women.

Mr. MCEWEN. I will reclaim my time to remind the gentleman that we have been lectured here for the last several months by Phil Donohue and by others ridiculing the people that had chosen to defend our country and wear the uniform of the United States, that somehow or another this was the last stop for them, that they had been abandoned by every other opportunity. Certainly no one would wish to stand for the United States of America in international circles wearing our uniform voluntarily; it had to be out of desperation, No. 1.

Second, liberals do not need to apologize. You never need to say you are sorry if you are a liberal, so you can say all during the 1960's that this gold-plated equipment of Reagan's cannot work, it is far too sophisticated, and our people cannot maintain it under combat, and besides our forces would not be bright enough to keep it working.

But what is happening? We are saving thousands and thousands of lives, and we are accomplishing our goal. We are not desecrating any holy sites or getting any collateral damage. We are going right into the smokestack and inside the door of the military headquarters that we are seeking to target

with highly sophisticated equipment maintained by America's best, the people that are willing to voluntarily give of their lives to defend our freedom, your freedom and mine and the stability and peace of the world. And rather than be ridiculed by the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, who in rebuttal to the State of the Union Address referred to them as the only people that will be fighting will be those of the poor. Regardless of the fact of whether or not they make Senators' incomes, regardless of whether or not they are millionaires like the distinguished leaders of the other body, the fact that they are wearing our uniform and willing to honor us makes them rich in my opinion. That is the highest calling that a person could have, and rather than disparaging of them, we should be applauding them because the fact of the matter is that no matter how you slice it, you have to concede that they are performing to the maximum of anyone's expectations and then more.

Mr. DORNAN of California. And that is not to say because of the Tomahawk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The gentleman will suspend for a moment. The Chair must advise all Members that it is not in order to refer to Members of the Senate except as sponsors of legislation.

Mr. MCEWEN. If I might respectfully reply to the Speaker, it is appropriate to address the Members of the other body, Members of the other body and their position and not by name, which I did.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Can we get a clarification on that?

Mr. MCEWEN. There is no need for one. I am fully aware of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. DORNAN of California. There was a gentleman who was a political leader of one of the two major parties in America.

Mr. MCEWEN. Let us see it where it says that I cannot refer to them as Members of the other body. I will show it to the Chair.

Mr. DORNAN of California. There is a leader of the other party who made a response to the leader of our party, and he began by saying we will never know if sanctions would have worked. We will never know if they would have worked, creating that doubt out there for all of the teachers in the high schools and the colleges. That was night 13 of the war, the 29th. Now we have had 15 days in January, so 21 days, and tonight ends the 21st day of the war. If we are beating the evil out of this guy by unfortunately having to hit all of his countrymen, many of whom have rallied to his cause, if we are beating him this badly in the air to ground war, the air war was over a long time ago, over the first night, and now we have supremacy in the air to ground war, how would sanctions have ever

worked if he is still hanging on like a madman during this?

Mr. MCEWEN. Do not lose your train of thought, but if I can respond to your first point, on the first page of the Washington Post of yesterday or today it referred to a reporter who in December was ordering an exotic beer at a restaurant in Baghdad, and he looked at the label of the production and it said the November 1990 batch.

These notorious sanctions went into effect in August 1990, and yet these exotic beers can still be purchased at random on the street. So that shows you the effectiveness of the sanctions.

The gentleman's question is under those conditions would this man, who will not respond when he has had his home blown up, his headquarters blown up, when he has had his head Air Corps destroyed in battle, and all of the other damage, would he then have suddenly awakened one morning, twiddling his thumbs and looking out over the peaceful desert and said: "I think I'll now turn back the gold and the oil that I have stolen from the people of Kuwait?" It stretches one's imagination.

Mr. DORNAN of California. In my 14-year span on Jenkins Hill here, I think probably the most hypocritical statement I have ever heard, and it is only from a segment from the pro-abortion forces, it is those that claim deep Christian spiritual beliefs or belief in other religions, and they start out all of their statements by saying, "I personally am opposed to abortion," and that is the handle, that is the prolog to every statement you make.

□ 2120

And of course, if you extrapolate that, and some even go this far, particularly if you question them, "What do you mean by that?" "I mean that that is a baby, a human being in the womb ordained into existence by God with a human soul. I believe that is a human being with a soul. But if you want to kill it, I will give you that choice, and I will get you Federal and State money to pay for it."

Now, here is a brand-new, handle, a prolog, if you talk in defense of demonstrators including those who burn the American flag. One of my colleagues from California, one of the gentlewomen Congressmen from that beautiful city named after St. Francis of Assisi, and I am sure he is rolling in his grave watching some of the demonstrations that go on there lately, and not necessarily about this gulf conflict, she mischaracterized my discussion about dissent in this country, particularly that dissent that is focused around blame-America-first club, burning the American flag and ranting and raving against Europe's and America's economy, free-market economy, the free world, and that we are the blame of everything that happens in the world. We are the cause of him pollut-

ing the gulf, we should have just left him alone, to hell with the Kurds, to blazes with all the people raped and pillaged and murdered in Kuwait.

But here I want to ask the gentleman about something, this new prolog: "I personally support the boys and girls in the gulf, those brave young men and women. I am totally with them, but first, I think we ought to have a cease-fire; second, we ought to get out next week; third, we ought to give this guy some breathing room and let him get out of there; or fourth, we want to stay with the air war, but I think we are killing women and children and bombing hospitals," and slowly start sliding into the old Jane Fonda mantra during the close of the Vietnam war that our primary targets, not our secondary targets if something was fogged in with morning fog, but our primary targets were schools, orphanages, old people's homes, temples and churches, a few Catholic churches in Hanoi and Hai-phong, that was our primary targets. These people are saying, "We are all for our men and women in the gulf, but we want them out of there."

How do you think that plays with the men and women in the gulf, particularly if they see an American flag burning in the background, and then hear Peter Arnett elicit from Saddam Hussein, "Mr. Arnett, I want to thank," in closing, "I want to thank the demonstrators in Germany, in England, and in the United States. I want to thank them for standing in solidarity with me." How do you think that "I personally support the men and women in the gulf but"; how do you think that plays with the troops?

Mr. McEWEN. I do not think anyone has any difficulty concluding as to why they do it and what their true feelings are, and the truth is that in the 1930's we had America First rallies, and when the murder and rape and the pillage was going on and the people were being randomly killed and millions of people were being gassed that there were those who were saying that, "I want to transcend all of that. I do not want to be involved, and I have no objection to those who have to wear the uniform, but I personally do not think that we should be doing anything about it," and it is not new in our history. I think that their pictures and their statements should be framed, and they should be hung on the walls of Auschwitz and Dachau, and they ought to be put there with recent vintage dates, and whenever young people walk through there and the tears and trauma and agony that one experiences when one goes through those death camps and say, "How could this happen," I can tell you very simply how it happens, because people look at values like that. They see the rape and pillage and murder. They see the stealing, and they say that, and I would say to my colleague from California that it is no

different than what happens in Washington, DC.

If a murderer storms down, knocks down a door, goes in, shoots the father, rapes the wife, and kills the children, we have a police force, and the police force is established for the purpose of stopping that.

Now on a larger scale, there is a nation that took police power states, took their tanks and took their M-16's and took their AK-47's and took their airplanes and went in and did that to a nation, and it is no more moral to stand by and watch that go on and say, "I do not want to be involved. I do not want to touch it. I do not want to risk American dollars." Of all the most repulsive arguments that I have ever encountered, that money is more important than the freedom of an entire nation. What kind of value, what kind of greed, what kind of "me" generation, what kind of selfishness have we descended to when we can say that a handful of dollars are more important than the screams of a nation being raped and pillaged someplace on the globe?

I mean, the fact that it exists is distressing enough, but, nevertheless, it is no more moral to ignore that than it is to go down to a police station in Washington, DC, and protest because a policeman is trying to enforce the law and stop some rape or murder that is taking place tonight in this city and say, "Well, you know, I really do not think we ought to be involved. It is none of our business. Do you realize that instead of spending money for that police car you could have been buying food stamps with it or something else?" That value system is there. There is no way to deny it. No matter how much you try to camouflage it by using the words that, "I really support the troops," the truth of the matter is you do not support what they are doing and what they are doing is drawing a line against the murder and rape that is taking place in Kuwait, and that is what the issue is, and that is what people all over America are supporting, and that is, for the first time in your lifetime or mine, spontaneously in courthouses and city squares across this country in an unprecedented fashion, people that have never been involved in anything, are every day, today, tomorrow, this weekend, every day spontaneously bringing their children and American flags and saying, "I am proud of what America is doing in the world."

Does the gentleman know what I encountered? I encountered a political science professor in Luxembourg just about 10 days ago at the American delegation to the European Parliament. He came up to me, and he said, "You are a Congressman, are you not?" He said, "I told a class of mine, 300 students," I said, "I want you to go back through your history books, and I want

you to find an example of where a nation risked so much for absolutely nothing. There is absolutely nothing that America is going to get out of defending." He said, "You and I know what the figures are. You know where that oil goes. Why is America doing it? Is it doing it for any reason at all other than nationalism or civilization and for our cause to defend what we stand for?" He said, "You know it, and I know it. Find any time in history when a nation so voluntarily risked so much." That is what we are standing for. I am sure it is not universal.

Mr. DORNAN of California. I want to go back to this demonstrator thing, because I really honestly look forward to hearing your opinions on what I call the Americana voters, those that fly a flag and still protest against our involvement in the Middle East. I think they were in the majority in the beginning while we were debating in this House, but I think now they have shrunk to a minority after many of the good, decent people having witnessed his despoiling the environment, beating up and killing, or probably killing, POW's, and, of course, rocketing the innocent women and children in a country that was not even involved in the conflict, but I want to ask the gentleman something, as the clock may be racing ahead.

We have seen Ronald Reagan, President Reagan's, modernization and reworking of the Air Force, the Navy, in the sea and in the air, naval air, and the Marine Corps, which is participating heavily in the air component of the Marine Corps, and we have seen them use on land, sea, and air these three components, all of this modernized equipment that has really left some of the more fairminded liberals and the media rather awestruck and rather respectful.

Now, I do not want a land war, and I assume that the gentleman does not want one either. That is correct. Am I not correct in that assumption?

Mr. McEWEN. Yes.

Mr. DORNAN of California. We all hope that God is going to call him tomorrow, and that the air-to-ground war will certainly somehow cause his regime to cave in.

What would you analyze though, if, God forbid, worst comes to worst, and we have to go in on the land, for the final liberation of France, oh excuse me, for the final liberation of Poland, oh, excuse me, the final liberation of Cambodia, excuse me, I mean, of course, Kuwait, or Luxembourg.

Mr. McEWEN. Exactly the same argument.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Exactly, or South Korea or South Vietnam. What do you think will be the initial response to this Army component that we have put the Reagan theory of high-technology, highly trained, 97-percent high school graduates and all college-

trained officer corps, what do you think the response will be on the battlefield from the Reagan modernization of the U.S. Army and the Marine Corps ground components?

Mr. MCEWEN. I think we are going to see a continuation of what we have seen now. And you have seen that the best and the brightest of the 1960's, and I refer to the Ramsey Clarks and the Robert Strange McNamaras and the antiwar movement that is in the Congress, and they were the ones that were lecturing us all along, and they are the ones who opposed what we have done thus far, but I repeat, being a liberal means never having to say you are sorry, and there is no time that you lose credibility, and you can be wrong in Nicaragua, you can be wrong in Grenada, and you can be wrong in the nuclear freeze, you can be wrong in Mozambique, you can be wrong, and you remember how fashionable it was to support Khomeini.

Jimmy Carter said, "We think the Shah should step down. We do not know whether or not the Shah can survive." His Ambassador to the United Nations said, "We think Khomeini might be a saint." Nobody knew who Khomeini was from Adam's off ox. He was sitting cross-legged in the back of some suburb in Paris, and it was not until the U.S. administration and Jimmy Carter favored him that anybody ever went over to find out who he was.

□ 2130

Yet never discouraged.

Mr. DORNAN of California. And the people who touted him were all executed by him.

Mr. MCEWEN. And it does not discourage them at all for coming along with their explanation for what foreign policy should be.

They can be wrong in Iran, wrong in Nicaragua, wrong in all the places, and they are dead wrong about what would happen. The gentleman remembers the words about the massive American body bags, 50,000, and all the things, and they build, build, build into a crescendo, and now we find out, under friendly fire, that we have lost a handful. That is extremely tragic and very unfortunate, but it does not have anything to do with what they said would happen. Now they are back here, not in the least intimidated and giving advice as to where to go on the next step.

The truth of the matter is that the people running this war, the Commander in Chief is not Lyndon Johnson, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is a person who was a major in Vietnam, and the Secretary of Defense is a person who believes in freedom, and believes we should enforce it with a minimum of risk to American soldiers. We do not believe in the Lyndon Johnson measured response. We do not believe in the taking weekends off.

Whenever we get ahead, they call for a cease-fire for 6 weeks to regroup, and of course the bombing pauses. We do not believe in having strategic targets exempted. We believe in either standing for something or if we are not standing for something, we are serious, or we are not serious. What we are doing here will not be anything willy-nilly or irresponsible. This is not a Kennedy-Johnson operation, but a permanent commitment to standing against tyranny in the first instance with not being stampeded into anything. No demand that this will be over in 1 week or 2 weeks, with the goal to accomplish our task with a minimum loss of American life.

I trust the people that have brought the United States so far, I trust the people that will take the United States to the step, to do what is right. I think that if any history at all, especially in the last 3 or 4 months has taught anything, that their record is far superior to those giving them the advice at the moment.

Mr. DORNAN of California. If people are conversant, if any person is conversant, any man or woman in this country on these defense systems, weapon systems, there was always a suspicion by those in the media who have had an abhorrence of any kind of a just war, let alone the aggressors who start wars, they will always ascribe to somebody who is cheered by justice and victory in the name of freedom and peace. They are always suspicious that somehow or other they wanted to fight, they wanted to see the bloodletting.

Tomorrow, and in 1955, February 7, that will be 36 years ago, three dozen years, I got my wings as an Air Force fighter pilot, as a pilot, and then went on to gunnery training to become a fighter pilot. I had been motivated by young pilots in the Battle of Britain when I was 7 or 8 years of age, and tracking all of the aces through Europe, and in the South Pacific, every service, including the Marines who at Guadalcanal made me want to be a Marine aviator. They would not lower the age in the Navy under 20, so when it went to 19, and they lowered it to 19, I went in the Air Force. I served 6 Eisenhower years in peace, never blowing up anything but targets on the desert.

Here is something fascinating: Any person who was in the Air Force Academy, Annapolis or West Point, in 1971 and it was their junior year, they could serve for 18 years and never see a war, and a lot have gotten out at the 5-year point, 10 years, 15. Any person who was in pilot training in 1972 was never going to see combat in Vietnam because the war ended in January 1973. For all of those people went on to see introduced into the inventory the F-15 Eagle, F-14 Tomcat, F-16 Falcon, F-18 Hornet, the beautiful Harrier that takes off vertically, and all the new helicopters such as the Apaches, and

except for a handful of people over the skies of Libya, expressing another tyrant, rattling his brains, to this date, fortunately we do not hear much from Mu'ammarr Qadhafi except for a few Navy pilots over the skies of Beirut and a few instances in Panama and Grenada. That is less than 1 percent of all the trained aviators in all the services. Anybody who served as I did, 5 years, 6 years, 8 years, 10 years, up to 18 years who got off active duty, and I met one who is leaving active duty this week, could not get orders rewritten to get to the gulf. Besides that, all fighter pilots in the Philippines, in Hawaii, in Europe, they are not fighting this war. It is the Tactical Air Command from the United States with the much discussed Flying Wing from Spain, the 401st; three Guard units, New Orleans, Syracuse, South Carolina. They are over there. They never know who will get picked and who gets called. However, all these people that are serving, not even a majority of our men in the air except maybe the Marine Corps, six Navy carriers, that means there are 8 carrier groups not involved over there. That means the Independence and the Eisenhower came home. So they are not participating in this, and the Enterprise. They do not know who is going to be here, but of these few men that are there, they did not lust to fight and draw blood.

They heard the clarion call. This was their time, on their ship, in their position "move" to go over there and serve. These people, a handful, compared to who served over the last 18 years in the Reagan years since Vietnam, they are doing it for everybody. And those that have already died in the skies, a handful, those that have been tortured to death, those that are maybe being starved to death in Saddam Hussein's dungeon tonight, they are the ones that we should be listening to in this Congress. They want to win it in the air-to-ground struggle so that their kid brothers, in uniform, do not have to do it.

They want peace as badly as anybody in this House. However, I see this jockeying for position here, political position, to find a ground. Strangely enough, the analogy is sand, like slipping sand around here to say, "Well, this guy is no Ho Chi Minh that I cheered for in college or high school. This guy is one evil dude," bathing friends in baths of acid in the name of the party. What do I do? Well, I will come up with that prologue. I personally support the people in the gulf who do not want to come home until it is over. I support them. I know more than they do, and I am going to ask for a cease-fire, to get them out of there now and create this monster.

Mr. MCEWEN. Now there is a resolution to introduce into the House, to have the draft for certain races because due to the fact that this is a volunteer

army, people who choose to defend freedom, voluntarily, that because the possibility exists that they are not volunteering in the proper mix, that we need to ridicule them because of their ethnic backgrounds. The truth of the matter is that this is a very, very noble calling and performance.

Let me say this virtually in conclusion, during the 1930's, the United States was not the world leader. That is hard for anyone under age 50 to remember, but the truth is that not until after World War II did the United States take the position of premier leader in the world. It was basically Britain and France nearby. The United States took no diplomatic moves without checking.

Mr. DORNAN of California. And our party particularly isolated itself in the 1930's.

Mr. MCEWEN. So the responsibility of Britain was to lead. At the time that the Nazis went into the Rhineland, they did nothing. When they went into Czechoslovakia, Austria first, nothing. They went into Czechoslovakia, they did nothing. Finally, the whole world fell into a conflict.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Who wants to die for Danzig?

Mr. MCEWEN. About people, Neville Chamberlain spoke about Czechoslovakia: "Strange people of which we know little." If a person can comprehend such a thing, but they did, and 55 million died.

The gentleman may remember from my speech at the close, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] asked that I close the debate on the first resolution, I remembered then of the time the popular vote as to what it was that when they said that if Hitler went into Czechoslovakia, Czechoslovakia means war. It was guaranteed. Every international leader said 3 words: Czechoslovakia means war. Do not ever go into Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia means war. So he went into Czechoslovakia, and now the whole world is kind of spastic about what is going to happen, and so there is a little tension. Hitler invites a couple of the leaders down to Munich. Why they went, I do not know, but they go to Munich and stand there. We all remember that picture with Neville Chamberlain standing there with the umbrella, which is the symbol of appeasement from that day to this, and took a little walk around the garden there with Hitler and signed the paper that he would not take any more nations, and then he landed at Hinden Field and held up the paper. It is peace in our time. Of course, the world already found out as he was flying back and the streets were lined, and he got to Downing Street, he could not turn in, and went to the House of Commons. There was a standing ovation over and over, "Peace in our time." Everyone was thrilled because we have fed the crocodile another

nation. Never mind the rape and the pillage that goes on in Austria and Czechoslovakia and the death camps and Dachau and all of the murder and the mistreatment of the Jews in the gas chamber, because we are at peace. By golly, look at the food stamps we can buy now. We do not have to worry. So they gave him a standing ovation repeatedly and turned to the former Lord Admiral, who had been out of office for 7 years, Winston Churchill, and asked what he thought. He said that the Prime Minister faced a very terrible decision, whether or not to choose war, to choose shame, and he has chosen both.

□ 2140

That was in 1938. Then you had 1939, he goes into Poland, and finally in 1940, and the United States did not get into it until 1941.

Here we are now, in February. I would say to my colleague from California that he will appreciate this, I have a copy of the telegram and I will be glad to share it with the gentleman. The moment that the United States of America became the premier nation on Earth was February 2, 1947. A telegram was sent—

Mr. DORNAN of California. My mother's 47th birthday. I want to memorize this right now.

Mr. MCEWEN. The Prime Minister of Great Britain sent a telegram to President Harry Truman and said that unless the United States intervened in the Cyprus crisis, Cyprus would be lost to communism and that the Crown did not have the wherewithal to maintain their presence there, and with that the torch was passed to a nation who had never asked for world leadership, never sought it, never pursued it, and did not like having it.

That is the first time in the history of man, let me say to the gentleman, that under the Phoenicians and the Greeks and under the Romans, under the Spanish and under the French and under the English, every nation that ever was the premier nation on Earth got to that position because they pursued it, and when they got there they knew what they had to do. They had to maintain the independence of the Mediterranean at Gibraltar and Suez. They had to maintain the Cape of Good Hope. They knew what had to be done.

The only exception to that is the United States of America. The United States of America, because of the power of its ideas, became the premier nation on Earth in which all the nations looked to for leadership, and now we bear this burden.

And indeed, Saddam Hussein supposed he had another Neville Chamberlain on his hands. He had seen Jimmy Carter's performance. He had seen some of the other actions in Vietnam and elsewhere, in Iran, and he said, "I know them."

Now, here is the point we need to remember, Every independent, every moderate Arab leader in all the Middle East, I am speaking of Mubarak in Egypt, I am speaking of King Fahd in Saudi Arabia, the Sultan of Oman, the list can go on, every one of them have said to President George Bush that if this man with the fourth largest military on Earth is able to thumb his nose, not just at the United States, but at the entire world, at the United Nations, if he is able to do that, the radical religious element in our nation, in Egypt, where half of all the world's Arabs live, in Egypt, in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, in Oman, in the United Arab Emirates, in Qatar, in those nations, we cannot survive a year because they will say, "There is the way you should behave."

It is not unlike Hitler when he went into the Rhineland against the opposition of all his military leadership. He said, "They will come down on us."

Then he went into Austria and elsewhere, and finally after the Munich appeasement the military finally began to shift over to Hitler and said, "He must know something we don't know, and that is he is able to pull this off. We're going to get behind him because he is going to make the Fatherland dominate all of Europe."

And that is what they have said to us, that at this critical moment if we wimp out, if we refuse to face our obligation, if we give some lame excuses as a value system that lives and freedom and independence are inferior to some whatever cause they have, that if we pursue that at this moment, all of the Middle East, you remember the closing arguments that I made, he pledged that he will bring the entire Arab world under his command. If he were to do that, you know what his goal is.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Sure.

Mr. MCEWEN. His goal is to destroy Israel. At that point, then do you think the liberals 3 years from now when we were faced with that situation in which he had intercontinental missiles and in which he had supported revolutions in all the neighboring countries, and he had made the fourth largest army into the third or second largest army and then he marches against Israel, then where do you think they are going to be?

Somebody is going to say, "Why didn't you back in 1991 when you had the chance, when you had the overwhelming air superiority, when he did not have intercontinental missiles, when he did not possess nuclear power, why didn't somebody have the foresight and the brains to do something about it?"

Mr. Speaker, look at history now. Fortunately we have learned. We are not going to make that mistake.

America has done what is right. When this trust was thrust upon us, which we did not ask for, and these im-

migrants that have escaped from around the world are now occupying this place that we call ourselves America, regardless of their Irish ancestry or Polish or whatever, that we do not even begin to look alike, except we are alike on the inside, that we love freedom and we are Americans. We have discharged that sacred responsibility beautifully, and I am extremely proud of the way the Congress acted on January 12. That was my birthday, in which we chose to defend freedom out of an act of graciousness and caring about our values, not because of what we are going to get. We were the ones giving the most, and yet because we knew that it was right and there was just spontaneously as a general reflex, without even thinking about it, there was Great Britain right at our side. We have done something out of an act for the ultimate peace and security of the world, of Israel and of our own peace in the future what is right, and we will be remembered for it as having stood in the gap. When the world was found wanting, we had a President and we had a leader who rallied the rest of the world around him, and I submit that his place in history as the result of this will be exactly where it belongs, right at the very top.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Amen. Would the gentleman ask the Chair how much time we have left?

Mr. MCEWEN. I would ask the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). The gentleman from Ohio has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Time for one question. I have taken great delight in watching the gentleman, maybe a little less than half a decade, or a little more than a decade, younger than I, who has the same love of history and lets history nourish his thinking process on not reliving the mistakes of the past. Never in all the years I have known the gentleman have I seen a little tiny mistake, and I caught one. It may have been the same mistake I made on the floor on the 50th anniversary of Chamberlain coming back, the gentleman and I and our great former colleague, Jack Kemp, we were talking about this Munich thing. First we did the 50th anniversary of the Hitler-Stalin Pact which crushed Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. Then we did on the 50th anniversary, September 30, 1989, not realizing that 40 days later the Berlin Wall was going to come down, and I said that Neville Chamberlain returned to Heston.

I researched that during the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Britain. Heston is where the great RAF museum is. The runways are long gone, but the field he came back to, the gentleman will like this because we both admire the namesake of this field. Heston, as in Charleton Heston's name.

Hendon is on the north part of London, but Heston is on the road to Heath Row.

Heston—Chris Heil, one of the greatest reporters we have, going supersonic with this pen, he will go back and correct Hendon to Heston.

But here is the last question with the few minutes we have. What would the gentleman say, and I know they are out there, God love them, what would the gentleman say to those first two categories of demonstrators who were in the majority in the beginning, the ones who are democratically inclined to look toward a diplomatic solution, exhausted even if all the odds are against them, and the spiritually inclined St. Francis of Assisi types who say never should we resort to violence, what would the gentleman say to these people in closing to kind of cap off that litany of perfect history the gentleman gave why sometimes you must stand up to the rapist and the murderer, particularly if it is your own wife and children who are being beaten before your very eyes, what do you say to the few good people who do not burn the flag, they wave it and they say, "Please, no war."

Mr. MCEWEN. I would encourage them just to listen to those whose lives are immersed in it.

Certainly the last thing that George Bush wanted was this situation. Certainly the last thing that Colin Powell and Dick Cheney or anyone else at the Pentagon wanted was to be in this situation. This is the last thing that Prime Minister Kaifu wanted to do. They say it cost us \$800 million a month and the last thing he wanted to do was commit \$9 billion. The last thing that Margaret Thatcher wanted to do was to commit this, but those who know what is at risk have made this decision out of obligation for the future generations, not for their own benefit, not without question, No. 1.

Second, it is not moral, it is not the high ground for those who are standing two doors away listening to the screaming of the rape and the pillaging going on two doors down to say, "I don't want to get involved. Don't lecture me about moral high ground," because you want to hold your ears and close your eyes and pull the curtains to the rape that is going on in the street. That is not moral high ground. That is the lowest act of selfishness. That is the ultimate accomplishment of the "me" generation and this generation has turned its back on the remnants of the Vietnam era in which there was no commitment from our national leadership as to what our goals were. That is beside us now.

Mr. DORNAN of California. What seems to have been one of the landmark changes in our culture, our society, that started this cultural war was the spring of 1964 at Berkeley, the Filthy Speech Movement, the FSM

with Mario Savio, later fritzed his brain out with acid or something. But you know what happened, funny how this date sticks in my mind, March 26, 1964, Covent Gardens, NY, Kitty Genovese screaming as she is being stabbed by a rapist-murderer, and people pulled their blinds down and he went away.

Mr. MCEWEN. Yes, and that is not moral high ground.

Mr. DORNAN of California. He came back and killed her.

Mr. MCEWEN. "I don't have anything involved. Why should I be involved? I might have to go to the hospital. I might have to help pay for some of the bills. That could mean I would lose some of the personal benefit." That is not moral high ground. That is the ultimate failure of human decency.

America is not like that. Saddam Hussein bet his life and his future that that was America, and there are those encouraging him at this moment, but I am here to say that America is the opposite, the total opposite of that, much more like what was said in the scriptures, "Greater love hath no man than to lay down his life for his friends."

Mr. DORNAN of California. John 15:13; my favorite line in all scripture. I am glad it is that of the gentleman, too.

What is the date we come back in here in this Chamber to assemble again?

Mr. MCEWEN. The 19th.

Mr. DORNAN of California. The 19th, let us do a special order the night of the 19th. There will have been 13 more days of air-to-ground war. Dick Cheney, our great Secretary of Defense, and Colin Powell will be back visiting with another great black American officer of African-American heritage, Calvin Waller.

□ 2150

They will discuss when is the right time to move. I think 13 more days from now we are still going to see an air war in progress and we are going to take our time to save lives, Iraqi lives as well as American lives. They will really start to die in heavy numbers if we have to hit them on the ground with high technology land weapons.

Mr. MCEWEN. I appreciate the time of the gentleman, his love of our country and his assistance in this special order.

Madam Speaker, I thank everyone here. I am fully aware of what we have done to you as you are about to take a week off, and to you I apologize and thank you.

I thank the Speaker, and I thank the sergeant-at-arms.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE  
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE  
ON THE BUDGET REGARDING  
CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING  
AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL  
YEAR 1991

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending, credit, and revenues for fiscal year 1991. This is the first report of the 1st Session of the 102d Congress.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, credit authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

Current level reports are intended to provide Members information to compare enacted spending and revenues with the aggregate ceilings on budget authority, outlays, and revenues established in a budget resolution, and also to compare enacted legislation with the allocations of new discretionary budget authority, entitlement authority, and credit authority made to a committee pursuant to subsection 302(a) of the Budget Act. This report compares the spending, credit, and revenue levels in current level with those assumed in the conference report to accompany the budget resolution for fiscal year 1991, House Concurrent Resolution 310. The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 10, 1990, page H9280.

Current level reports provide information that is necessary for enforcing section 311 of the Budget Act. Section 311(a) prohibits the consideration of a spending or revenue measure if the adoption of that measure would cause the ceiling on total new budget authority or total outlays set in the budget resolution for a fiscal year to be exceeded or would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level of revenues set forth in the budget resolution.

Section 311(b) provides an exception to the 311(a) point of order for measures that would breach the ceilings on total spending set forth in the budget resolution but would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" of discretionary spending made pursuant to section 302(a) of the Budget Act. Such an exception was first provided by the budget resolution for fiscal year 1985, House Concurrent Resolution 280, 98th Congress. The exception was made permanent by the amendments to the Budget Act included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, Public Law 99-177, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. This exception is intended to protect a committee that has stayed within its allocation of discretionary budget authority and new entitlement authority from points of order

if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control.

Section 311(c) of the Budget Act provides that, for purposes of enforcing section 311, the levels of new budget authority, entitlement authority, outlays, and revenues shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget. Current level reports represent partial fulfillment of this enforcement responsibility of the Budget Committee by providing both estimates of enacted aggregate spending and revenues, and, for purposes of determining the applicability of the section 311(b) exception, estimates of the relationship between the budgetary effect of enacted legislation within a committee's jurisdiction and the allocation of spending authority made to that committee.

The estimates in this report are based on economic and technical assumptions in place at the time of the adoption of the budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 310. This is intended to protect committees which acted on the basis of the assumptions of the budget resolution from changes in economic and technical factors over which they have no control. Unless the Congress adopts a subsequent budget resolution for a fiscal year that alters the assumptions concerning legislative actions, committees should be able to expect that measures that conform with the budget resolution will not be subject to points of order for violation of the Budget Act. To do otherwise and base enforcement on constantly changing economic and technical estimates would seriously disrupt the legislative process, penalize committees that are unable to complete work on legislation within a short period after adoption of a budget resolution, and undermine respect for budget enforcement procedures.

In addition to section 311, the Budget Act contains another point of order that requires Budget Committee estimates for enforcement. Section 302(f)(1) of the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of a measure providing new budget authority, new entitlement authority, or new credit authority if the adoption of that measure would cause a committee to exceed its allocation of new spending or credit authority made pursuant to subsection 302(b) of the Budget Act. The 302(b) allocation is a subdivision of the new spending, new entitlement, and new credit authority allocated to a committee pursuant to section 302(a), among either the subcommittees of that committee or among programs over which the committee has jurisdiction. This point of order was added to the Budget Act by the amendments included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Section 302(g) provides that the enforcement of section 302 shall be based on estimates of spending and credit authority made by the Committee on the Budget. The Budget Committee fulfills this responsibility by providing, as necessary, a separate section 302 status report to the Speaker.

For information purposes only, current level reports will continue to include a comparison of the budget and credit authority divided among the Appropriations subcommittees by that committee's 302(b) division with the actual enacted spending and credit legislation within each subcommittee's jurisdiction.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, February 6, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending.

I am herewith transmitting the status report under H. Con. Res. 310, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1991.

In the House of Representatives, the procedural situation for fiscal year 1991 with regard to the spending ceilings (total new budget authority and total outlays) and the revenue floor is affected by Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended by Public Law 99-177. Section 311(a) prohibits the consideration of a spending or revenue measure which would cause the ceiling on total new budget authority or total outlays set in the budget resolution for a fiscal year to be exceeded or would cause total revenues to be less than the appropriate level set in the budget resolution. Section 311(b) provides an exception to the 311(a) point of order for measures which would breach the ceilings on total spending in the budget resolution but would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" of new discretionary budget authority or new entitlement authority under Section 302(a) of the Budget Act.

The intent of Section 311(b) of the Budget Act is to protect a committee that has stayed within its spending authority allocations—new discretionary budget authority or new entitlement authority—from points of order if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control. The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 310 were printed in the Congressional Record on October 10, 1990, page H9280.

The enclosed tables compare enacted legislation to each committee's 302(a) allocation of discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments. The estimates of spending and revenues for purposes of the application of points of order under the Budget Act are based upon the economic and technical assumptions underlying the fiscal year 1991 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 310.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE  
ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL  
YEAR 1991 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET  
ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 310

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF FEB. 5, 1991

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level .....	1,485,600	1,236,900	1,172,900
Current level .....	1,481,536	1,236,224	1,175,177
Amount under ceilings .....	4,064	676	
Amount over floor .....			3,277

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure which provides budget or entitlement authority and which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$4,064 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure which increases outlays and which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$676 million for fiscal 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310 to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss which is not included in the current level revenue estimate and that exceeds \$3,277 million in revenues for fiscal year 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310.

FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET AUTHORITY—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION ALLOCATION BY COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

(In millions of dollars)

House Committee:	Current level budget authority
Agriculture	-742
Appropriations <sup>1</sup>	-1,344
Armed Services	+57
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs	-32
District of Columbia	
Education and Labor	
Energy and Commerce	-14
Foreign Affairs	
Government Operations	
House Administration	
Interior and Insular Affairs	+74
Judiciary	+3
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	-5
Post Office and Civil Service	+869
Public Works and Transportation	
Science and Technology	+1
Small Business	
Veterans' Affairs	-94
Ways and Means	-2,354
Unassigned (sequestration)	-389

<sup>1</sup> See next table for detail.

Note.—Committees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(a) allocation for "discretionary action."

FISCAL YEAR 1991 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DISCRETIONARY ACTION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION SUBDIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 302

(In millions of dollars)

House Appropriations Subcommittee:	Current level budget authority	Direct loans	Primary loan guarantees
Commerce, State, Justice	-7	-11	-184
Defense	-54		
District of Columbia	-2		
Energy and Water	-775		
Foreign Operations	+404	-17	-1
Interior			
Labor, HHS, Education	-624		
Legislative Branch	-53		
Military Construction	-136		
Rural Development and Agriculture	-6	-112	-49
Transportation	-1		
Treasury, Postal Service	-4		
VA/HUD/Independent Agencies	-76	-198	
Total	-1,344	-338	-234

Note.—Subcommittees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(b) subdivisions for "discretionary action."

FISCAL YEAR 1991 ALLOCATION OF NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY [NEA] PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

(In millions of dollars)

Committee	Allocation	Reported <sup>1</sup>	Enacted <sup>2</sup>	Enacted over (+) or under (-) allocation
Agriculture	+53	+1,309	-566	-619
Appropriations		+2,253	+2,253	+2,253
Armed Services		+2,209	+2,270	+2,270
Education and Labor	-120		+1	+121
Energy and Commerce	+305		+1	-304
Judiciary		+2	+2	+2
Post Office and Civil Service				
ice	-1,230		-1,390	-160
Veterans' Affairs	-65		+180	+245
Ways and Means	-4,200		-3,182	+1,018

<sup>1</sup> These figures are used for 401(b)(2) of the Budget Act.

<sup>2</sup> These figures are used for 302(f) points of order.

Note.—The figures for the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees represent the full costs of the January 4.1 percent pay raise for Federal military and civilian personnel respectively. The pay raise was assumed in the budget resolution, but the New Entitlement Authority (NEA) was not allocated to any committee because the budget resolution assumed that the pay raise would be achieved through administrative actions.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, February 6, 1991.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, estimated revenues, and direct and guaranteed loan levels in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1991 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 310). This report, my first for the first session of the 102d Congress, is tabulated as of close of business February 5, 1991. A summary of this tabulation follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	Current level	Budget resolution H. Con. Res. 310	Current level +/- resolution
Budget authority	1,481,536	1,485,600	-4,064
Outlays	1,236,224	1,236,900	-676
Revenues	1,176,177	1,172,900	3,277
Direct loan obligations	20,607	21,000	-393
Guaranteed loan commitments	106,940	106,800	140

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 102D CONG., 1ST SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1991 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS FEB. 5, 1991

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions.			
Revenues			1,176,178
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	1,066,350	801,618	
Other legislation	664,057	676,371	
Offsetting receipts	-242,564	-242,564	
Total enacted in previous sessions	1,487,843	1,235,425	1,176,178
II. Enacted this session: Extending IRS deadline for Desert Storm troops (Public Law 102-2)			(-1)
III. Continuing resolution authority			
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses			
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory adjustments required to conform with current law estimates in budget resolution	-6,307	799	
Total current level <sup>1</sup>	1,481,536	1,236,224	1,176,177
1991 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 310)	1,485,600	1,236,900	1,172,900

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 102D CONG., 1ST SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1991 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS FEB. 5, 1991—Continued

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution			3,277
Under budget resolution	4,064	676	

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with section 606(D)(2) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Title XIII of Public Law 101-508) current level excludes \$1,335 in budget authority and \$1,562 in outlays for Operation Desert Shield, Debt Forgiveness for Egypt and Poland and Internal Revenue Service funding above the June 1990 baseline level. In addition, current level outlays include a savings of \$1,100 million for the Bank Insurance Fund that the Committee attributes to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (Public Law 101-508) and revenues include the Office of Management and Budget's estimate of \$3,037 million for the Internal Revenue Service provision in the Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations Bill (Public Law 101-509).

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for the 102d Congress for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The rules of the committee were adopted on January 30, 1991 in open session, a quorum being present.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, 102D CONGRESS

(Adopted January 30, 1991)

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in Clause 2 of Rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the extent applicable. The Chairman shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee, and to its rules to the extent applicable.

2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House is in session pursuant to Clause 2(b) of Rule XI of the House. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with Clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to Clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered.

3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum.

One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions: (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation, (2)

closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public, and (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas.

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### 4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule or any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b)(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the Members, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this subsection vote to close 1 subsequent day of hearing.

(c) No congressional staff person shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee which has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with Rule 20.

#### 5. ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or markup to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at least 1 week before the commencement of that hearing or markup unless the Committee or subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin meeting at an earlier date. Such determination may be made with respect to any hearing or markup by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

Public announcement of all hearings and markups shall be made at the earliest possible date and shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record, and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

Members shall be notified by the Chief of Staff, whenever it is practicable, 1 week in advance of all meetings (including markups and hearings) and briefings of subcommittees and of all the full Committee.

The agenda for each Committee and subcommittee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, including a copy of any bill or other document scheduled for markup, shall be furnished to each Committee or subcommittee Member by delivery to the Member's office at least 2 full calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sunday, and legal holidays) before the meeting, whenever possible.

#### 6. WITNESSES

##### a. interrogation of witnesses

Insofar as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption, questioning by the Committee Members taking place afterward. In recognizing Members, the Chairman may give preference to the Members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the Members actually present. A Member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the Chairman and not the witness in order to insure orderly procedure.

Each Member may interrogate the witness for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5-minute period. After all Members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

The Chairman shall take note of Members who are in their chairs when each day's hearing begins and, insofar as practicable, when the time occurs for interrogation, shall recognize each such Member ahead of all others.

##### b. statements of witnesses

So far as practicable, each witness shall file with the committee, 48 hours in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and shall make a brief oral summary of his views.

#### 7. PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and markup sessions.

Members of the Committee and any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own remarks and may make any grammatical or technical changes that do not substantially alter the record. Any such Member or witness shall return the transcript to the Committee offices within 5 calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of the transcript, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Any information supplied for the record at the request of a Member of the Committee shall be provided to the Member when received by the Committee.

Transcripts of hearings and markup sessions (except for the record of a meeting or hearing which is closed to the public) shall be printed as soon as is practicable after receipt of the corrected versions, except that the Chairman may order the transcript of a hearing to be printed without the corrections of a Member or witness if the Chairman determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time to correct such transcript and such transcript has not been returned within such time.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

#### 8. EXTRANEOUS MATERIAL IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

No extraneous material shall be printed in either body or appendixes to any Committee or subcommittee hearing, except matter which has been accepted for inclusion in the record during the hearing. Copies of bills and other legislation under consideration and responses to written questions submitted by Members shall not be considered extraneous material.

Extraneous material in either the body or appendixes to any hearing to be printed which would be in excess of eight printed pages (for any one submission) shall be accompanied by a written request to the Chairman, such written request to contain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing such material.

#### 9. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE VOTES

The result of each rollcall vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the Committee offices—including a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition; the name of each Member voting for and against and whether by proxy or in person; and the Members present but not voting.

A rollcall vote shall be ordered on any question at the request of 20 percent of those present.

#### 10. PROXIES

Proxy voting is permitted in the Committee and in subcommittees only under the following conditions:

The proxy authorization—

(a) Shall be in writing;

(b) Shall assert that the Member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting; and

(c) Shall be limited to a motion to report a bill or a resolution.

Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the Member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies are not counted for a quorum.

#### 11. PRIOR APPROVAL OF REPORTS

No Committee, subcommittee, or staff report, study, or other document which purports to express publicly the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or the subcommittee may be released to the public or filed with the Clerk of the House unless approved by a majority of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate. In any case in which Clause 2(1)(5) of House Rule XI does not apply, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be given an opportunity to have views or a disclaimer included as part of the material filed or released, as the case may be.

#### 12. REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Except in unusual circumstances, bills and resolutions will not be considered by the Committee unless and until the appropriate subcommittee has recommended the bill or resolution for Committee action, and will not be taken to the House for action unless and until the Committee has ordered reported such bill or resolution, a quorum being present. Unusual circumstances will be determined by the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with such Members of the Committee as the Chairman deems appropriate.

#### 13. STAFF SERVICES

The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in the field of foreign affairs to the Committee, the subcommittees, and all its Members.

The staff shall include persons with training and experience in foreign affairs who have a variety of backgrounds and skills so as to make available to the Committee services of individuals who have a first-hand acquaintance with major countries and areas and with major aspects of U.S. overseas programs and operations.

It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff shall be available to all Members of the Committee.

(a) The professional and clerical employees of the Committee, except those assigned to the minority or to a subcommittee as provided below, shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman with the approval of the majority of the Members of the Committee. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman within the ceilings set in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI, and they shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assignments are to be authorized by the Chairman or by the Chief of Staff under the direction of the Chairman.

(b) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined as the minority Members of the Committee shall determine within the general ceiling in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI. *Provided, however,* That no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority staff counterpart. Such staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member with the approval or consultation of the minority Members of the Committee.

(c) In the matter of subcommittee staffing:

(1) The chairman of each standing subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to

appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) The ranking minority Member of each of six standing subcommittees on the Committee is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of said Ranking Minority Member.

(3) The staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in Paragraph (c) of Clause 6 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House or (B) the rate paid the staff member appointed pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph.

(4) No Member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) The staff positions made available to the ranking minority Members pursuant to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph shall be made available from the staff positions provided under Clause 6 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

#### 14. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(1) The full Committee will handle the markup and reporting of general legislation relating to foreign assistance (including development assistance, security-related aid, and Public Law 480 programs abroad) or relating to the Peace Corps. Regional subcommittees will have responsibility with respect to foreign assistance as follows:

(1) The annual legislative programs of foreign assistance for each region shall be referred to the appropriate subcommittee for review and legislative recommendations, within a time frame to be set by the Committee.

(2) Those subcommittees shall be responsible for ongoing oversight of all foreign assistance activities affecting their region.

(3) Those subcommittees shall have the responsibility of annually reporting to the full Committee, on a timely basis, the findings and conclusions of their oversight, including specific recommendations for legislation relating to foreign assistance.

(b) There shall be eight standing subcommittees. The names and jurisdiction of those subcommittees shall be as follows:

##### A. Functional Subcommittees

There shall be four subcommittees with functional jurisdiction:

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARMS CONTROL, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND SCIENCE.**—To deal with national security and scientific developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers and executive agreements legislation; Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and all aspects of arms control and disarmament with particular emphasis on the investigation and evaluation of arms control and disarmament proposals and concepts; security aspects of nuclear technology and materials; international terrorism with special focus on the U.S. Government's policies and programs for combating international terrorist movements and actions; oversight of military aspects of foreign policy and foreign intelligence; and oversight of State and Defense Department activities involving arms transfers, arms export licenses, administration of security assistance, arms sales, foreign military training and advisory programs, and conventional arms control.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS.**—To deal with Department of State and U.S. Information Agency operations and legislation; the diplomatic service; international education and cultural affairs; for-

ign buildings; international terrorism with special emphasis on policies and programs relating to the enhancement of embassy security and the protection of U.S. personnel and institutions abroad; parliamentary conferences and exchanges; protection of American citizens abroad; international broadcasting; and international communication and information policy.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY AND TRADE.**—To deal with measures relating to international economic and trade policy; measures to foster commercial intercourse with foreign countries; export administration; international investment policy; trade and economic aspects of nuclear technology and materials and international communication and information policy; legislation pertaining to and oversight of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; commodity agreements; and special oversight of international financial and monetary institutions, the Export-Import Bank, and customs.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—To deal with oversight of, and legislation pertaining to, the United Nations, its related agencies, and other international organizations; international law; implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other matters relating to internationally recognized human rights generally; the American Red Cross; international environmental policy; and oversight of international fishing agreements.

##### B. Regional Subcommittees

There shall be four subcommittees with regional jurisdiction: the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East; the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs (including South Asia); the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs; and the Subcommittee on Africa.

In addition to the responsibilities provided by subsection (a) of this rule, the regional subcommittees shall have jurisdiction over the following:

(1) Matters affecting the political relations between the United States and other countries and regions, including resolutions or other legislative measures directed to such relations.

(2) Legislation with respect to disaster assistance outside the Foreign Assistance Act, boundary issues, and international claims.

(3) Legislation with respect to region- or country-specific loans or other financial relations outside the Foreign Assistance Act.

(4) Resolutions of disapproval under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, with respect to foreign military sales.

(5) Oversight of regional lending institutions.

(6) Identification and development of options for meeting future problems and issues relating to U.S. interests in the region.

(7) Environmental, population, and energy affairs affecting the region.

(8) Base agreements and regional security pacts.

(9) Oversight of matters relating to parliamentary conferences and exchanges involving the region.

(10) Concurrent oversight jurisdiction with respect to matters assigned to the functional subcommittees insofar as they may affect the region.

#### 15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set

meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other subcommittee chairmen, with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee or subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible. It shall be the practice of the Committee that meetings of subcommittees not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full Committee.

In order to insure orderly and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, hearings and meetings should be arranged in advance with the Chairman through the Chief of Staff of the Committee.

The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee may attend the meetings and participate in the activities of all subcommittees, except for voting and being counted for a quorum.

#### 16. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks, unless by majority vote of the majority party Members of the full Committee, consideration is to be otherwise effected. Any subcommittee chairman who believes that the subcommittee has jurisdiction over the legislation or other matter may so notify the Chairman within the 2-week period.

The Chairman may designate a subcommittee chairman or other Member to take responsibility as "floor manager" of a bill during its consideration in the House.

#### 17. PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

The majority party caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party Members for each subcommittee: *Provided, however*, That party representation on each subcommittee or conference committee shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member are authorized to negotiate matters affecting such ratios including the size of subcommittees and conference committees.

#### 18. SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGETS AND RECORDS

(a) Each subcommittee shall have an adequate budget to discharge its responsibility for legislation and oversight.

(b) In order to facilitate Committee compliance with Paragraph (e)(1) of Clause 2, Rule XI, each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each rollcall vote shall be promptly made available to the full Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the subcommittee. Such records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

#### 19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairmen on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting need not be held if there is no business to conduct. It shall be the practice at such meetings to review the current agenda and activities of each of the subcommittees. Each majority Member of the Committee shall have the right to attend such meetings.

#### 20. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

It shall be the policy of the Committee to afford access to classified information under its control for its own Members and other Members of the House of Representatives.

**AUTHORIZED PERSONS.**—In accordance with the stipulations of the House Rules, all Members of the House shall be construed to be persons authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

Members of the Committee staff shall be construed to be authorized access to classified information within the possession of the Committee (1) when they have the proper clearances, and (2) when they have a demonstrable "need to know". The decision on whether a given staff member has a "need to know" will be made on the following basis:

(a) In the case of the full Committee majority staff, by the Chairman, acting through the Chief of Staff;

(b) In the case of the full Committee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, acting through the Minority Chief of Staff;

(c) In the case of subcommittee majority staff, by the Chairman of the subcommittee;

(d) In the case of the subcommittee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee.

No other individuals shall be considered authorized persons, unless so designated by the Committee Chairman.

**DESIGNATED PERSONS.**—Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to classified information in the "confidential" category. Such designated persons must have the proper security clearance and a "need to know" as determined by his or her principal. Upon request of a Committee Member in specific instances, a designated person also shall be permitted access to information classified "secret" which has been furnished to the Committee pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended. Designation of a staff person shall be by letter from the Committee Member to the Committee Chairman.

**LOCATION.**—Classified information will be kept in secure safes in the Committee rooms. All materials bearing the designation "top secret" must be kept in secured safes located in the main Committee offices, 2170 Rayburn House Office Building. "Top Secret" materials may not be taken from that location for any purpose.

Materials bearing designations "confidential" or "secret" may be taken from Committee offices to other Committee offices and hearing rooms by Members of the Committee and authorized Committee staff in connection with hearings and briefings of the Committee or its subunits for which such information is deemed to be essential. Removal of such information from the Committee offices shall be only with the permission of the Chairman of the full Committee, under procedures designated to insure the safe handling and storage of such information at all times.

**NOTICE.**—Notice of the receipt of classified documents received by the Committee from the executive branch will be sent promptly to Committee Members. The notice will contain information on the level of classification.

**ACCESS.**—Except as provided for above, access to classified materials held by the Committee will be in the main Committee offices in a designated "reading room". The following procedures will be observed:

(a) Authorized or designated persons will be admitted to the reading room after inquiring of the Chief of Staff or an assigned staff member. The reading room will be open during regular Committee hours.

(b) Authorized or designated persons will be required to identify themselves, to identify the documents or information they wish to view, and to sign the Classified Materials Log, which is kept with the classified information.

(c) No photocopying or other exact reproduction, oral recording, or reading by telephone, of such classified information is permitted.

(d) The assigned staff member will be present in the reading room at the option of the authorized person. Such staff member will be responsible for maintaining a log which identifies (1) authorized and designated persons seeking access, (2) the classified information requested, and (3) the time of arrival and departure of such persons. The assigned staff member will also assure that the classified materials are returned to the proper location.

(e) The Classified Materials Log will contain a statement acknowledged by the signature of the authorized or designated person that he or she has read the Committee rules and will abide by them.

**DIVULGENCE.**—Any classified information to which access has been gained through the Committee may not be divulged to any unauthorized person in any way, shape, form, or manner. Apparent violations of this rule should be reported to the Chairman of the full Committee at once, and by him to the full Committee as promptly as possible.

**TECHNICAL SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES.**—Committee rooms and equipment shall be maintained in accordance with such technical security standards as the Chairman deems necessary to safeguard classified information from unauthorized disclosure. Such standards may include requirements for technical security monitoring during closed sessions involving classified information, conducted under the direction and control of the Chairman by personnel responsible to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

**OTHER REGULATIONS.**—So long as they do not conflict with any of the rules herein set down, the Chairman of the full Committee may establish other regulations and procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Members of the Committee will be given notice of any such regulations and procedures promptly. They may be modified or waived in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee. Furthermore, any additional regulations and procedures should be incorporated into the written rules of the Committee at the earliest opportunity.

#### 21. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

When requested by the Superintendent of the House Radio and Television Gallery and upon approval by the Committee or its subcommittees, all Committee and subcommit-

tee hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage: *Provided*, That such request is submitted to the Committee or its subcommittees not later than 4 p.m. of the day preceding such hearings.

The Chairman of the full Committee or the chairmen of the subcommittees are authorized to determine on behalf of the full Committee or its subcommittees respectively whether hearings which are open may be broadcast, unless the Committee or its subcommittees respectively by majority vote determine otherwise. The Committee or subcommittee chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room.

Such coverage shall be in accordance with the following requirements (Section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970; Clause 3(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives):

(a) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to Clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) The allocation among cameras permitted by the Committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any Member of the Committee or its subcommittees or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(f) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee or subcommittee is in session.

(g) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage to the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(h) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to the photographers from Associated Press Photos, United Press International

Newspictures, and Reuters. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(i) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the Members of the Committee or its subcommittees.

(j) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(k) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(l) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery Committee of Press Photographers.

(m) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

#### 22. SUBPOENA POWERS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees, in accord with House Rule XI, Clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Pursuant to House Rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe, the Chairman may be delegated the power to authorize and issue subpoenas in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

#### 23. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever the Speaker is to appoint a conference committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Members of the Committee who are primarily responsible for the legislation (including to the fullest extent feasible the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House), who have actively participated in the Committee or subcommittee consideration of the legislation, and who agree to attend the meetings of the conference. With regard to the appointment of minority Members, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

#### 24. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairman of the full Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Any additional procedures or regulations may be modified or rescinded in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

(Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks

at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the requirement of clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit herewith the rules of the Committee on Ways and Means for the 102d Congress and ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point. These rules were adopted by the committee in open session on January 23, 1991.

#### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, provides in part:

"\* \* \* The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees.

"\* \* \* Each subcommittee of a committee is a part of that committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of that committee and to its rules as far as applicable.

"\* \* \* Each standing committee of the House shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. Such rules \* \* \*

"(1) shall be adopted in a meeting which is open to the public \* \* \*

"(2) shall be not inconsistent with the Rules of the House or with those provisions of law having the force and effect of Rules of the House \* \* \*"

In accordance with the foregoing, the Committee on Ways and Means, on January 23, 1991, adopted the following as the Rules of the Committee for the 102d Congress.

#### A. GENERAL

##### Rule 1. Application of Rules

Except where the terms "full Committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Ways and Means and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairmen.

##### Rule 2. Meeting Date and Quorums

The regular meeting day of the Committee on Ways and Means shall be on the second Wednesday of each month while the House is in session. A majority of the Committee constitutes a quorum for business; provided however, that two members shall constitute a quorum at any regularly scheduled hearing called for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence. In establishing a quorum for purposes of a public hearing, every effort shall be made to secure the presence of at least one member each from the majority and the minority.

The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet pursuant to the call of the Chair.

##### Rule 3. Proxy Voting

Voting by proxy shall be permitted in accordance with the manner prescribed in clause 2(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

##### Rule 4. Committee Budget

For each session of the Congress, the Chairman, in consultation with the majority members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall in-

clude necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee. After consultation with the minority members, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted by minority members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall present the same to the Committee for its approval or other action. The Chairman shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House. After said budget shall have been adopted, no substantial change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the Committee.

*Rule 5. Publication of Committee Document*

Any committee or subcommittee print, document, or similar material prepared for public distribution shall either be approved by the Committee or subcommittee prior to distribution and opportunity afforded for the inclusion of supplemental, minority or additional views, or such document shall contain on its cover the following disclaimer:

Prepared for the use of Members of the Committee on Ways and Means by members of its staff. This document has not been officially approved by the Committee and may not reflect the views of its Members.

Any such print, document, or other material not officially approved by the Committee or subcommittee shall not include the names of its members, other than the name of the full Committee Chairman or subcommittee chairman under whose authority the document is released. Any such document shall be made available to the full Committee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays) prior to its public release.

This rule shall apply only to the publication of policy-oriented, analytical documents, and not to the publication of public hearings, legislative documents, documents which are administrative in nature or reports to the Committee which are required under public law. The appropriate characterization of a document subject to this rule shall be determined after consultation with the Minority.

*Rule 6. Official Travel*

Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee members and Committee staff. Official travel to be reimbursed from funds set aside for the full Committee for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of formal or informal hearings conducted by the Committee, its subcommittees, or any other committee or subcommittee of the Congress on matters relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee, and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the official travel;
- (2) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;

(3) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and

(4) The names of Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

Where official travel is in connection with the conduct by Members of the Committee of an informal hearing, the prior approval not only of the Chairman but also of the appropriate subcommittee chairman shall be required where the hearing involves any matter within the jurisdiction of one or more of the subcommittees of the Committee.

In the case of official travel of Members of staff of a subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to such subcommittee, prior authorization must be obtained from the subcommittee chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable subcommittee chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated above.

Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the full Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

*Rule 7. Availability of Committee Records*

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

**B. SUBCOMMITTEES**

*Rule 8. Subcommittee Ratios and Jurisdiction*

All matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means involving revenue measures, except those revenue measures referred to subcommittees under paragraph 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5, shall be considered by the full Committee and not in subcommittee.

There shall be six standing subcommittees as follows: a Subcommittee on Health; a Subcommittee on Human Resources; a Subcommittee on Oversight; a Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures; a Subcommittee on Social Security; and a Subcommittee on Trade. The ratio of Democrats to Republicans on any subcommittee of the Committee shall be consistent with the ratio of Democrats to Republicans on the full Committee.

The jurisdiction of each subcommittee shall be:

1. The Subcommittee on Health shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Democrats and 4 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means which relate to programs providing payments (from any source) for health care, health delivery systems, or health research. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Health shall include bills and matters which relate to the health care programs of the Social Security Act (including titles V, XI (Part B), XVIII, and XIX thereof) and, concurrent with the full Com-

mittee, tax credit and deduction provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with health insurance premiums and health care costs.

2. The Subcommittee on Human Resources shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Democrats and 4 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means which relate to the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act including welfare reform, supplemental security income, aid to families with dependent children, social services, child support, eligibility of welfare recipients for food stamps, and low-income energy assistance. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall include bills and matters relating to titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XX and related provisions of titles VII and XI of the Social Security Act.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means which relate to the Federal-State system of unemployment compensation, and the financing thereof, including the programs for extended and emergency benefits. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Human Resources shall also include all bills and matters pertaining to the programs of unemployment compensation under titles III, IX and XII of the Social Security Act, Chapters 23 and 23A of the Internal Revenue Code, the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1974, and provisions relating thereto.

3. The Subcommittee on Oversight shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Democrats and 4 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall include all matters within the scope of the full Committee's jurisdiction but shall be limited to existing law. Said oversight jurisdiction shall not be exclusive but shall be concurrent with that of the other subcommittees. With respect to matters involving the Internal Revenue Code and other revenue issues, said concurrent jurisdiction shall be shared with the full Committee. Before undertaking any investigation or hearing, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight shall confer with the Chairman of the full Committee and the chairman of any other subcommittee having jurisdiction.

4. The Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of 11 Members, 7 of whom shall be Democrats and 4 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures shall consist of those revenue measures which, from time to time, shall be referred to it specifically by the Chairman of the full Committee.

5. The Subcommittee on Social Security shall consist of 8 Members, 5 of whom shall be Democrats and 3 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means which relate to the Federal Old-Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System, the Railroad Retirement System, and employment taxes and trust fund operations relating to those systems. More specifically, the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Social Security shall include bills and matters

involving title II of the Social Security Act and Chapter 22 of the Internal Revenue Code (the Railroad Retirement Tax Act), as well as provisions in title VII and title XI of the Act relating to procedure and administration involving the Old-Age, Survivors' and Disability Insurance System.

6. The Subcommittee on Trade shall consist of 14 Members, 9 of whom shall be Democrats and 5 of whom shall be Republicans.

The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Trade shall include bills and matters referred to the Committee on Ways and Means which relate to customs and customs administration including tariff and import fee structure, classification, valuation of and special rules applying to imports, and special tariff provisions and procedures which relate to customs operation affecting exports and imports; import trade matters, including import impact, industry relief from injurious imports, adjustment assistance and programs to encourage competitive responses to imports, unfair import practices including antidumping and countervailing duty provisions, and import policy which relates to dependence on foreign sources of supply; commodity agreements and reciprocal trade agreements including multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations and implementation of agreements involving tariff and nontariff trade barriers to and distortions of international trade; international rules, organizations and institutional aspects of international trade agreements; budget authorizations for the U.S. Customs Service, the U.S. International Trade Commission, and U.S. Trade Representative; and special trade-related problems involving market access, competitive conditions of specific industries, export policy and promotion, access to materials in short supply, bilateral trade relations including trade with developing countries, operations of multinational corporations, and trade with non-market economies.

#### Rule 9. Subcommittee Chairmen

For each subcommittee of the Committee, the Democratic Caucus of the Committee shall nominate to the Democratic Caucus of the House one candidate for the position of subcommittee chairman. The nominations shall be determined in the manner specified in this rule. Democratic members of the Committee shall have the right in order to full Committee seniority to bid for vacant subcommittee chairmanships. Such bids shall be subject to approval by a majority of those present and voting in the Democratic Caucus of the Committee. If the caucus rejects a subcommittee chairmanship bid, the next senior Democratic member may bid for the position as in the first instance. No member of the Committee who serves on the Budget Committee shall serve as a chairman of a subcommittee. A subcommittee chairmanship shall not be considered vacant while the subcommittee chairman has taken a leave of absence to serve on the Budget Committee.

#### Rule 10. Ex-Officio Members of Subcommittees

The Chairman of the full Committee and the Ranking Minority Member may sit as ex-officio members of all subcommittees. They may be counted for purposes of assisting in the establishment of a quorum for a subcommittee. However, their absence shall not count against the establishment of a quorum by the regular members of the subcommittee. Ex-officio members shall neither vote in the subcommittee nor be taken into consideration for purposes of determining the ratio of the subcommittee.

#### Rule 11. Subcommittee Meetings

Insofar as practicable, meetings of the full Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman of the full Committee and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding, wherever possible, simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

#### Rule 12. Reference of Legislation and Subcommittee Reports

Every bill or other measure (except revenue measures) referred to the Committee or initiated by the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman of the full Committee to the appropriate subcommittee within 2 weeks from the date of its receipt by the full Committee; unless by a majority vote of the full Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee. A subcommittee shall, within 3 legislative days of the referral, acknowledge same to the full Committee.

After a measure has been pending in a subcommittee for a reasonable period of time, the Chairman of the full Committee may make a request in writing to the subcommittee that the subcommittee forthwith report the measure to the full Committee with its recommendations. If within 7 legislative days after the Chairman's written request, the subcommittee has not so reported the measure, then there shall be in order in the full Committee a motion to discharge the subcommittee from further consideration of the measure. If such motion is approved by a majority vote of the full Committee, the measure may thereafter be considered only by the full Committee.

No measure reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been presented to all Members of the full Committee at least 2 legislative days prior to the full Committee's meeting, together with a comparison with present law, a section-by-section analysis of the proposed change, a section-by-section justification, and a draft statement of the budget effects of the measure that is consistent with the requirements for reported measures under clause 7 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### Rule 13. Recommendation for Appointment of Conferees

Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman of the full Committee shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members of the subcommittee (or subcommittees) which handled the substantive legislation, and such other Committee members as the Chairman may designate. Such recommendation shall be in the order of their subcommittee seniority. In making recommendations of minority members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

### C. HEARINGS

#### Rule 14. Witnesses

In order to assure the most productive use of the limited time available to question hearing witnesses, a witness who is scheduled to appear before the full Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of his appearance a written statement of his proposed testimony. In addition, all witnesses shall comply with the formatting requirements of the Joint Committee on Printing. Failure to comply with the 24-hour rule may result in a witness being denied the opportunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a witness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. A witness shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his position and shall provide sufficient copies of his written statement to the clerk for distribution to members, staff and news media.

portunity to testify in person. Failure to comply with the formatting requirements may result in a witness' statement being rejected for inclusion in the published hearing record. A witness shall limit his oral presentation to a summary of his position and shall provide sufficient copies of his written statement to the clerk for distribution to members, staff and news media.

#### Rule 15. Questioning of Witnesses

Committee members may question witnesses only when recognized by the Chairman for that purpose. All members shall be limited to five minutes on the initial round of questioning. In questioning witnesses under the five-minute rule, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall be recognized first after which members who are in attendance at the beginning of a hearing will be recognized in the order of their seniority on the Committee. Other members shall be recognized in the order of their appearance at the hearing. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage members of the majority.

#### Rule 16. Records of Hearings

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all testimony taken at a public hearing. The staff shall transmit to a witness the transcript of his testimony for correction and immediate return to the Committee offices. Only changes in the interest of clarity, accuracy and corrections in transcribing errors will be permitted. Changes which substantially alter the actual testimony will not be permitted. Members shall correct their own testimony and return transcripts as soon as possible after receipt thereof. The Chairman of the full Committee may order the printing of a hearing without the corrections of a witness or Member if he determines that a reasonable time has been afforded to make corrections and that further delay would impede the consideration of the legislation or other measure which is the subject of the hearing.

A witness appearing at a public hearing, or submitting a statement for the record of a public hearing, or submitting written comments in response to a published request for comments by the Committee must provide the Committee with a list of any clients or persons, or any organization for whom the witness appears. Such list shall be made available for public inspection unless otherwise directed by the Committee. Oral testimony and statements for the record, or written comments in response to a request for comments by the Committee, will be accepted only from citizens of the United States or corporations or associations organized under the laws of one of the 50 States of the United States or the District of Columbia, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman of the full Committee or subcommittee involved. Written statements from noncitizens may be considered for acceptance in the record if transmitted to the Committee in writing by Members of Congress.

#### Rule 17. Broadcasting of Hearings

The provisions of clause 3(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives are specifically made a part of these rules by reference. In addition, the following policy shall apply to media coverage of any meeting of the full Committee or a subcommittee:

1. An appropriate area of the Committee's hearing room will be designated for members of the media and their equipment.

2. No interviews will be allowed in the Committee room while the Committee is in session. Individual interviews must take place before the gavel falls for the convening of a meeting or after the gavel falls for adjournment.

3. Day-to-day notification of the next day's electronic coverage shall be provided by the media to the Chairman of the full Committee through the chief counsel or some other appropriate designee.

4. Still photography will be permitted during a Committee meeting as long as it does not disrupt the proceedings or block the vision of Committee members or witnesses.

5. Klieg lights will be permitted to illuminate the hearing room only during the first fifteen minutes following the Chairman's initial calling of the Committee to order.

6. Further conditions may be specified by the Chairman.

#### D. MARKUPS

##### Rule 18. Record Votes

A record vote on an issue shall be required on the request of a member which is supported by at least one-fifth of a quorum (i.e., four members during the 102d Congress).

##### Rule 19. Reconsideration of Previous Vote

When an amendment or other matter has been disposed of, it shall be in order for any member of the prevailing side, on the same or next day on which a quorum of the Committee is present, to move the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence over all other questions except the consideration of a motion to adjourn.

When a paragraph or section of a bill being considered for purpose of amendment has been adopted, it shall not be in order to return thereto except by majority vote of the Committee.

##### Rule 20. Previous Question

The Chairman shall not recognize a member for the purpose of moving the previous question unless the member has first advised the Chair and the Committee that this is the purpose for which recognition is being sought.

##### Rule 21. Official Transcripts of Markups and Other Committee Meetings

An official stenographic transcript shall be kept accurately reflecting all markups and other meetings of the full Committee and the subcommittees, whether they be open or closed to the public. This official transcript, marked as "uncorrected," shall be available for inspection by Members of the House, or Members of the Committee together with their staffs, in the full Committee or subcommittee office. Official transcripts shall not be removed from the Committee or subcommittee office. If, however, (1) in the drafting of a Committee or subcommittee decision, the Office of the House Legislative Counsel or (2) in the preparation of a Committee report, the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation determines (in consultation with appropriate majority and minority Committee staff) that it is necessary to review the official transcript of a markup such transcript may be released upon the signature and to script shall be returned immediately after its review in the drafting session.

The official transcript of a markup or Committee meeting other than a public hearing shall not be published or made public in any way except by a majority vote of

the Committee. Before any public release of the uncorrected transcript, members must be given a reasonable opportunity to correct their remarks. In instances in which a stenographic transcript is kept of a conference committee proceeding, all of the requirements of this rule will likewise be observed.

##### Rule 22. Publication of Decisions and Legislative Language

A press release describing any tentative or final decision made by the full Committee or a subcommittee on legislation under consideration shall be made available to each member of the Committee as soon as possible, but no later than the next day. However, the legislative draft of any tentative or final decision of the full Committee or a subcommittee shall not be publicly released until such draft is made available to each member of the Committee.

#### E. STAFF

##### Rule 23. Supervision of Committee Staff

The staff of the Committee, both professional and clerical, shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman of the full Committee except as provided in clause 5(d) and clause 6 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives concerning committee expenses and staff; provided, however, that the chairman of each subcommittee shall have the right to select and designate at least one professional and one clerical staff member for the subcommittee subject to the approval of a majority of the Democratic Caucus of the full Committee. The Ranking Minority Member shall have the right to designate one staff member. Said staff members shall be compensated at a salary commensurate with the responsibilities prescribed by the subcommittee chairman. Compensation shall be provided out of appropriated amounts rather than statutory amounts allowed the full Committee.

##### Rule 24. Staff Honoraria, Speaking Engagements, and Unofficial Travel

This rule shall apply to all majority and minority staff of the Committee and its subcommittees.

a. *Honoraria.*—Under no circumstances shall a staff person accept the offer of an honorarium. This prohibition includes the direction of an honorarium to a charity.

b. *Speaking engagements and unofficial travel.*—

(1) *Advance approval required.*—In the case of all speaking engagements, fact-finding trips, and other unofficial travel, a staff person must receive approval by the full Committee Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, from the Ranking Minority Member) at least seven calendar days prior to the event.

(2) *Request for approval.*—A request for approval must be submitted in writing to the full Committee Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) in connection with each speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or other unofficial travel. Such request must contain the following information:

(a) the name of the sponsoring organization and a general description of such organization (nonprofit organization, trade association, etc.);

(b) the nature of the event, including any relevant information regarding attendees at such event;

(c) in the case of a speaking engagement, the subject of the speech and duration of staff travel, if any; and

(d) in the case of a fact-finding trip or international travel, a description of the pro-

posed itinerary and proposed agenda of substantive issues to be discussed, as well as a justification of the relevance and importance of the fact-finding trip or international travel to the staff member's official duties.

(3) *Reasonable travel and lodging expenses.*—After receipt of the advance approval described in (1) above, a staff person may accept reimbursement by an appropriate sponsoring organization of reasonable travel and lodging expenses associated with a speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or international travel related to official duties, provided such reimbursement is consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. (In lieu of reimbursement after the event, expenses may be paid directly by an appropriate sponsoring organization.) The reasonable travel and lodging expenses of a spouse (but not children) may be reimbursed (or directly paid) by an appropriate sponsoring organization consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(4) *Trip summary and report.*—In the case of any reimbursement or direct payment associated with a fact-finding trip or international travel, a staff person must submit, within 60 days after such trip, a report summarizing the trip and listing all expenses reimbursed or directly paid by the sponsoring organization. This information shall be submitted to the Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, to the Ranking Minority Member).

c. *Waiver.*—The Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) may waive the application of section (b) of this rule upon a showing of good cause.

## RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 102d Congress which were adopted by the committee in open session on January 30, 1991:

### RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET (Adopted January 30, 1991) MEETINGS

#### Rule 1—Regular Meetings\*

The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the 2nd Wednesday of each month at 11:00 a.m., while the House is in session.

The Chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when he determines there is no business to be considered by the Committee, provided that he gives written notice to that effect to each member of the Committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

Regular meetings shall be cancelled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

#### Rule 2—Additional and Special Meetings

The Chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the Committee as he considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the Committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(c).

In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Chairman shall provide written or verbal notice of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while Congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

#### Rule 3—Open Business Meetings

Each meeting for the transaction of Committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll-call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(1). No person other than members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This rule shall not apply to any meeting that relates solely to matters concerning the internal administration of the Committee.

#### Rule 4—Quorums

A majority of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

#### Rule 5—Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the Chairman, may address the Committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the Committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

#### Rule 6—Consideration of Business

Measures or matters may be placed before the Committee, for its consideration, by the Chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the Committee, a quorum being present.

#### Rule 7—Procedure for Consideration of Budget Resolutions

In developing a concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the Committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the Committee open to amendment; subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters which have already been amended in their entirety.

Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

#### Rule 8—Rollcall Votes

A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present.

#### Rule 9—Proxies\*

Any member of the Committee may vote by special proxy if the proxy authorization is in writing, asserts that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the Committee, designates the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and is limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or

other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

#### Rule 10—Parliamentarian's Status Report and Section 302 Status Report

(a) In order to carry out its duty under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

The Committee authorizes the Chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b) In order to carry out its duty under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the Committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the Committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

The Committee authorizes the Chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

#### HEARINGS

#### Rule 11—Announcement of Hearings

The Chairman shall publicly announce the date, place, and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of that hearing, unless he determines there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which case public announcement shall be made at the earliest possible date.

#### Rule 12—Open Hearings

Each hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its Task Forces shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Task Force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The Committee or Task Forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

For the purposes of House Rule XI, clause 2(g) (2) the Task Forces of the Committee are considered to be subcommittees.

#### Rule 13—Quorums\*

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

#### Rule 14—Time for Questioning Witnesses

Committee members shall have not to exceed 5 minutes to interrogate each witness

until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to interrogate such witness.

After all members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule, the Chairman and the ranking minority member may be recognized first after which members may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing. Among the members present at the time the hearing is called to order, seniority shall be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the Chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

#### Rule 15—Subpoenas and Oaths

In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m), subpoenas authorized by a majority of the Committee may be issued over the signature of the Chairman or of any member of the Committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

The Chairman, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

#### Rule 16—Witnesses' Statements

So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the Committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee in advance of delivery.

#### Rule 17—Committee Prints

All Committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the Committee.

#### BROADCASTING

#### Rule 18—Broadcasting of Meetings and Hearings

It shall be the policy of the Committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the Committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 3. Whenever any Committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 3. However, radio, television, and still camera equipment may be excluded from the Committee room by a majority vote of the Committee, a quorum being present.

#### STAFF

#### Rule 19—Committee Staff

(a) Subject to approval by the Committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman.

Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to Committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

All Committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official Committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(b) In addition to the staff provided in paragraph (a) each member of the Committee may select and designate an associate staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of that member. Such staff member shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the member, not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; provided That no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to these provisions; provided further, that members designating a staff member under this subsection must certify by letter to the Chairman that the employee is needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

(c) In addition to the staff provided in the above paragraphs, the Chairman shall appoint no fewer than five staff, recommended by the minority members, who shall provide staff assistance to the minority members.

#### Rule 20—Staff Supervision

Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 6(c)) and job titles, and, in his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they deem appropriate.

#### COMMITTEE RECORDS

##### Rule 21—Preparation and Maintenance of Committee Records

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings.

The proceedings of the Committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

Members of the Committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof.

Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical or technical changes that do not substantially alter the record of testimony.

The Chairman may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for corrections, and that further delay would seriously impede the Committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Transcripts of hearings and meetings may be printed if the Chairman decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

##### Rule 22—Access to Committee Records

(a) The Chairman shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of roll-call votes and to provide access by members to Committee records (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e)).

Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the Committee members. Such information shall be kept in the Committee safe, and shall be available to members in the Committee office.

(b) \*The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administra-

tion shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

#### APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

##### Rule 23—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

#### CONFEREES

##### Rule 24—Appointment of Conferees

Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the Chairman subject to the approval of the majority party members of the Committee. The Chairman shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party, provided that the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the Committee.

#### FOOTNOTE

\*Written rule required by House.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. McEWEN, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mr. RITTER, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on February 19, 20, and 21.

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

Ms. OAKAR, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. TORRES, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. COYNE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. DELLUMS, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mrs. BOXER, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mr. FOGLIETTA, for 60 minutes, today.  
Ms. WATERS, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mr. MILLER of California, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SANDERS, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mrs. UNSOELD, for 60 minutes, today.  
Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, on February 20.  
Mr. MOODY, for 60 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. MACHTLEY.  
Mr. CLINGER.  
Ms. SNOWE in three instances.  
Mr. FIELDS.  
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.  
Mr. GALLEGLY.  
Mr. SOLOMON in nine instances.  
Mr. COX.  
Mr. IRELAND.  
Mr. GINGRICH.  
Mr. PORTER.  
Mr. MORRISON.  
Mr. WOLF.  
Mr. COLE in two instances.  
Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
Mr. HORTON.  
Mr. RHODES.  
Mr. GEKAS.  
Mr. BALLENGER.  
Mr. GREEN of New York.  
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

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

Mr. ROEMER.  
Mr. YATRON in two instances.  
Mr. CARDIN.  
Mr. ROE.  
Mr. MCCLOSKEY.  
Mr. BILBRAY.  
Mr. GORDON.  
Mr. FOGLIETTA.  
Mr. NATCHER.  
Mr. ATKINS.  
Ms. NORTON.  
Mr. SABO.  
Mr. LEVIN.  
Mr. LAFALCE.  
Mr. COYNE.  
Mr. STARK in three instances.  
Mrs. SCHROEDER.  
Mr. MOODY.  
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.  
Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances.  
Mr. MAZZOLI.  
Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.  
Mr. GUARINI.  
Mr. HAMILTON.  
Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.  
Mr. JACOBS.  
Mr. STUDDS.  
Mr. TORRES.  
Mr. VISLOSKEY.  
Mr. TORRICELLI.  
Mr. RICHARDSON.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 348. An act to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to March 18, 1991; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,  
FEBRUARY 19, 1991

Mr. MCEWEN. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. UNSOELD). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 59, 102d Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:00 noon, Tuesday, February 19, 1991.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 59, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 19, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the second, third and fourth quarters of 1990, in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Augustus F. Hawkins	4/5	4/17	England		446.00		65.00				511.00
Hon. Carole Stringer	4/5	4/17	England		446.00		65.00				511.00
Hon. Beth Buehlmann	4/5	4/17	England		446.00		65.00				511.00
Hon. Teresita Schroeder	4/5	4/17	England		446.00		65.00				511.00
Committee total					1,784.00		260.00				2,044.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Note.—Addendum to 2d quarter report covering the period Apr. 1 to June 30, 1990: Expenses incurred in England which were not available at the time of the 2d quarter reporting.

WILLIAM D. FORD, Chairman, Jan. 28, 1991.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to Iceland, Finland, Sweden and Norway, July 1-8, 1990:											
Hon. Dennis M. Hertel	7/1	7/3	Iceland		364.00						364.00
	7/3	7/4	Finland		237.00						237.00
	7/4	7/6	Sweden		630.00						630.00
	7/6	7/8	Norway		464.00						464.00
Hon. Jim Courter	7/1	7/3	Iceland		364.00						364.00
	7/3	7/4	Finland		237.00						237.00
	7/4	7/6	Sweden		630.00						630.00
	7/6	7/8	Norway		464.00						464.00
Ms. Marilyn A. Elrod	7/1	7/3	Iceland		364.00						364.00
	7/3	7/4	Finland		237.00						237.00
	7/4	7/6	Sweden		630.00						630.00
	7/6	7/8	Norway		464.00						464.00
Mr. William A. Andahazy	7/1	7/3	Iceland		364.00						364.00
	7/3	7/4	Finland		237.00						237.00
	7/4	7/6	Sweden		630.00						630.00
	7/6	7/8	Norway		464.00						464.00
	7/1	7/3	Iceland		364.00						364.00
	7/3	7/4	Finland		237.00						237.00
	7/4	7/6	Sweden		630.00						630.00
	7/6	7/8	Norway		464.00						464.00
Delegation expenses	7/4	7/6	Sweden						291.51		291.51
Visit to Mexico, July 1-6, 1990:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	7/1	7/6	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Mr. Archie D. Barrett	7/1	7/6	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Delegation expenses	7/1	7/6	Mexico				224.16		58.32		282.48
Visit to Germany, Aug. 1-3, 1990:											
Hon. Marvin Leath	8/1	8/3	Germany				4,803.20				4,803.20
Commercial transportation											
Visit to Switzerland, Aug. 5-9, 1990:											
Hon. H. Martin Lancaster	8/5	8/9	Switzerland		1,100.00						1,100.00
Visit to Germany and Italy, Aug. 25-Sept. 4, 1990:											
Hon. Thomas M. Foglietta	8/21	8/29	Germany		1,463.00						1,463.00
	8/29	9/4	Italy		225.00						225.00
Visit to Japan and Korea, Aug. 31-Sept. 2, 1990:											
Hon. Ike Skelton	8/28	8/31	Japan		723.00						723.00
	8/31	9/2	Korea		390.00						390.00
Hon. Solimon P. Ortiz	8/28	8/31	Japan		723.00						723.00
	8/31	9/2	Korea		390.00						390.00
Mr. Archie D. Barrett	8/28	8/31	Japan		723.00						723.00
	8/31	9/2	Korea		390.00						390.00
Visit to the United Kingdom, Aug. 25-Sept. 4, 1990:											
Hon. Marvin Leath	8/31	9/4	United Kingdom		1,463.00				287.06		1,750.06
Commercial transportation							5,774.00				5,774.00
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	8/25	9/2	United Kingdom		1,645.00				287.06		1,932.06
Commercial transportation							3,366.00				3,366.00
Mr. William T. Fleshman	8/27	9/2	United Kingdom		1,173.00						1,173.00
Commercial transportation							3,366.00				3,366.00
Committee total					18,708.00		17,553.36		923.95		37,165.31

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LES ASPIN, Chairman, Jan. 28, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to Panama, Nov. 4-10, 1990:											
Warren L. Nelson	11/4	11/10	Panama		1,092.00						1,092.00
Commercial Transportation							651.00				651.00
Robert S. Rangel	11/4	11/10	Panama		1,092.00						1,092.00
Commercial Transportation							651.00				651.00
William T. Fleshman	11/4	11/7	Panama		545.00						545.00
							651.00				651.00
Visit to United Kingdom and Austria, Nov. 24-Dec. 2, 1990:											
Hon. Norman Sisisky	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/19	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Hon. Richard Ray	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Hon. Herbert H. Bateman	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Hon. H. Martin Lancaster	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Hon. James H. Bilbray	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Peter C. Scrivner	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Karen S. Heath	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Georgia C. Ostermen	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Ronald J. Bartek	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom		1,455.00						1,455.00
	11/29	12/2	Austria		651.00						651.00
Delegation expenses	11/24	11/29	United Kingdom				400.26		4,710.50		5,110.76
	11/29	12/4	Austria						68.65		68.65
Visit to the Philippines, Japan and Korea, Dec. 10-19, 1990:											
Hon. Richard Ray	12/10	12/12	Philippines		75.00						75.00
	12/12	12/15	Japan		205.50						205.50
	12/15	12/19	Korea		769.50						769.50
Commercial transportation							3,655.00				3,655.00
Michael A. West	12/10	12/12	Philippines		75.00						75.00
	12/12	12/15	Japan		205.50						205.50
	12/15	12/19	Korea		769.50						769.50
Commercial transportation							3,665.00				3,665.00
Peter M. Steffes	12/10	12/12	Philippines		75.00						75.00
	12/12	12/15	Japan		205.50						205.50
	12/15	12/19	Korea		769.50						769.50
Commercial transportation							3,655.00				3,655.00
Visit to Italy, Turkey, and Germany, Dec. 11-17, 1990:											
Hon. Beverly B. Byron	12/11	12/13	Italy		378.00						378.00
	12/13	12/15	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	12/15	12/17	Germany		108.00					108.00	
Hon. Owen B. Pickett	12/11	12/13	Italy		378.00						378.00
	12/13	12/15	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	12/15	12/17	Germany		108.00						108.00
Hon. Gene Taylor	12/11	12/13	Italy		378.00						378.00
	12/13	12/15	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	12/15	12/17	Germany		108.00						108.00
Karen S. Heath	12/11	12/13	Italy		378.00						378.00
	12/13	12/15	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	12/15	12/17	Germany		108.00						108.00
Alma B. Moore	12/11	12/13	Italy		378.00						378.00
	12/13	12/15	Turkey		324.00						324.00
	12/15	12/17	Germany		108.00						108.00
Visit to Bahamas, Dec. 18, 1990:											
James C. Waters	12/18	12/18	Bahamas		3.75						3.75
Edward J. Holton	12/18	12/18	Bahamas		3.75						3.75
Committee total					28,891.50		13,348.26		4,779.15		47,018.91

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LES ASPIN, Chairman, Jan. 28, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
P. Abbruzzese	10/25	10/27	Belgium		482.00						482.00
Commercial transportation							2,670.20				2,670.20
	11/24	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
Commercial transportation							3,672.00				3,672.00
S. Andross	11/5	11/7	Switzerland		586.00						586.00
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		472.00						472.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia		684.00						684.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland		328.00						328.00
	11/15	11/17	Belgium		482.00						482.00
Commercial transportation							5,149.00				5,149.00
Hon. D. Bereuter	11/26	11/30	United Kingdom		1,164.00						1,164.00
Commercial transportation							2,237.00				2,237.00
Hon. H. Berman	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
Military transportation											
Total					8,020.00		13,728.20				21,748.20
S. Biegun	11/29	11/30	Kenya		616.00						616.00
	12/2	12/3									
	12/4	12/6									
	11/30	12/2	Tanzania		243.00						243.00
	12/3	12/4									
	12/7	12/9	Mozambique		352.00						352.00
	12/6	12/7	South Africa		444.00						444.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial transportation	12/9	12/11									
J.J. Brady	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
Military transportation											
R. Bush	12/1	12/14	China		1,278.16				70.69		1,348.85
Total					5,009.16		5,402.69				10,411.85
Commercial transportation	12/14	12/16	Hong Kong			442.00					442.00
N. Carman	11/5	11/7	Switzerland		4,431.00						4,431.00
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		586.00						586.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia			472.00					472.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland			684.00					684.00
	11/15	11/17	Belgium			328.00					328.00
Commercial transportation											
F.M. Chambers	11/5	11/7	Philippines				5,149.00				5,149.00
	11/7	11/10	Singapore	516.00		639.00					1,155.00
	11/10	11/15	Thailand			880.00		177.47			1,057.47
	11/15	11/20	Laos			750.00					750.00
Commercial transportation											
	11/20	11/26	Hong Kong			1,476.00					1,476.00
Total				11,686.00		10,971.51					22,657.51
A. Dunn-Mouton	12/6	12/10	Senegal		780.00						780.00
	12/10	12/12	Guinea			301.33					301.33
	12/12	12/19	Ivory Coast			1,660.00					1,660.00
	12/19	12/20	Liberia								
	12/20	12/21	Gambia			100.00					100.00
	12/22	12/22	United Kingdom			97.00					97.00
Commercial transportation											
J. Eliason	11/29	12/7	Belgium		5,994.00						5,994.00
Commercial transportation											
					1,928.00		1,623.50				3,551.50
Military transportation											
M. Ennis	10/25	10/27	Belgium		405.00						405.00
Commercial transportation											
	11/8	11/10	Hungary			348.00					348.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia			684.00					684.00
	11/14	11/17	Poland			613.00				139.00	752.00
Total				12,860.33		4,293.70		139.00			17,293.03
Commercial transportation	11/17	11/18	Czechoslovakia		456.00		2,913.00				3,369.00
Military transportation	11/25	11/31	United Kingdom		2,037.00						2,037.00
D.F. Fascell	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
Military transportation											
D. Finn	12/1	12/9	Chile		1,810.00						1,810.00
Commercial transportation											
	12/13	12/14					3,480.00				3,480.00
B. Ford	11/5	11/7	Philippines		516.00						516.00
	11/7	11/10	Singapore			639.00					639.00
	11/10	11/15	Thailand			880.00		177.47			1,057.47
	11/15	11/20	Laos			750.00					750.00
Total					9,164.00		6,570.47				15,734.47
Commercial transportation	11/20	11/26	Hong Kong		1,476.00		5,640.04				7,116.04
M. Goodman	11/25	11/26	Italy								
	11/26	11/28	Switzerland		735.00						735.00
	11/28	12/1	Belgium		436.50						436.50
Commercial transportation											
R. Hathaway	11/7	11/10	Singapore		639.00						639.00
	11/10	11/13	Thailand		528.00		177.47				705.47
	11/13	11/19	Laos		750.00						750.00
Commercial transportation											
	12/15	12/23	Thailand		800.00		2,943.00				3,743.00
G. Ingram	12/15	12/23	Thailand		800.00						800.00
Commercial transportation											
D. Jarvi	10/6	10/10	United Kingdom		1,116.00						1,116.00
Commercial transportation											
							3,466.00				3,466.00
Total				6,480.50		23,228.01					29,708.51
R. Jenkins	11/8	11/9	France		245.00						245.00
	11/9	11/12	Tunisia		408.00						408.00
	11/12	11/14	Jordan		350.25						350.25
	11/14	11/18	Egypt		654.50						654.50
	11/18	11/21	Israel		540.00						540.00
Commercial transportation											
G. Kapen	11/8	11/9	France		245.00						245.00
	11/9	11/12	Tunisia		408.00						408.00
	11/12	11/14	Jordan		350.25						350.25
	11/14	11/18	Egypt		654.50						654.50
	11/18	11/23	Israel		900.00						900.00
Commercial transportation											
Hon. T. Lantos	11/10	11/11	Germany		237.00						237.00
	11/11	11/23	Hungary		2,262.00						2,262.00
	11/23	11/24	Romania		78.36		216.74				295.10
Total				7,332.86		12,862.74					20,195.60
Commercial transportation	11/24	12/2	Hungary		1,566.00		1,707.00				3,273.00
D. Latorre	12/2	12/6	Mali		940.00						940.00
	12/7	12/13	Kenya		1,092.00						1,092.00
Commercial transportation											
D. Laufman	11/29	11/30	Kenya		616.00		5,535.10				6,151.10

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
	12/2	12/3									
	12/4	12/6									
	11/30	12/2	Tanzania		243.00						243.00
	12/3	12/4									
	12/7	12/9	Mozambique		352.00						352.00
	12/6	12/7	South Africa		444.00						444.00
	12/9	12/11									
Commercial transportation							5,332.00				5,332.00
Total					5,253.00		12,574.10				17,827.10
R. McBride	11/5	11/7	Switzerland		586.00						586.00
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		522.00						522.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia		684.00						684.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland		328.00						328.00
	11/15	11/17	Belgium		482.00						482.00
Commercial transportation							5,149.00				5,149.00
F. Marshall	12/13	12/17	Haiti				538.00				538.00
Commercial transportation											
Hon. J. Meyers	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
Military transportation											
N. Mims	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
Military transportation											
Total					6,754.00		5,687.00				12,441.00
K. B. Moazed	12/2	12/6	Mali		940.00						940.00
	12/7	12/13	Kenya		1,092.00						1,092.00
Commercial transportation							5,535.10				5,535.10
S. Morrison	12/10	12/12	France		502.00						502.00
	12/12	12/19	Angola		1,645.00						1,645.00
	12/21	12/22	United Kingdom		241.00						241.00
Commercial transportation							6,633.00				6,633.00
K. Nakamura	11/4	11/6	Germany		474.00						474.00
	11/6	11/7	Switzerland		293.00						293.00
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		522.00						522.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia		684.00						684.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland		328.00						328.00
Commercial transportation							3,078.00				3,078.00
Total					6,721.00		15,246.10				21,967.10
R.S. Oliver	11/5	11/6	France		245.00						245.00
	11/6	11/8	Austria		217.00						217.00
	11/8	11/11	France		980.00						980.00
Commercial transportation							3,054.00				3,054.00
	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
	11/30	12/8	Morocco		1,320.00						1,320.00
	12/8	12/11	Algeria		357.00						357.00
	12/11	12/12	Spain		280.00						280.00
Military transportation											
Commercial transportation							1,922.10				1,922.10
Hon. W. Owens	12/6	12/7	Israel		227.00						227.00
	12/7	12/9	Egypt		480.00						480.00
	12/9	12/11	Jordan		421.75						421.75
	12/11	12/12	Syria		202.00						202.00
	12/12	12/13	Saudi Arabia		199.00						199.00
Total					6,674.75		4,976.10				11,650.85
	12/13	12/14	Oman		205.00						205.00
	12/14	12/15	Yemen		410.00						410.00
	12/15	12/18	Israel		681.00						681.00
	12/18	12/19	Jordan		193.00						193.00
	12/19	12/20	Israel		227.00						227.00
Commercial transportation							7,348.30				7,348.30
B. Paolo	11/5	11/7	Switzerland		586.00						586.00
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		472.00						472.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia		684.00						684.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland		328.00						328.00
	11/15	11/17	Belgium		482.00						482.00
Commercial transportation							5,149.00				5,149.00
Total					4,268.00		12,497.30				16,765.30
Hon. D. Payne	12/15	12/19	Ivory Coast		491.00						491.00
	12/19	12/20	Liberia								
	12/20	12/21	Gambia								
Commercial transportation							7,267.00				7,267.00
K. Peel	11/4	11/6	Germany		474.00						474.00
	11/6	11/7	Switzerland		312.85						312.85
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		522.00						522.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia		684.00						684.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland		328.00						328.00
	11/15	11/17	Belgium		482.00						482.00
Commercial transportation							5,231.00				5,231.00
M. Poloyac	11/27	12/5	Yugoslavia		1,458.00		151.20				1,609.20
Commercial transportation							5,068.40				5,068.40
Total					4,751.85	17,717.60					22,469.45
A. Powell	11/4	11/6	Germany		474.00						474.00
	11/6	11/7	Switzerland		312.86						312.86
	11/7	11/10	Hungary		522.00						522.00
	11/10	11/13	Czechoslovakia	684.00							684.00
	11/13	11/15	Poland		328.00						328.00
	11/15	11/16	Germany		234.00						234.00
Commercial transportation							3,130.00				3,130.00
M. Quarterman	12/6	12/10	Senegal		780.00						780.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial transportation	12/10	12/12	Guinea		301.34						301.34
	12/12	12/19	Ivory Coast		1,660.00						1,660.00
	12/19	12/20	Liberia								
	12/20	12/21	Gambia		100.00						100.00
	12/22	12/22	United Kingdom		97.00						97.00
<b>Total</b>					5,493.20		9,074.00				14,567.20
F. Record	12/15	12/23	Thailand		3460.00						460.00
Commercial transportation							2,868.00				2,868.00
A. Roberts	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
Military transportation	11/30	11/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
J.W. Roberts	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
Military transportation	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
S. Roth	11/9	11/11	Saudi Arabia		3200.00						200.00
	11/11	11/13	Egypt		3197.14						197.14
	11/14	11/14	Thailand		176.00						176.00
	11/14	11/19	Philippines		860.00						860.00
Commercial transportation	11/19	11/20	Malaysia		79.00						79.00
<b>Total</b>					6,124.14		7,845.00				13,969.14
R. Scheunemann	11/5	11/7	Philippines		516.00						516.00
	11/7	11/10	Singapore		639.00						639.00
	11/10	11/15	Thailand		880.00		177.47				1,057.47
	11/15	11/20	Laos		750.00						750.00
Commercial transportation	11/20	11/26	Hong Kong		1,476.00						1,476.00
D. Schlieker	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
Military transportation	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00				20.47		1,766.47
E. Schwartz	12/18	12/18	Portugal								
	12/19	12/21	Angola		470.00						470.00
	12/21	12/24	Zaire		336.00						336.00
	12/24	12/24	Rwanda								
Commercial transportation	12/24	12/24	Burundi				6,832.00				6,832.00
<b>Total</b>					7,143.00		12,654.51		20.47		19,817.98
M. Sletzinger	11/27	12/5	Yugoslavia		1,402.00			151.00			1,553.00
Commercial transportation							5,068.40				5,068.40
Hon. I. Smith	11/9	11/12	Spain		825.00						825.00
	11/12	11/15	Syria		606.00						606.00
	11/15	11/17	Saudi Arabia		398.00						398.00
Military transportation	11/17	11/20	United Kingdom		873.00			6,594.00			873.00
	11/24	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,746.00
Military transportation	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00						330.00
<b>Total</b>					6,180.00		11,813.40				17,993.40
Hon. S. Solarz	11/9	11/11	Saudi Arabia		400.00						400.00
	11/11	11/13	Egypt		3191.07						191.07
	11/14	11/14	Thailand		176.00						176.00
	11/14	11/19	Philippines		3807.02						807.02
Commercial transportation	11/19	11/20	Malaysia		158.00						158.00
	12/18	12/18	Portugal								
	12/19	12/21	Angola		470.00						470.00
	12/21	12/24	Zaire		336.00						336.00
Commercial transportation	12/24	12/24	Rwanda								
	12/24	12/24	Burundi				6,832.00				6,832.00
<b>Total</b>					2,538.09		11,799.00				14,337.09
I. Spalatin	10/6	10/10	United Kingdom		1,116.00						1,116.00
Commercial transportation							5,774.00				5,774.00
	11/25	11/27	United Kingdom		582.00						582.00
Commercial transportation	11/27	12/5	Yugoslavia		1,458.00			151.20			1,609.20
Hon. R. Torricelli	11/30	12/2	Korea		380.00			4,448.00			4,448.00
	12/2	12/3	Japan		218.00						218.00
	12/3	12/5	China		414.00						414.00
	12/5	12/6	Hong Kong		392.00						392.00
Commercial transportation	12/7	12/9	India		3170.00			6,573.20			170.00
<b>Total</b>					4,730.00		16,946.40				21,676.40
J. Weber	11/25	11/30	United Kingdom		1,746.00						1,755.84
Military transportation	11/30	12/2	Morocco		330.00				9.84		330.00
S. Weissman	12/10	12/11	France		502.00						502.00
	12/12	12/14	Angola		470.00						470.00
Commercial transportation	12/15	12/16	Belgium		241.00						241.00
R. Wilson	11/7	11/9	France		245.00			6,219.00			6,219.00
	11/9	11/12	Tunisia		408.00						245.00
	11/12	11/14	Jordan		350.25						408.00
	11/14	11/18	Egypt		654.50						350.25
Commercial transportation	11/18	11/21	Israel		540.00			6,323.00			654.50
<b>Total</b>					5,486.75		12,542.00		9.84		18,038.59

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. H. Wolpe	12/10	12/11	France		502.00						502.00
	12/12	12/14	Angola		470.00						470.00
	12/14	12/15	Gabon		142.00						142.00
	12/15	12/19	Ivory Coast		491.00						491.00
	12/19	12/20	Liberia								
	12/20	12/21	Gambia								
	12/22	12/22	United Kingdom		97.00						97.00
Commercial transportation							7,025.00				7,025.00
Total					1,702.00		7,025.00				8,727.00
Grand total for 4th quarter											369,996.77

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Represents refund of unused per diem.

DANTE B. FASCELL, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1990.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Helen Delich Bentley	11/8	11/8	Germany								
	11/8	11/8	Yugoslavia								
	11/9	11/10	Greece		( <sup>3</sup> )	4,985.50					4,985.50
Joan M. Bondareff	10/29	11/3	United Kingdom	713.29	1,395.00		3,672.00				5,207.00
						73.00	140.00				6,442.00
Joan M. Bondareff	11/26	12/8	Chile	651.300	2,004.00		4,438.00				6,067.00
Gina DeFerrari	11/26	12/12	Australia	2,110.86	7,120.00		4,947.00				4,399.00
James K. McCallum	11/10	11/17	Spain	159.542	1,710.00		2,689.00				6,375.00
Thomas O. Melius	11/26	12/6	Australia	2,110.86	7,150.00		5,025.00				4,593.00
Charles O. Moore	10/31	11/8	Switzerland	2,172.15	1,701.00		2,892.00				4,130.00
Rodney H. Moore	11/11	11/16	Spain	132.952	1,425.00		2,650.00				4,130.00
							55.00				4,130.00
Jeffrey R. Pike	11/11	11/15	Spain	132.952	1,425.00		2,705.00				4,130.00
Duncan C. Smith III	11/20	12/2	United Kingdom	1,784.10	3,492.00		3,672.00				7,345.05
						92.50	181.05				400.00
Edmund B. Welch	12/4	12/9	Netherlands		940.00						400.00
Cynthia M. Wilkinson	11/20	12/2	United Kingdom	1,784.10	3,492.00		3,672.00				7,264.00
						49.90	100.00				61,337.55
Committee total					19,514.00		41,823.55				61,337.55

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Per diem not requested.<sup>4</sup> Military transportation costs.<sup>5</sup> Commercial airfare.<sup>6</sup> Local ground transportation.<sup>7</sup> Travelers authorized \$1,620.00; Jan. 10, 1991, DeFerrari returned \$500 to U.S. Treasury; Jan. 15, 1991, Melius returned \$270 to U.S. Treasury.<sup>8</sup> Transportation—train fare.<sup>9</sup> Cash advance issued by Department of State.

WALTER B. JONES, Chairman, Jan. 17, 1991.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Robert A. Borski	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Hon. Bob Clement	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Hon. William F. Clinger	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Hon. Jerry F. Costello	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Hon. J.P. Hammerschmidt	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Hon. James L. Oberstar	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Edward G. Feddeaman	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Caroline D. Gabel	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
David A. Heymsfeld	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Charles C. Ziegler	12/11	12/13	Canada		629.31				176.37		805.68
Hon. Bud Shuster	11/08	11/09	Chile	213.75	171.00						171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00						657.00
	11/13	11/18	Australia	1,335.60	1,050.00			37.98	29.86		1,079.86
Erla A. Youmans	11/08	11/09	Chile	213.75	171.00						171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00						657.00
	11/13	11/18	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00			37.98	29.86		1,504.86
	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00						492.00
Committee total					10,966.10				1,823.42		12,789.52

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT A. ROE, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Dr. Eileen Lee	10/7	10/14	Brazil		4,238.20						4,238.20
Hon. Norman Mineta	11/7	11/10	Switzerland								
Commercial air							660.00				660.00
Hon. Robert A. Roe	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
Hon. Harold L. Volkmer	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Hon. James A. Hayes	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
David D. Clement	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
John S. Doyle	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Gloria J. Dunderman	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Earley T. Green	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Carolyn C. Greenfield	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Kathy E. Guilfoyle	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Robert C. Ketcham	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Robert E. Palmer	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
James H. Paul	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
William S. Smith	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Sherri L. Stone	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/8	11/9	Chile	213.75	171.00					213.75	171.00
	11/10	11/12	New Zealand	1,067.65	657.00					1,067.65	657.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Hon. Thomas C. McMillen	11/21	11/22	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
	11/11	11/12	New Zealand	355.88	219.00					355.88	219.00
	11/13	11/20	Australia	1,876.20	1,475.00					1,876.20	1,475.00
Commercial air							6,779.00				6,779.00
Hon. Norman Mineta	11/18	11/20	Australia	536.06	421.22					536.06	421.22
Commercial air	11/21	11/21	Hong Kong	3,834.20	492.00					3,834.20	492.00
Commercial air							3,598.00				3,598.00
Committee total					45,975.42		11,037.00				57,012.42

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ROBERT A. ROE, Chairman, Jan. 30, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Sam Gibbons	11/30	12/03	Belgium	22,051	723.00						723.00
Military transportation							10,301.11				10,301.11
	11/12	11/14	Switzerland	610.20	486.00						486.00
Commercial transportation							2,806.00				2,806.00
Hon. Sander Levin	11/08	11/10	Switzerland	618.20	486.00						1,146.00
	11/30	12/03	Belgium	22,051	723.00						723.00
Military transportation							10,301.11				10,301.11
Hon. Don Pease	11/30	12/03	Belgium	22,051	723.00						723.00
Military transportation							10,301.11				10,301.11
Meredith Broadbent	11/29	12/07	Belgium	58,804	1,928.00						1,928.00
Commercial transportation							1,543.00				1,543.00
Military transportation							2,316.59				2,316.59
Janet Nuzum	11/29	12/08	Belgium		2,169.00						2,169.00
Frank Pfifer	11/12	11/14	Switzerland	610.20	486.00						486.00
	11/14	11/16	Belgium	14,711	482.00						482.00
Commercial transportation							2,806.00				2,806.00
	11/30	12/03	Belgium	22,051	723.00						723.00

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Military transportation											
Joanna Shelton	11/05	11/16	Switzerland		2,673.00		10,301.11				10,301.11
George Weise	10/30	11/06	Switzerland	3,400.10	2,673.00		2,892.00				5,565.00
	11/29	12/08	Belgium	2,181.55	1,701.00		2,892.00				4,593.00
				66,155	2,169.00						2,169.00
Commercial transportation							1,746.00				1,746.00
Military transportation							2,316.59				2,316.59
Mary Jane Wignot	11/18	11/29	Switzerland		2,673.00						2,673.00
	11/29	12/08	Belgium		2,083.20						2,083.20
Commercial transportation							2,816.50				2,816.50
Thelma Askey	11/30	12/03	Belgium	22,051	723.00						723.00
Military transportation							10,301.11				10,301.11
Committee total					21,433.20		77,010.01				98,443.21

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman, Jan. 24, 1991.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Congressman Charles B. Rangel	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Congressman Lawrence Coughlin	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Commercial transportation							1,448.42	331.00			1,448.42
Military transportation							63.51				63.51
Congressman Frank Guarini	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Commercial transportation							277.00				277.00
Military transportation							1,167.55				1,167.55
Congressman Solomon Ortiz	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							1,448.42				1,448.42
Congressman Wally Herger	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Edward H. Jurith	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
William Smith	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Rebecca Hedlund	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Jennifer A. Brophy	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Ruthie Thompson	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Mary Frances Valentino	12/10	12/12	Mexico		304.00		63.51				367.51
	12/12	12/13	Guatemala		155.00		(3)				155.00
Military transportation							2,357.92				2,357.92
Committee total					5,049.00		24,234.36				29,283.36

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Information not yet available.

CHARLES B. RANGEL, Chairman.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel A. Childs, Jr., staff	11/5	11/6	Central America		99.00						99.00
	11/6	11/15	South America		1,377.00						1,377.00
Commercial airfare							455.00				455.00
Military air							11,729.80				11,729.80
Louis H. Dupart, staff	11/5	11/6	Central America		99.00						99.00
	11/6	11/15	South America								1,377.00
Military air							11,729.80				11,729.80
Hon. Bill Richardson	11/10	11/17	Africa		987.00						987.00
	11/17	11/20	South America		417.00						417.00
Commercial airfare							3,121.00				3,121.00
Military air							12,458.36				12,458.36
Hon. Bud Shuster	11/13	11/15	Australia				796.57				796.57
Bernard Raimo, staff	12/3	12/9	Asia		1,218.00						1,218.00
Commercial airfare							4,023.00				4,023.00
Kenneth M. Kodama, staff	12/9	12/19	Asia		1,387.00						1,387.00
Commercial airfare							2,690.00				2,690.00
Military air							2,260.50				2,260.50
Joyce E. Pratt, staff	12/9	12/13	Asia		560.00						560.00
Commercial airfare							2,375.00				2,375.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Committee total					7,521.00		51,639.03				59,160.03

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVE McCURDY, Acting Chairman, Jan. 31, 1990.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

579. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Acquisition), Department of the Air Force, transmitting notice that the Air Force plans to conduct the cost comparisons for base operating support at Goodfellow and Reese Air Force Bases, TX, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

580. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting selected acquisition reports [SARS] for the quarter ending September 30, 1990, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

581. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarship Program—notice of final procedures, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

582. A letter from the Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to the Dominican Republic (Transmittal No. 5-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

583. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions for Charles R. Baquet III, of Maryland, Ambassador Extraordinary to the Republic of Djibouti, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

584. A letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting arms control impact statements for the fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2576(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

585. A letter from the Postal Rate Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for 1990 on the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552d; to the Committee on Government Operations.

586. A letter from the Executive Director, Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1404; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

587. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the biennial report on the Senior Executive Service, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3135(a), 4314(d); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

588. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Legislative Affairs), Department of State, transmitting a report on measures the Department has undertaken for conservation and protection of sea turtles, pursuant to Public Law 101-162, section 609(a)(5)(C) (103

Stat. 1038); jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

589. A letter from the Director (Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management), Department of Energy, transmitting notice that the report detailing the expenditure of fiscal year 1990 environmental restoration and waste management funds will be delayed until April 15, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 101-189, section 3141(c)(1), (2) (103 Stat. 1680); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Appropriations, and Energy and Commerce.

### 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. TOWNS:

H.R. 838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for tuition paid by parents for the college education of their children or paid by certain independent taxpayers for their own college education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. APPELGATE:

H.R. 839. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase from \$50,000 to \$100,000 the amount of life insurance provided to members of the Armed Forces under the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance and Veterans' Group Life Insurance Programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PURSELL:

H.R. 840. A bill to improve counseling services for elementary school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONTZ (for himself, Mr. RIDGE,

Mr. EVANS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. APPELGATE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Ms. LONG, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. REED, and Mr. LANCASTER):

H.R. 841. A bill to expand services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JONTZ (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JACOBS,

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. GEREN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PENNY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 842. A bill to provide for the protection of the remaining ancient forests on the Federal lands of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

By Mr. ATKINS (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ROE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. RAVENEL):

H.R. 843. A bill to establish national standards for the manufacture and labeling of certain plumbing products in order to conserve and protect water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ATKINS (for himself, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PEASE, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BELENSON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 844. A bill to provide for the improved management of the Nation's water resources; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. HENRY):

H.R. 845. A bill to require the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health to conduct a study of the prevalence and issues related to contamination of workers' homes with hazardous chemicals and substances transported from their workplace and to issue or report on regulations to prevent or mitigate the future contamination of workers' homes, and for other purposes.

poses; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE (for himself and Mr. MACHTLEY):

H.R. 846. A bill to delay during the Persian Gulf conflict the implementation of reductions in authorized inpatient mental health services under CHAMPUS and changes in the management of such services; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 847. A bill to redesignate Custer Battlefield National Monument as the Little Bighorn National Battlefield Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 848. A bill to authorize the establishment of a memorial at Custer Battlefield National Monument to honor the Indians who fought in the Battle of the Little Bighorn, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 849. A bill to amend title 1 of the United States Code to define the type of adjournment that prevents the return of a bill by the President, and to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate to receive bills returned by the President at any time their respective Houses are not in session; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CARPER):

H.R. 850. A bill to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 851. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to phase out the earnings test over a 5-year period for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (for herself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. FROST, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SAVAGE):

H.R. 852. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to increase outreach to small disadvantaged businesses that are potential contractors or subcontractors with the Department of Defense, through a variety of methods, and to require potential defense contractors to certify compliance with equal opportunity requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan):

H.R. 853. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to administer a program of construction and revitalization

of public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STARK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. COSTELLO):

H.R. 854. A bill to protect the national security by prohibiting profiteering of essential commodities during periods of national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALCOMA VAEGA:

H.R. 855. A bill to include the Territory of American Samoa in the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH (for himself, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LENT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. SOLOMON):

H.R. 856. A bill to provide for adherence with the MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Rules, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 857. A bill to provide a constitutional Federal death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mr. BERREUTER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):

H.R. 858. A bill to amend the International Air Transportation Competition Act of 1979; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 859. A bill to assist schools in improving student performance through flexibility, program accountability, and incentives; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 860. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the coverage

of hospice care under Medicaid plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of New York:

H.R. 861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the gasoline tax for purposes of providing additional revenues for the mass transit account in the highway trust fund and for purposes of reducing the deficit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOAGLAND (for himself, Mr. SABO, and Mr. WEBER):

H.R. 862. A bill to provide that certain games of chance conducted by a nonprofit organization not be treated as an unrelated trade or business of such organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the exclusion from gross income for combat pay received by a commissioned officer to \$2,000 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.R. 864. A bill to provide for a constitutional death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DOWNEY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROE, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.R. 865. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase of up to 5 in the number of years disregarded in determining average annual earnings on which benefit amounts are based upon a showing of preclusion from remunerative work during such years occasioned by need to provide child care or care to a chronically dependent relative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. FROST, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 866. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exempt from the earnings test amounts earned for child care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 867. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide penalties for physical trainers who induce athletes to use anabolic steroids; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 868. A bill to control the transfer of arms to countries that threaten world peace, including countries that are the subject of a United Nations or United States blockade or embargo; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Agriculture, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE:

H.R. 869. A bill to modify the effective date of an amendment relating to title 11 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK of

Massachusetts, Mr. GEREN of TEXAS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN);

H.R. 870. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide management standards and recycling requirements for spent lead-acid batteries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEREN of TEXAS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RIDGE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN);

H.R. 871. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require producers and importers of tires to recycle a certain percentage of scrap tires each year, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a recycling credit system for carrying out such recycling requirement, to establish a management and tracking system for such tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEREN of TEXAS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN);

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from listing used oil and affiliated materials as a hazardous waste under that act, to require producers and importers of lubricating oil to recycle a certain percentage of used oil each year, to require the Administrator to establish a recycling credit system for carrying out such recycling requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEREN of TEXAS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. WYDEN)

H.R. 873. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require producers and importers of newsprint to recycle a certain percentage of newsprint each year, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a recycling credit system for carrying out such recycling requirement, to establish a management and tracing system for such newsprint, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 874. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of temporary lodging expenses incurred by family members who receive transportation incident to the hospitalization of a member of the Armed Forces for a serious illness or serious injury sustained by the member in the line of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 875. A bill to make the import alert issued by the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the drug RU-486 ineffective and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 876. A bill to require that passenger vans shall be subject to the same Federal motor vehicle safety standards as are applicable to passenger motor vehicles and to require manufacturers of motor vehicles to provide for dissemination to the public all vehicle warranty and repair information provided dealers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 877. A bill entitled the "Former Presidential Enough Is Enough and Taxpayers Relief Act of 1991"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for public financing of advertising and related expenses in campaigns for the House of Representatives and to prohibit contributions by multicandidate political committees to candidates who accept such financing; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 879. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, to provide for rewards for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of certain kidnapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 880. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 881. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the manufacture, sale, and use of radar detectors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 882. A bill to amend Public Law 85-745 to provide that a former President may receive monetary allowances under that law only after waiving any rights to receive any other annuity or pension to which the former President would otherwise be entitled under any other Federal law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 883. A bill to make "America, the Beautiful" the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 884. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize reduced-rate air transportation to the United States for certain persons who have been or will be adopted by a resident of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 885. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit the next of kin of a deceased veteran to designate the style of flag to be furnished at the burial of such veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 886. A bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency, which shall be headed by a Social Security Board, and which shall be responsible for the administration of the Old-age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Program under title II of the Social Security Act and the Supplemental Security Income Program under title XVI of such Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 887. A bill to provide for improved investment policies for the Social Security trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LONG:

H.R. 888. A bill to exclude the receipts and disbursements for the Unemployment Trust Fund (and its administrative expenses) from the calculation of discretionary spending limits, deficits, and maximum deficit amounts for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; jointly, to the Committee on Government Operations and Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the tax on interest received by foreigners on certain portfolio investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 890. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the indexing of the basis of the taxpayer's principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 891. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the business deduction for any amount paid or incurred for regularly scheduled air transportation to the extent such amount exceeds the normal tourist class fare for such transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase to 32 cents per pack the Federal excise tax on cigarettes and to provide that the revenues from the addi-

tional tax shall be deposited in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 893. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to require actual dependency as a condition of a stepchild's eligibility for child's insurance benefits, thereby preventing an insured individual's stepchildren from qualifying for such benefits on his or her wage record (and thereby reducing the benefits of his or her natural children) if they are being supported by their natural parent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 894. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that social security taxes shall not apply to payments made to State and local government employees under law in the nature of workmen's compensation acts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 895. A bill to eliminate the exemption for Congress or for the United States from the application of certain provisions of Federal law relating to employment and privacy, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Government Operations.

H.R. 896. A bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, delivery, or importation of certain motor vehicles and rail cars that do not have seat belts, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 897. A bill to make a technical amendment to the Mount Rushmore Commemorative Coin Act to conform to the intent of Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. ROSE):

H.R. 898. A bill related to the Herbert C. Bonner Bridge; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN of California):

H.R. 899. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to reduce the potential liability of the United States for losses from the deposit insurance funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KOLTER:

H.R. 900. A bill to provide that any veterans' benefits that were cut during the 1980's shall be restored to the level in effect before the cuts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 901. A bill to amend section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to establish additional procedures and requirements relating to the identification and disposition of environmentally sensitive land and other property with natural, cultural, recreational, or scientific values of special significance by the Resolution Trust Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 902. A bill to provide assistance to recipients of loans from the Small Business Administration who are affected by military service as part of Operation Desert Storm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 903. A bill to require the payment of reparations by Iraq following the conclusion of Operation Desert Storm; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 904. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a national historic landmark theme study on African American history; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H.R. 905. A bill to ensure that agencies establish the appropriate procedures for assessing whether or not regulation may result in the taking of private property, so as to avoid such where possible; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 906. A bill to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to encourage a broader range of training and job placement for women and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H.R. 907. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit alternative methods for qualifying "ability-to-benefit" students for Federal student financial aid; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 908. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, and other provisions of law to provide improved benefits and services for military personnel who serve during the Persian Gulf war, including particularly benefits and services for members of the National Guard and Reserve components, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, Armed Services, Ways and Means, Small Business, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 909. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Sunnyside, WA., to the Sunnyside Valley Irrigation District; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON (for himself, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.R. 910. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish the Fast Flux Test Facility as a research and development center to be known as the Research Reactor User Complex; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 911. A bill to encourage the States to enact legislation to grant immunity from

personal civil liability, under certain circumstances, to volunteers working on behalf of nonprofit organizations and governmental entities; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 912. A bill to reform the Federal deposit insurance system by limiting the amount of insurable deposits of any person to \$100,000; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for contributions to candidates for election to the House of Representatives from the congressional district in which the taxpayer resides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 914. A bill to provide an improved program of extended unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER:

H.R. 915. A bill to assure that United States assistance and benefits for the Soviet Union are made available, on an equitable basis, to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 916. A bill to reauthorize the waste treatment construction grants program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROYBAL (for himself, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. DERRICK, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GALLO, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. YATES, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. POSHARD, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ROE, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. LENT, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. CARR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. MINK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE,

Mr. INHOFE, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LUKE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. DAVIS:

H.R. 917. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for a more gradual period of transition—under a new alternative formula with respect to such transition—to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 as such changes apply to workers born in years after 1916 and before 1927—and related beneficiaries—and to provide for increases in such workers' benefits accordingly, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 918. A bill to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public domain lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. MOLOHAN, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HEFFNER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. ROE, and Mrs. LLOYD):

H.R. 919. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to make available for humanitarian relief purposes nonlethal surplus personal property, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Armed Services, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 920. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prepare and implement cooperative drought contingency plans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself and Mr. BEREUTER):

H.R. 921. A bill to prohibit the disposal of solid waste in any State other than the State in which the waste was generated; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 922. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to further restrict contributions to candidates by multicandidate political committees, require full disclosure of attempts to influence Federal elections through soft money and independent expenditures, correct inequities resulting from personal financing of campaigns, strengthen the role of political parties, and contain the cost of political campaigns; jointly, to the Committee on House Administration and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 923. A bill to authorize the reformulation of the Cedar Bluff Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Kansas, to provide for the amendment of water service and repayment contracts; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS:

H.R. 924. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1989 which require the withholding of income tax from wages paid for agricultural labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSE:

H.R. 925. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to permit the city of Fayetteville, NC, to allow vehicular traffic, other than buses, to use Hay Street; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROWLAND:

H.R. 926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt distributions to members of the reserves while on active duty from the additional tax on early distributions from qualified retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 927. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that any carrier offering obstetrical benefits under the Health Benefits Program for Federal employees must also provide benefits relating to certain family-building procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 928. A bill to provide for the applicability of combat-related tax benefits to Operation Desert Storm participants serving in Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHARP (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 929. A bill to make certain technical corrections in the Solar, Wind, Waste, and Geothermal Power Production Incentives Act of 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 930. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to adopt and enforce certain guardianship laws providing protection and rights to awards and individuals subject to guardianship proceedings as a condition of eligibility for receiving funds under the Medicaid Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction from gross income for home care and adult day and respite care expenses of individual taxpayers with respect to a dependent of the taxpayer who suffer from Alzheimer's disease or related organic brain disorder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine):

H.R. 932. A bill to settle all claims of the Aroostook Band of Micmacs resulting from the band's omission from the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act of 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 933. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to prevent double counting of income in the conduct of needs analysis for student assistance under that Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 934. A bill to prohibit the export of satellites intended for launch-from-launch vehicles owned by the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 935. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to require the congressional intelligence committees to establish certain procedures to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of information furnished to those committees; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

H.R. 936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child care credit for lower-income working parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 937. A bill to direct the President to impose certain limitations on the amount of milk protein products that may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 938. A bill to require agreement entered into with certain foreign countries, that involve the exchange or transfer of scientific or technological information to be submitted to the Secretary of Defense; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.R. 939. A bill to provide eligibility to members of the Selected Reserve for the Veterans Home Loan Program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to modify the full-funding limitation in the case of multiemployer plans; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and Labor.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

H.R. 941. A bill to amend part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the premium amounts for those enrolled under such part and to amend section 218(n) of such act to provide for a transition in the case of voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees under Medicare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. JAMES, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 942. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow taxpayers to designate \$1 of their income tax liability and some or all of their income tax refunds, and to contribute additional amounts, for purposes of rehabilitation and treatment in combating the war on drugs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SYNAR:

H.R. 943. A bill to amend the National Park Service Concessions Policy Act to foster competition among concessioners, to improve management of concessions consistent with the preservation of resources and the purposes of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SYNAR (for himself, Mr. DARDEN, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 944. A bill to provide for domestic livestock grazing fees for public rangeland reflecting the fair market value of forage on those lands; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WISE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.R. 945. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to require States to provide an opportunity for their citizens to participate in comprehensive recycling programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 946. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a program for expanding the capacity of heavily traveled portions of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways located in urbanized areas with a population of 50,000 or more for the purposes of reducing traffic congestion, improving safety, and increasing the efficiency of the system; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. ECK-ART, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 947. A bill to authorize appropriations for local rail freight assistance through fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MOODY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FISH and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 948. A bill to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 120 North Henry Street in Madison, WI, as the "Robert W. Kastenmeier United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. WILSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SANTORUM):

H.J. Res. 112. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the terms of offices of Members of Congress and increasing the term of Representatives to 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 113. Joint resolution for the relief of Alexander Vraciu; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for balanced budgets and elimination of the Federal indebtedness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 115. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal clause 11, of section 8, of article I of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the expenditure of money to elect public officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 117. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the compelling of testimony from a defendant in a criminal case in open court, a restriction on the use of prior convictions except when they are an element of the crime charged, and the right of a defendant in a criminal case to be informed of the evidence against him; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the President to grant a pardon to an individual only after such individual has been convicted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 119. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit service by Representatives, Senators, and Federal judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS of California (for himself and Mrs. BYRON):

H.J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to designate May 1991 as "National Physical Fitness and Sports Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NATCHER (for himself, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. ROGERS):

H.J. Res. 121. Joint resolution to designate June 1, 1992, as "Kentucky Bicentennial Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the right to life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to designate Tuesday, October 15, 1991, as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RUSSO:

H.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect unborn children and other persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LONG, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PAXON, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. WALSH, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. TRAXLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. RITTER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CONTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. DORNAN of California, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. MINK, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. ROE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WEBER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. KOLTE):

H.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning November 24, 1991, and

the week beginning November 22, 1992, each as "National Family Caregivers Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to require that congressional resolutions setting forth levels of total budget outlays and Federal revenues must be agreed to by two-thirds vote of both Houses of the Congress if the level of outlays exceeds the level of revenues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to call to active duty additional members of the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service for the purpose of responding to the shortage of health care providers in the United States that has occurred as a result of the Persian Gulf conflict, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning May 19, 1991, as "National Police Athletic League Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the deployment in the Persian Gulf conflict of troops of the U.S. Armed Forces who are members of the same family; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution condemning the use of rapid decompression as a method of animal euthanasia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that federally funded school lunches should provide optional meatless meals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any Federal agency that utilizes the Draize rabbit eye irritancy test should develop and validate alternative ophthalmic testing procedures that do not require the use of animal test subjects; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding reinstatement of certain public arrival ceremonies to honor the members of the U.S. Armed Forces who die in the Persian Gulf conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. FEIGHAN):

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Japan should fulfill its commitment to defend the air space and sea lanes within 1,000 nautical miles of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H. Res. 56. Resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 57. Resolution designating majority membership on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H. Res. 58. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Armed Services in the first session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Res. 59. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the first session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself and Mr. SOLOMON):

H. Res. 60. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Rules in the first session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. HORTON):

H. Res. 61. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Government Operations in the first session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. DAVIS):

H. Res. 62. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the first session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H. Res. 63. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Small Business in the first session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H. Res. 64. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide that any general appropriation bill making appropriations for the Veterans' Administration may not make appropriations for any other department or agency of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 65. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 1st session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. COUGHLIN):

H. Res. 66. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control in the 1st session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROE (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H. Res. 67. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation in the 1st session of the 102d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 68. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Aging in the 1st session of the

102d Congress; the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 69. Resolution establishing the House of Representatives Classified Information Security Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

12. The SPEAKER presented memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to the U.N. Security Council resolutions against Iraqi aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. ROSE introduced a bill (H.R. 949) to authorize coastwise documentation for the vessel *Windward III*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 16: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 34: Mr. WOLF, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 77: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 78: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 85: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 112: Mr. YATES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 123: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 138: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 142: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 179: Mr. BAKER and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 180: Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 193: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FIELDS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 232: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 234: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 246: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KYL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GEREN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 249: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. JONES of North

Carolina, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 261: Mr. HORTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 300: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 315: Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 317: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, and Mr. TAXLER.

H.R. 320: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 327: Mr. HENRY, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 328: Mr. BROWN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 394: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. FROST, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 413: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. RHODES, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 446: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. YATES, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 447: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 460: Mr. STOKES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 473: Mr. STUMP and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 481: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 542: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HALL of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 559: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 560: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 565: Mr. HORTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KYL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 566: Mr. HYDE and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 601: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 611: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 614: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 617: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 637: Mr. HORTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. POSHARD, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mrs. MINK.

H.R. 640: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HUBBARD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RITTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WYLIE.

H.R. 643: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. WEBER, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 644: Mr. STOKES, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 645: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 652: Mr. HUGHES and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 661: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 666: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 667: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 690: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 707: Ms. LONG.

H.R. 724: Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 738: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 744: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROSE, Mr. TALLON, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 745: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 755: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 763: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 767: Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 773: Mr. LEVINE of California and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 805: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. MONTGOMERY.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. KYL, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MORELLA, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.J. Res. 95: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.J. Res. 97: Mr. STOKES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. CARR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. GREEN, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROE, Mr. RAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FROST, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Ms. LONG, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. MINK, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LENT.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. BEVILL.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. HORTON.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. RITTER, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. CRANE.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. KYL, Mr. SMITH of TEXAS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. FROST.

H. Res. 12: Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. COX of Illinois.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

23. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Federal Bar Association, Los Angeles, CA, relative to the Ethics Reform Act of 1989; which was referred jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Post Office and Civil Service.