

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 5, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O God, that each person of our Nation has opportunity to celebrate the rich history and heritage that is ours to experience. We are grateful for our many backgrounds and for the diversity that we bring to our communities. We pray also, O God of all people, that we will know and practice a spirit of unity and wholeness among ourselves and our communities, and more fully represent the purpose of Your creation. May Your spirit, O God, that gave to all the gift of life, unite us in our purposes and in our goals that we will reflect the beauty of creation and the grace of Your love to us. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EDWARDS of California 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 the Senate had passed a joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution entitled "National Day of Prayer and Thanksgiving"; and S. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution commending the President and the Armed Forces for the success of Operation Desert Storm.

The message also announced that the Chair announces on behalf of the chairman of the Finance Committee those members of the committee designated by the chairman to serve as members of the Joint Committee on Taxation for the 102d Congress: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. DOLE.

The message also announced that, pursuant to Public Law 93-618, as amended, the Chair on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, appoints the following members of the Finance Committee as congressional advisers on trade policy and negotiations and as official advisers to the U.S. delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. DOLE; and as alternative official advisers to the above negotiations: Mr. BOREN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BREAU, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. SYMMS, and Mr. GRASSLEY.

CONGRESS SHOULD SUPPORT NON-PROLIFERATION OF ARMS IN MIDEAST

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, you remember the theme from "Jaws," and just when you thought it was safe to go back in the water, the shark was circling? Well, just when you thought it was safe to go back in the waters of the Middle East, the sharks are circling. In this case, Mr. Speaker, the world's arms merchants are circling.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal carried an article which I will put in the RECORD later which all Members should read, indicating that some of the very highest technology nightfighting equipment which our soldiers and sailors used so beneficially, protecting their lives in prosecuting Desert Storm, will be, if the arms merchants of the world have their way, sold to these unstable nations, possibly to be used against our people in a future conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the President and Secretary Baker, who said they are going to seek nonproliferation of arms in the area. I hope they are successful. I certainly think Congress ought to support them in those efforts.

CRIME VICTIMS RIGHTS WEEK

(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, at this very moment there is convening in our Capital City a summit on crime. In every single year, 35 million Americans are victims of crime. As the President turns his attention to the new world order, it will include an emphasis on law enforcement and a crackdown on crime. In the meantime, we will be reviving Crime Victims Rights Week, that is scheduled to be celebrated this April 21 through 27. Last year we had a rousing meeting of this celebration in the White House, and we want to revive it for this year.

Mr. Speaker, we are introducing a resolution to designate that week as Crime Victims Rights Week, and ask for cosponsorship among Members in the House.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS ON DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991 AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, Tuesday, March 5, 1991, to file two reports accompanying two privileged bills making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1991 making dire emergency supplemental appropriations, and for other purposes; and for the Department of Defense for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

Mr. MCDADE reserved all points of order on the bills.

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

There was no objection.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY'S LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, nearly 1 year ago, the president of Stanford University, Donald Kennedy, turned up the heat on a simmering complaint among students and ignited a national debate with his assertion that the academic community had been neglecting undergraduate learning for the sake of scholarly out-

□ 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.

put. On Sunday, President Kennedy fulfilled his commitment to reassert the role of teaching when Stanford released its plan to reward professors for their devotion to instruction.

A student who has been fortunate to have learned from a dedicated and enthusiastic professor carries a love of learning through life and to all those he or she touches. I am pleased that our Nation's finest institutions of higher learning have stated their desire to reinvigorate the classroom, and I am particularly proud that Stanford University has provided the leadership in this endeavor.

NO PENSIONS FOR FELONS, H.R. 1077

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, banning honoraria and tightening ethics guidelines were two positive steps we took in the 101st Congress to rebuild public faith in the credibility of our institution. I call upon my colleagues today to show their continued support for efforts on this front.

Currently, a Member of Congress convicted of a felony may continue to receive a Federal pension, funded in part by the American taxpayer.

As lawmakers, we are obviously duty bound to be law abiders.

It is simply unconscionable that an elected official be permitted to draw a publicly funded pension after showing blatant disregard for the laws of this Nation.

Last week, I introduced H.R. 1077, legislation that would deny a Member of Congress convicted of a felony the federally funded portion of his annuity.

Under this bill, a convicted official would receive only his or her own contributions, thereby ensuring that the American taxpayer funds only the retirement benefits of those public officials who have earned the public's trust.

Today I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE SYSTEM—A SYSTEM IN CATASTROPHIC FAILURE

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the American health care system is a system in catastrophic failure.

We pay far more for medical services than any other country in the world, and we get much too little in return.

The system defies most traditional laws of economics. Demand for health services seems almost unlimited: The more money people have, the more

they spend on health. Competition to provide those services actually drives prices up: The more providers there are, the higher the cost for care. In fact, health care is a business that creates its own demand. Research has shown that the number of surgical procedures performed corresponds to the number of surgeons in any given area, not the number of patients.

Perhaps most paradoxical is the fact that while one-third of the Nation's hospital beds are empty, hospital construction continues to rise.

Essentially, three key factors are at play.

Costs are too high. The quality of care is uneven. Access to care is inequitable.

We must begin to restructure our health care system now with the goal that: All persons have the medical care necessary to sustain life or free them from disability; that they have the chance to lead meaningful, productive lives regardless of their disease, their place of residence, or their ability to pay.

□ 1210

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION URGING ALL ARAB NATIONS TO RECOGNIZE STATE OF ISRAEL

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today Representative NITA LOWEY and I are introducing a resolution urging all Arab nations to recognize and end their state of hostility with the State of Israel.

We envision progress toward peace in the Arab-Israeli conflict as a result of the postwar period, but while we all rejoice that the war against Iraq may be over, we must not forget that a state of war continues in the Middle East. All of the Arab nations except one, have refused to recognize Israel's existence.

For 8 years, the Arab nations had led an effort in the United Nations to oust Israel and to undercut her legitimacy. Through warfare and an economic boycott, these Arab countries have tried to wipe Israel off the map.

A first step toward a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is for the Arab nations to recognize the State of Israel. I encourage all of our colleagues to support this legislation and join us in being a part of this important effort.

UNITED STATES SHOULD OFFER MANPOWER AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO MITIGATE OIL DAMAGE IN MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, 800 of Kuwait's oil wells are in flames. A smoky pall smothers the area from Turkey to Iran and could spread as far as India. Grimy toxic rain could contaminate regional crops. Residents in Turkey have been ordered not to use rainwater or allow their animals to drink it.

Oil 40 times the equivalent of the Exxon Valdez spill has flooded the gulf. Yesterday my office asked the State Department what is being done to expedite environmental cleanup. While it is common knowledge that private interests, such as Red Adair, are rushing to the scene, my staff has been informed that our Government has done nothing because there has been no request from the Kuwaiti Government.

Such a disaster should not await a formal request from the Emir, if he does get back to Kuwait City. We should offer all of the manpower and technical assistance at our disposal immediately and initiate international cooperative efforts within the region and at the United Nations to mitigate the damage. We must act now to clean up Saddam's vile legacy.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1991, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 158

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, March 6, 1991, to consider House Joint Resolution 158 in the House; that debate on said resolution be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] or their designees; and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORT BROOMFIELD RESOLUTION PRAISING PRESIDENT BUSH AND OUR TROOPS

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening the President will address a joint session of the Congress to report on the successful conclusion of the war in the Persian Gulf, and it is indeed a time for celebration and also a time for thanks.

As Commander in Chief, the President represents all of those who have been involved in this successful effort from the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military lead-

ers and certainly, most of all, the troops that have performed so ably. And also I would suggest those in the much maligned defense industry whose work has made it possible to develop the high-technology weapons that enabled our troops to perform so well.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], has produced a resolution which we will be voting on which expresses our appreciation not only to the troops and to our leadership, but importantly, to President George Bush, recognizing his steadfast leadership. Mr. Speaker, when others had doubts, the President of the United States held a steady course. He understood the strategy involved. He was right about sanctions, he was right about the strategy to minimize casualties, he was right about the air war, and I think it is a fitting tribute to the President of the United States that we support his resolution.

I urge my colleagues to vote aye on the Broomfield resolution.

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT SUPPORT THE EMIR AS NEW DICTATOR IN KUWAIT

(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, American and allied troops did not liberate Kuwait from one dictator simply to turn Kuwait over to another dictator.

Members of Congress, reports say that the Emir of Kuwait has a hit list. Evidently threatened in his own mind by freedom-loving patriots, the Emir has death squads and has plans to assassinate and murder his own countrymen to protect his reign as a monarch. I say if these reports are true, the Emir should be charged with war crimes.

Ladies and gentlemen, a half million Americans did not put their lives on the line to return Kuwait to prehistoric monarch enslavement. A dictator is a dictator is a dictator, and I believe before our troops come back there should be a thorough investigation as to this Emir who evidently is sitting pretty high on a pedestal.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF OPERATION HOMEFRONT

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

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce a resolution in support of the brave service men and women who served our country in the Persian Gulf. Now, I know the House later today will consider a resolution commending the President and the United States and allied troops in the gulf. In

light of overwhelming victory, I am confident this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

My resolution, however, goes one step further. The resolution I will introduce, with 20 of my colleagues, also expresses our support for the admirable efforts of Operation Homefront.

On February 9, in downtown Bellevue, my wife Joyce and I participated in a "support our troops" rally organized by Washington State's Operation Homefront. In fact, nearly 10,000 people in my home State alone have gathered at Operation-Homefront-sponsored support rallies to show their support for our troops and their families.

Volunteer organizations, like Washington's have sprung up all across the country to coordinate support rallies, letter-writing campaigns, red, white, and blue ribbon brigades, and to offer support to the families of service men and women here at home.

Now that the war is over, our troops soon will begin coming home and Operation Homefront will shift into phase 2. Volunteers will work to encourage businesses, clubs, veteran groups, and others to donate their time and effort in the organization of welcome home activities. In addition to yellow-ribbon parades, Operation Homefront will organize welcome home discount packages with the support of local restaurants, resorts, movie theaters, car washes, and numerous other merchants.

Operation Homefront is not a Federal program and requires no Federal funding. Its purpose is to continue to support our troops and their families until they are all safely home and to ensure that these brave men and women receive the heroes' welcome they deserve. My resolution, in turn, provides Operation Homefront with the congressional support it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Congress to join Operation Homefront in rolling out the red carpet for our returning heroes.

ENSURING ALL AMERICANS HAVE ACCESS TO PROPER HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the very important issue of health care. It is imperative that all of us as citizens of this Nation be able to adequately assume that this Nation adequately takes care of its citizens. I find it appalling that more than 37 million Americans are uninsured. We must expand access to comprehensive primary health services for all individuals.

For example, one area of my district, the Rockaways, has lost 14 doctors who carry Medicaid patients. With only one doctor now servicing this entire area, many patients now find the over-

crowded emergency rooms of New York City as their primary health care source.

Health care costs are indeed skyrocketing, but Mr. Speaker, just as we have allocated resources and set priorities in other areas, we must also do the same for health care. Our current health care system needs to be overhauled.

I would urge all of the persons who share this in this House of Representatives, the President, members of the administration, to come together and let us put aside partisanism and support those things which allow us to meet the health care needs of our citizens.

GUESS WHO BENEFITS FROM H.R. 5, THE STRIKE 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, guess who benefits from H.R. 5, the so-called striker replacement bill?

Funny, it's not the workers or business owners. It seems the principal group to benefit from H.R. 5 would be the power-hungry labor unions.

Labor says it needs H.R. 5 so the right to strike can be guaranteed. The real motive is to increase union membership.

With union membership in a steep decline, representing only 16 percent of workers, organized labor knows that providing risk-free strikes will guarantee new recruits.

An overwhelming majority of workers, 84 percent, reject the tired, worn doctrine of unionism. This is a last ditch effort by a desperate special interest group to increase its membership by increasing strikes.

Do not be fooled by this ploy. H.R. 5 is a mistake and should be vigorously opposed.

□ 1220

THE HEALTH CARE GULF

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, now that peace is returning to the Persian Gulf, I hope the President will begin to pay attention to the health care gulf in America—the tragic gulf between our American values and the realities:

Thirty-seven million Americans with no health insurance;

Infant mortality in many areas worse than in the Third World;

Inner-city hospitals reeling under the epidemics of AIDS, crack, and violence;

Rural hospitals that cannot keep their doors open;

Outbreaks of measles and polio, diseases we can prevent if we can get the vaccine to the children;

Employers facing staggering premium increases every year; and

With all its defects, a health care system that costs over \$600 billion a year, eating up an ever-bigger share of our national income year after year.

In his State of the Union Address, the President stood here and declared that "good health care is every American's right and every American's responsibility." When is the President going to meet his responsibility, and send up a health care plan to fulfill that right?

A PLEA FOR A CLEAN BILL TO FUND RTC

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

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, in the words of Yogi Berra, "It's *deja vu*." One of the reasons I joined the Banking Committee was because I was concerned with the growing problems of the S&L industry.

In 1985, I was a sponsor of legislation to improve the regulation and oversight of the industry. That legislation was delayed and blocked by the Banking Committee leadership, and the problem got worse.

In 1986, I, and a number of my colleagues, urged the then chairman of the Banking Committee to address the S&L problem. Again, there was delay and inaction, and the problem got worse and more expensive.

In 1987, after several delays, the Banking Committee passed legislation to deal with insolvent S&L's. However, as I said at the time, it was woefully inadequate, as it was much weaker than the administration's proposal, not to mention a year and a half late. Although the bill was improved in conference, it was too little, too late.

In 1989, Congress made good on its promise to protect depositors' money with the full faith and credit of the United States.

When we finally began the process of insuring deposits and closing insolvent S&L's, there was no doubt that delay after delay made the problem worse and far more costly to the taxpayers.

We are now being asked to continue the process we began in 1989. We must fund the Resolution Trust Corporation so that depositors will be protected and insolvent S&L's can be closed.

But a majority of the Democrats on the Banking Committee seem to be intent on using the RTC as a Christmas tree on which to hang burdensome and controversial legislation.

The result is delay and inaction. In the meantime, the problem is getting worse and more expensive.

If we learned anything from the past, it should be that delay and inaction are disastrous.

Therefore, I again urge the leadership of the Banking Committee to bring forward a clean and straightforward bill to fund the RTC so that we can avoid *deja vu* all over again.

H.R. 5 GUARANTEES UNIONS WIN STRIKES

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO's top legislative priority, we are told, is passage of a bill which would unilaterally disarm many employers during labor disputes. The so-called striker replacement bill, H.R. 5, prohibits employers from operating their businesses during economic strikes or other labor disputes using permanent replacement workers. Employers could only operate their businesses where they could find replacement workers or crossover employees who would be willing to risk union violence, harassment, and intimidation by coming to work on a temporary basis—that is, for the several weeks or months that the labor dispute lasts. Unions know that in most cases employers will be unable to find temporary replacement workers, especially where the jobs require extensive training or specialized skills, or where the jobs are in remote or undesirable areas.

This bill would guarantee that unions win strikes.

This strike-promoting measure was too radical even for the Carter administration to include in the famous labor law reform bill in the late seventies.

If it was too radical then, it is too radical now.

TRIBUTE TO 58TH TACTICAL FIGHTER SQUADRON

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

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, we are all very proud of the outstanding performance of our service men and women in Operation Desert Storm. I am particularly proud of the 58th Tactical Fighter Squadron of the 33d Tactical Fighter Wing from Eglin Air Force Base in my district. Even before the ground war had started the 58th was credited with downing 15 Iraqi fighters of Saddam Hussein's Air Force. Another Iraqi jet hit the ground while being pursued. At last accounting the 58th is the leading allied scorer of Desert Storm. The wing, known as the Nomads, fly F-15C Eagles. Their mission helped to gain air superiority over enemy air forces. The 33d is the only unit ever to win the William Tell competition twice in suc-

cession. William Tell is the U.S. Air Force's air-to-air gunnery meet. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to highly commend the 58th Tactical Fighter Squadron, which deployed to the Persian Gulf on August 27, 1990, for its outstanding success on behalf of allied forces.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House that today, I will introduce a resolution which calls for an international tribunal to hear charges of war crimes against Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials.

The resolution urges the administration to work with signatories of the Geneva Convention and members of the United Nations to establish such a body.

We continue to hear of sadistic atrocities Iraqi soldiers committed against Kuwaiti citizens. And we are incensed by the fact that Kuwait's oilfields are being burned and that its people were being executed even as Iraq was preparing to surrender.

We all believe Saddam should be held accountable. We should bring him to justice with the same international cooperation we displayed in expelling him from Kuwait.

Since fair treatment for the accused is one of the foundations of our country, we should make it one of the foundations of any New World Order.

Establishing an international tribunal is the first step.

ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR ALL LONG OVERDUE

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, our brave young Americans fought bravely to make the world a safer and more secure place. They did their share. We must now do ours to ensure the personal security of all Americans.

We have defined ourselves as a strong country in terms of military might. We must now define our strength in terms of the health and well-being of all Americans.

From the U.S. infant mortality rate, which the gentleman from Washington pointed out which is like that of a Third World country, to the lack of long-term health care for our seniors, we are weak. From the beginning of life to the end and in all the years in between, Americans are menaced by the fear of becoming ill and the fear of being pauperized by that illness.

Let us make Americans more secure with cost effective, cost-contained

health care. Access to health care for all Americans is long overdue. Let us remove this fear from our great country.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO MAKE PERMANENT 25-PERCENT TAX DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF SELF-EMPLOYED

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

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to make the 25-percent tax deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals a permanent part of the Internal Revenue Code. I hope my colleagues will join me in strong support of this legislation.

As my colleagues know, in an effort to encourage small business owners to purchase health insurance for themselves and their employees, the Tax Reform Act of 1986 granted self-employed individuals a 25-percent deduction for health insurance premiums for themselves and their dependents. However, this deduction was authorized only for 3 years. Since 1989, many small business owners have been held in limbo every year while Congress determines whether or not to extend the 25-percent deduction. Each year I have introduced legislation to extend this deduction and Congress has done so. We need to make this deduction permanent.

Statistics on the uninsured show that 24 million of the 31.5 million uninsured in families where someone is working and, furthermore, that 42 percent of the self-employed are uninsured. By creating these incentives we can make great strides toward eliminating the great numbers of uninsured individuals in this country.

While many favor a greater health insurance percentage deduction, including myself, I think we must first act to make the existing 25-percent deduction permanent so the farmers, ranchers, and very small businesses that exist in all of our districts can count on this deduction and have greater incentive to provide health insurance for their employees.

□ 1230

ELIZABETH BARRETT HONORED AS 1991 CRISTA MCAULIFFE EDUCATOR

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

Mr. ROEMER, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and admiration that I extend my appreciation and congratulations to Elizabeth Barrett, an instructional technology specialist at

Penn High School in Mishawaka, IN, who has been named a 1991 Crista McAuliffe Educator.

The National Foundation for the Improvement of Education selects only five teachers from across the country for this honor, created in the memory of the teacher who lost her life in the Challenger space shuttle.

Highly commended for her leadership in the application of new technology, Elizabeth Barrett trains students and teachers in the use of computers, software, and audiovisual equipment. She is one of those outstanding individuals who dedicates herself to helping others achieve the same excellence that is apparent in her own work.

As a former teacher from a family of educators, I understand that remarkable teachers like Elizabeth Barrett can make a difference not only in the education of our young people, but also in the shaping of their lives.

This award holds special significance to me because, almost two decades ago, I graduated from Penn High School. I can still remember several of my own teachers, people who instilled in me the value of hard work and urged me to reach for my own dreams.

We have all heard the saying, "Our children are our future." Our work force of the next century must be ready to deal with new and everchanging technology. Elizabeth Barrett is doing more than her part to see that our work force is ready to meet this challenge. With people like Elizabeth Barrett in our schools, I imagine an America of tomorrow even stronger than the America of today.

PERSIAN GULF SCROLL

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, trying times seem to bring out the best in Americans. The public support shown our armed services during Operation Desert Storm has been a refreshing and welcome change in the Nation's history.

I have in my hand some evidence of the outpouring of support for our troops in the Persian Gulf. Last Friday, segments of my hometown in Fullerton celebrated "Support Our Armed Forces Day." The event was sponsored by John and Pranee Lin, who own a popular fast food franchise just down the street from my district office, and recruiting officers Sgt. Randy Bush of the U.S. Marine Corps, Sgt. Gregory Johnson of the U.S. Army, Sgt. Leo Berrington of the U.S. Army, and PO1c. John Carter of the U.S. Navy. Together they teamed with the Fullerton High School ROTC Program to collect over a thousand signatures from citizens and placed them on a special scroll to be delivered to Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf.

I am unable to unroll the scroll in the well due to House rules, but I assure you the outpouring of love and support for our troops will be self-evident when it is presented to General Schwarzkopf. Let me thank the Lins, Ed Shaw, the principal of Fullerton High School, Col. James Ashhurst and Sgt. John Tucker of the Fullerton High School ROTC program, as well as the ROTC students and citizens who made the scroll possible.

These are good deeds that make America great.

ARAB NATIONS SHOULD RECOGNIZE AND MAKE PEACE WITH ISRAEL

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

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, most Arab nations maintain an active state of aggression against Israel, including many members of the allied coalition against Saddam Hussein.

This ongoing state of war threatens all peoples of the Middle East. Today, I am introducing a resolution, along with Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN, which calls on all Arab nations which have not done so to recognize and make peace with Israel. In addition, the resolution expresses the view that the United States should pressure Arab members of the allied coalition to fulfill these important goals.

The lesson of Kuwait is all too clear. This nation, which was not recognized by Iraq, fell victim to Iraq's naked aggression. The failure of Arab nations to establish diplomatic relations with Israel and to negotiate peace treaties is a severe threat to peace in the Middle East. Now is the time for Arab members of the allied coalition to make fundamental changes in their policy toward Israel.

Our resolution calls on the Arab nations to recognize and negotiate peace with Israel, and it calls on the United States to encourage this process. We urge all Member of Congress to join us in this extremely important effort.

CONSUMER CONFIDENCE: BALANCE FEDERAL BUDGET

(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, now that the war in the Persian Gulf is all but over, America has to focus its energy on another front—our economy.

Never before have I seen such unity in this body and in this great country. We will need this unity to avoid another budget catastrophe like we experienced last fall.

Chairman Greenspan recently testified before the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy that he believes one of the main causes of our current recession is a sharp decline in consumer confidence. He attributed part of this to uncertainties with the war and increasing oil prices.

Now that oil prices have dropped and the war is over, consumers' attitudes will change. We have to do all we can to encourage consumer confidence by putting America's fiscal house in order. To do that we should pass a constitutional amendment to balance the Federal budget.

With the unity and national spirit brought about by the end of the war, now is the time for Congress to seize the initiative. We need to restore our economy by empowering and encouraging consumers, not by dominating their lives with deficit spending. The best way to do this is for Congress to balance its budget. Nothing we can do is more important to restoring consumer confidence than balancing our Federal budget.

INTRODUCING INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, together with the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] and 78 cosponsors, we introduced the International Family Planning Protection Act. This legislation, designed to reverse the misguided Mexico City policies, will make complete and accurate family planning resources and services available to women worldwide.

The Mexico City policy prohibits U.S. population assistance funds from being channeled through prominent international organizations such as the International Planned Parenthood Federation and the U.N. Fund for Population Activities because they provide counseling about abortion as part of their services. It is important to note that this counseling is nondirective. Abortion is not advocated, but abortion information is made available to those who want it.

Curiously, the Mexico City policy does allow population assistance funds to go to government organizations that offer abortion counseling. These governmental organizations must only agree to keep U.S. funds in a separate bank account, and promise not to use U.S. funds to directly pay for abortions. We should end this double standard on family planning and make these services available to women worldwide.

□ 1240

A TRIBUTE TO LANCE CORPORAL CHRISTIAN PORTER, KILLED IN ACTION

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, a few hours before President Bush announced a cease-fire in Operation Desert Storm, a U.S. Marine Corps unit waged a pitched battle for control of the Kuwait International Airport.

In what turned out to be one of the final battles of the war, Lance Cpl. Christian Porter of Springfield, IL, was killed in action.

Lance Corporal Porter, 20 years of age, had joined the Marines in 1989 and planned to return home and open a small business after his tour of duty.

The love which has poured out for Christian Porter since the sad news of his death is testimony to the quality of the life he led. This young man with his quick smile, his quiet friendly manner, and his determination to always do his best will be missed by his family and many friends.

I join my colleagues in Congress offering our condolences to his parents, John and Phillipa Porter. We pray that God will give you and your family the strength to endure the loss of this fine young man who gave his life in the service of our country.

COMMENDATION TO PRESIDENT BUSH

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

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, we all were very pleased that bipartisan support existed for our troops. It has been rather tragic over the past several days and weeks that some on the other side of the aisle wanted to prevent us from bringing to the floor a resolution which commends President Bush for the strong and decisive action he took in dealing with the Persian Gulf crisis.

Well, I congratulate the distinguished ranking member of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] who has offered a resolution which has the cosponsorship of every Republican in this House. It is the Broomfield resolution which we will be able to debate later today with complete Republican support which will be congratulating President Bush for the stellar leadership that he provided us during this important crisis.

UNITED NATIONS SHOULD ORGANIZE INTERNATIONAL WAR CRIMES TRIBUNAL

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, the war in the Persian Gulf is over. This American-led Allied effort is a cause for thanksgiving and national pride. There is a job yet to be done, however, not just in rebuilding and diplomacy, but in the administration of justice. The Iraqis in Kuwait, and in their own land, have been guilty of unspeakable brutality, inhuman conduct, and atrocities. We have an obligation to the civilized world to proceed with the investigation process and organize, through the United Nations, an International War Crimes Tribunal to deal with this matter.

President Bush should take the lead. Indeed, our President should exercise the high degree of leadership which he has exhibited in preparing for and prosecuting the war.

IN SUPPORT OF BROOMFIELD RESOLUTION COMMENDING PRESIDENT BUSH

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today we will have a chance to vote on the Broomfield resolution commending President Bush for the fine leadership that he has provided during the gulf crisis.

Yes, our troops deserve the praise that they have been receiving. They have done a magnificent job, but so does President Bush deserve our recognition for a job well done. He overcame obstacles to the military operations in the gulf. He overcame those obstacles to a successful conclusion of victory, obstacles which if not overcome would not have permitted us to have successfully completed the mission with a minimum number of casualties.

One of the obstacles came from opposition right here in this hall. Let us not forget that just several weeks ago, just 1 month ago, a majority of those on the other side of the aisle voted to tie the hands of the President of the United States behind his back when he was facing down Saddam Hussein. It is time for us to admit that a policy of strength and the leadership of President Bush has brought the United States of America to this wonderful conclusion. We should thank President Bush, as well as the servicemen and women of the United States of America.

SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING ASSISTANCE

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

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1179, a bill which will end the disastrous Mexico City policy on family planning assistance to nongovernmental organizations.

The world's population explosion continues at alarming levels. The record growth expected this decade means the per capita availability of key resources such as land, water, food, and fuel will continue to shrink at a frightening pace. We must not fail to do our fair share in the multinational battle to control the devastating consequences of this threat. Assistance to family planning programs is a proven, effective means of fulfilling our responsibility.

Those who oppose such funding would substitute their own values for the informed consent of women and their families. They would deprive women overseas of family planning information and resources which are readily available to millions of American women. Such a policy not only contributes to dangerously high levels of population growth abroad. There also is evidence that depriving women of this much needed information and resources can lead to an even heavier reliance on abortion as a means of preventing unwanted births. Furthermore, this legislation does not allow U.S. funding for abortions abroad.

It is time that we recognize the magnitude of the global population problems we face.

It is time that we respect the rights of women and their families to decide how best to plan their own lives. In sum, it is time that we reconsider our position on the Mexico City policy and resume funding of international programs which contribute so much to improving the quality of life for millions around the world.

IN RECOGNITION OF LEADERSHIP OF PRESIDENT BUSH

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman Member of this House. I voted for the use of force.

I feel that recognition of President Bush's leadership is long overdue, not only in the way that he pulled together the historical coalition of 28 countries, but his decisive, no nonsense leadership in dealing with Saddam Hussein.

I also would like to commend the brave young men and women of our country who served with distinction, and last but not least, I met with the

family yesterday morning of David Plasch of Portsmouth, NH, an Army helicopter pilot who died on February 27 in a helicopter crash. He made the ultimate sacrifice for all of us in our goals for freedom.

His greatest concern through his letters to his mom and dad and the concern and the wishes of his mom and dad are how our troops would be received when they come home.

Mr. Speaker, and my fellow colleagues, I strongly recommend that you support the resolution to commend our great President for his leadership, and I also ask that you do your part and our part in making sure that the celebration for our troops when they come home is the greatest celebration of all time in the history of our country.

IRAQIS SHOULD REMOVE ALL MINES

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join all of those who have commended everyone involved with Desert Shield and Desert Storm, from the President on down, the Chief of Staff, General Powell, General Schwarzkopf, and all the brave men and women who have served.

My concern now, and I have sent a memo to the Pentagon and I hope that all of my colleagues will agree with me, is that we want to bring them home. We want to have the celebrations, but they are not yet out of harm's way.

I would suggest very respectfully that those who set the mines on land and on the sea be the ones to remove them, that American troops not be utilized to clean up Kuwait or southern Iraq where the mines are in the desert. Part of the effort we are making now is to see that there is peace of an enduring nature, and we very strongly recommend that those who put the minefields in the desert be the ones to pick them up. They know where they are. They have the maps and they should do them. I hope the Members will join me in contacting the Pentagon that this be done.

THE HOUSE IS WASTING \$8 MILLION A DAY

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have here a chart which shows the amount of money we have already lost to pure waste of Resolution Trust Corporation funding, \$40 million as of today. Tomorrow it will be \$48 million, the next day it will be \$56 million.

This is pure waste, and it is pure waste because the Democratic leadership of the Congress has failed to bring up renewed funding to take care of the depositors' insurance.

Now, it is foolish for this House to waste \$8 million a day, and yet every day from now until the day a signable bill reaches the President's desk, including weekends, we are losing \$8 million a day; so each day I hope to do a 1-minute to just remind the country that the Democratic congressional leadership by its failure to pass a bill is adding \$8 million a day in pure waste to the deficit.

There is no explanation for this, except that Congress cannot get the job done. You can imagine if General Schwarzkopf had had to report to this body how long it would have taken to get anything done in the Middle East.

□ 1250

PETTY PARTISAN POLITICAL PROFIT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as I sat in the Chamber this afternoon listening to some of these 1-minute speeches, I have become alarmed at the less than subtle attempts by some Members of this body to use the war that has just been successfully concluded for petty partisan political profit.

Americans by the dozens lost their lives in this war; citizens of the world by the tens of thousands are now dead; environmental havoc has been wreaked across much of the Middle East; political chaos is now threatened.

For Members of Congress, for their own political purposes, to try to make gain out of this war is unpatriotic, un-American and, in the end, will be roundly rejected by the American people.

LET US HAVE THE BIPARTISAN COALITION LEADERSHIP FOR DOMESTIC ISSUES AS DEMONSTRATED IN THE PERSIAN GULF

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, last week was one of America's great foreign policy successes. Last week was also one of America's great domestic embarrassments.

We saw on the one hand dynamic leadership making the tough decisions, doing the right planning, putting together the necessary allied coalition to be successful in the gulf. At the same time, we saw here in the Congress the inability to provide the leadership, the

inability to make the tough decisions, the inability to put together any form of a bipartisan coalition to deal with the Resolution Trust.

So we won the war in the gulf and we lost the battle on getting the funding by March 1 for the Resolution Trust.

While Americans this week celebrate victory internationally, they also see their national debt go up \$8 million each day.

This Congress fails to do what it should here at home on our domestic agenda.

Let us do the same kind of bipartisan coalition leadership for domestic issues that we saw work so well last week in the gulf.

LET US STOP PLAYING GAMES AND VOTE FOR FUNDING RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker and Members, I had no intention of doing a 1-minute here today. But sitting here listening to some of the descriptions of what took place in the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs caused me to get up here to try and straighten the record out.

It was Democrats, and only Democrats, who voted for the funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation; not one Republican vote.

For those who stand here and say they want to see the funding take place, they want to see the Resolution Trust Corporation continue, they must understand that it takes both side of the aisle in order to do that.

There were amendments placed in the bill from both sides of the aisle. Some got what they wanted, others did not.

There were some who had some outrageous amendments that they wanted from the other side of the aisle. They were not able to get that.

If they are angry about that, that should not stop them from voting for this bill. Those on the Democratic side of the aisle wanted to make sure that there was some oversight.

We cannot continue to spend the taxpayers' money without insuring that it is done properly.

I would ask those who want to see the Resolution Trust Corporation funded to tell the other side of the aisle to stop playing games and vote for the bill.

GULF PROVES AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Americans cheered and stood a little taller each time our Patriot missiles intercepted an Iraqi Scud missile. Vindicated after years of criticism of America and how our industrial ability and know-how didn't measure up, we proved everyone wrong and wowed the world with our military performance in the gulf.

That euphoria lasted only a short time when it was brought to our attention that our Government decided a year ago to release this advanced dual technology to the Soviet Union through Cocom.

This international organization of advanced industrial nations controls high technology with military applications, requiring unanimous agreement to license certain technologies for export from the West.

Now our Government is resisting and hopefully will hang tough and urge our allies to join us in blocking the sale of this vital dual-use technology to Moscow.

This technology should not be decontrolled through Cocom. For American pride—and national security we need to continue to be the gee-whiz kids of high technology.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

COMMODITY FUTURES IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1991

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 707) to improve the regulations of futures trading, authorize appropriations for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 707

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN TRADING PRACTICES

- Sec. 101. Dual trading.
- Sec. 102. Trading among members of broker associations.

TITLE II—ENHANCEMENT OF REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

- Sec. 201. Audit trails.
- Sec. 202. Telemarketing fraud.
- Sec. 203. Undercover operations and enforcement.
- Sec. 204. Self regulatory organization disciplinary committees and governing boards.
- Sec. 205. Required registration of floor traders.
- Sec. 206. Enhancement of registration requirements.
- Sec. 207. Enforcement of civil money penalties.
- Sec. 208. Ethics training for registrants.
- Sec. 209. Nationwide service of process and venue.
- Sec. 210. Monitoring of hedge exemptions.
- Sec. 211. Penalties for felony violations.
- Sec. 212. Contract market emergency actions.
- Sec. 213. Prohibition against insider trading.
- Sec. 214. Qualifications of Commissioners.
- Sec. 215. Monitoring of margins on equity index instruments.
- Sec. 216. Monitoring of index arbitrage trading.
- Sec. 217. Prohibition on voting by interested members.
- Sec. 218. Study of delivery points for agricultural commodity contracts.
- Sec. 219. Study of assessments on transactions.
- Sec. 220. Competitiveness study.
- Sec. 221. Computerized futures trading.
- Sec. 222. Money penalties in civil court actions.

TITLE III—ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITIES

- Sec. 301. Definition of foreign futures authority.
- Sec. 302. Subpoena authority.
- Sec. 303. Cooperation with foreign futures authorities.
- Sec. 304. Investigative assistance to foreign futures authorities.
- Sec. 305. Disclosure of information received from foreign futures authorities.
- Sec. 306. Disclosure of information to foreign futures authorities.

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS; EFFECTIVE DATE

- Sec. 401. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 402. Technical amendments.
- Sec. 403. Effective date.

TITLE I—LIMITATIONS ON CERTAIN TRADING PRACTICES

- SEC. 101. DUAL TRADING.**
 - (a) PROHIBITION.—Section 4j of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6j) is amended by—
 - (1) redesignating subsection (2) as subsection (b); and
 - (2) amending subsection (1) to read as follows:

“(a)(1) The Commission shall issue regulations to prohibit dual trading by a floor broker in any contract market in which the Commission determines that the average daily trading volume is equal to or greater than the threshold trading level established pursuant to this paragraph. For the purposes of this subsection, the threshold trading level shall be seven thousand contracts, based on a six-month moving average of the number of contracts traded daily on such contract market. The Commission may provide for increases or decreases in the threshold trading level for specific contract markets if, in the judgment of the Commission, such a change is warranted. In determining whether such a change is warranted, the Commission shall consider the effects of this paragraph on the liquid-

ity of the contract market, price volatility, bid-ask spreads, and the public interest. Any action by the Commission to adjust the threshold trading level of a contract market pursuant to this paragraph shall be reported to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate not later than 3 days after the Commission takes such action.

"(2) The regulations issued by the Commission to implement paragraph (1) for such contract market shall—

"(A) define the term 'dual trading';

"(B) specify the methodology by which the Commission shall determine the average daily trading volume of contracts on a contract market;

"(C) provide for transition measures, as determined necessary by the Commission to prevent market disruption or to protect the public interest, for a contract market when the average daily trading volume on such contract market increases to or above, or decreases below, the threshold trading level;

"(D) provide that a floor broker may dual trade in a newly designated contract market until the average daily trading volume on such contract market has increased to or above the threshold trading level;

"(E) provide for limited exceptions, as the Commission determines necessary, to the prohibition against dual trading required by paragraph (1) with respect to spread trades and trades to correct errors;

"(F) provide that a floor broker affected by paragraph (1) shall indicate prior to the opening of trading for any given trading session whether such floor broker shall trade solely for such broker's own account or solely for customers' accounts for the entire trading session, with limited exceptions as determined by the Commission pursuant to subparagraphs (E) and (G); and

"(G) provide that a customer may designate an individual floor broker to execute such customer's orders for future delivery and trade for such broker's own account, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), if such customer, not less than once annually, executes a written form so designating such broker by name; unless the Commission determines with respect to the subparagraph involved that the action required by such subparagraph is unnecessary because of action taken by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (3). Such regulations may also provide that if the average daily trading volume on a contract market increases to or above, or decreases below, the threshold trading level, any change in the status of dual trading otherwise required by paragraph (1) may be delayed or suspended if the Commission determines that such increase or decrease is a temporary, unusual occurrence.

"(3) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1), (2), and (4), the Commission shall, as it determines necessary, make a determination from time to time, by rule, regulation, or order, whether or not dual trading, as that term may be defined in regulations issued by the Commission, by a floor broker may be allowed in contract markets where such trading is not prohibited pursuant to paragraph (1). If the Commission determines that dual trading by a floor broker shall be permitted, the Commission shall further determine the terms, conditions, and circumstances under which such dual trading shall be conducted. Any such determination shall, at a minimum, take into account the effect of dual trading on the liquidity of trading in each contract market. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the Commission from making separate determinations for different contract markets when such are warranted in the judgment of the Commission, or to prohibit contract markets from setting terms and conditions more restrictive than those set by the Commission.

"(4) The Commission shall issue an order to exempt a contract market from the provisions of paragraph (1) if the Commission determines that such exception is in the public interest and if the applicable board of trade can demonstrate to the Commission that the surveillance systems and procedures, including but not limited to the audit trail, for that contract market—

"(A) can detect those instances of trading violations that the Commission determines to be attributable to dual trading; and

"(B) are fully verifiable.

The Commission shall approve or deny any application by a board of trade for such an order no later than 60 days after receipt of the application. The Commission shall submit a report of the issuance of any such order to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate not later than three days after the issuance of such order."

(b) REGULATIONS.—(1) The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue the regulations required by section 4j(a)(2) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as added by subsection (a), no later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The Commission shall issue regulations to implement section 4j(a)(4) of such Act, as added by subsection (a), no later than 240 days after the date of enactment of this Act or 30 days before the issuance of the regulations required by section 4j(a)(2), whichever occurs earlier.

(2) If, no later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a board of trade submits an application to the Commission for an order for a contract market pursuant to section 4j(a)(4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, the Commission may, pending the completion of its review of such application, temporarily waive the application of section 4j(a)(1) of such Act to that contract market if the Commission determines that there is a likelihood that the contract market meets the conditions of section 4j(a)(4) of such Act.

SEC. 102. TRADING AMONG MEMBERS OF BROKER ASSOCIATIONS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 4j of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6j), as amended by section 101(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) It shall be unlawful, pursuant to regulations issued by the Commission—

"(1) for a member of a broker association, for or on behalf of any customer, to execute a transaction such that another member of the same broker association, trading for such other member's own account, or the account of the association, takes the opposite side of such transaction;

"(2) for any member of a broker association to trade with another member of the same broker association, whether such brokers are trading for such brokers' own accounts, for customers, or for the account of the broker association, if such transactions in any month total more than 25 percent of the total number of transactions of such broker; and

"(3) for any member of a broker association to engage in such other practices as the Commission determines necessary to prohibit or curb abuses, and otherwise to protect the interests of customers from potential trading abuses by members of broker associations.

Such regulations shall include a definition of the term 'broker association' and may provide for exceptions from the provisions of this subsection in the case of trades executed through trading systems in which the identity of the opposite broker is unknown at the time of the trade. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the Commission or contract markets from prohibiting trading by broker associations or their members or from setting terms

and conditions for such trading that are more restrictive than those set by this subsection."

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue regulations to implement section 4j(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as added by subsection (a), no later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall determine whether the public interest would best be served by placing alternative restrictions on trading by broker associations and their members, and whether broker associations or trading by broker associations should be prohibited. The Commission shall submit a report describing its determination and containing any recommendations by the Commission for regulatory or legislative initiatives to implement such recommendations to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate no later than 270 days after the effective date of the regulations required under this section.

TITLE II—ENHANCEMENT OF REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

SEC. 201. AUDIT TRAILS.

(a) AUDIT TRAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACT MARKETS.—Section 4g of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6g) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (1) through (6) as subsections (a) through (f), respectively;

(2) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(2)(A) Each contract market shall maintain or cause to be maintained by its clearinghouse a single record that shall show for each futures or options trade the transaction date, time of execution (as required by subparagraph (B)), quantity, and such other information as the Commission determines necessary. Such record shall enable such contract market to rapidly reconstruct an accurate record, as determined by the Commission, of the transactions executed on such contract market.

"(B) For the purposes of subparagraph (A), the time of execution of a transaction shall be verifiable and shall—

"(i) be stated within an increment of no more than 1 minute in length, beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991; and

"(ii) be stated within an increment of no more than 30 seconds in length, beginning not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991.

"(C) The Commission shall submit a report on the status of compliance with the standards imposed by this paragraph to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate within 180 days after the expiration of the 1-year and 3-year periods specified in subparagraphs (B)(i) and (B)(ii), respectively.

"(D) The Commission shall—

"(i) determine whether the record required by this paragraph has enabled the affected contract markets to rapidly reconstruct an accurate, verifiable record of the transactions executed on such contract markets, as determined necessary by the Commission to provide for the effective enforcement of the applicable provisions of this Act and the rules or regulations thereunder;

"(ii) determine whether the recording and reconstruction of the time and sequence of trades can more accurately represent the real times of such trades through the use of improved technologies or other means and determine whether any regulatory or legislative changes would be

necessary or appropriate to implement such improvements; and

"(iii) report in writing its findings pursuant to this subparagraph to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate no later than 5 years after the enactment of the Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991.";

(3) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (2)" and inserting "subsection (b)".

(b) **AUDIT TRAIL COMPLIANCE AS CONDITION FOR CONTRACT MARKET DESIGNATION.**—Section 5 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7) is amended by—

(1) indenting the left margin of subdivisions (a) through (g) by 2 ems;

(2) striking "(a)", "(b)", "(c)", "(d)", "(e)", "(f)", and "(g)", and inserting "(1)", "(2)", "(3)", "(4)", "(5)", "(6)", and "(7)", respectively; and

(3) adding at the end the following:

"(8) When such board of trade demonstrates that every contract market for which such board of trade is designated complies with the requirements of sections 4g(b)(2)(B)(i) and 4g(b)(2)(B)(ii)."

SEC. 202. TELEMARKETING FRAUD.

Section 17 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 21) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) Each futures association registered under this section shall, subject to the approval of the Commission pursuant to subsection (j), adopt a rule specifying the factors it will consider in determining whether to issue a summary member responsibility action or other disciplinary action to require a member to adopt special supervisory procedures relating to telephone solicitations for new futures or options customer accounts. Such procedures shall require at a minimum that, with respect to an individual with no previous futures or options trading experience who was solicited by telephone, the member may not enter any order for such individual for a period of not less than 3 days after the individual signs the required acknowledgment of receipt of the applicable risk disclosure statement."

SEC. 203. UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS AND ENFORCEMENT.

Section 8(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(1)" after "(a)"; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

"(2) In conducting investigations authorized under this subsection or other provision of this Act, the Commission shall continue, as the Commission determines necessary, to request the assistance of and cooperate with the appropriate Federal agencies in the conduct of such investigations, including undercover operations by such agencies."

SEC. 204. SELF REGULATORY ORGANIZATION DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEES AND GOVERNING BOARDS.

(a) **DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEES AND MAJOR VIOLATIONS.**—Section 8c of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12c) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (1) through (4) as subsections (a) through (d);

(2) in subsection (a), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "(A)" and inserting "(1)"; and

(B) by striking "(B)" and inserting "(2)";

(3) in subsection (c), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (2)" each place it appears and inserting "subsection (b)";

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated, by striking "subsection (1)" and inserting "subsection (a)"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

"(e)(1) The Commission shall issue regulations to require the establishment of a system of contract market disciplinary committees. Under

such system, each board of trade designated as a contract market shall—

"(A) establish one or more disciplinary committees which shall be authorized by such board of trade to determine whether violations of the rules of the board of trade have been committed, to accept offers of settlement, and to impose appropriate penalties;

"(B) provide that disciplinary committees established pursuant to subparagraph (A) be composed of members of the board of trade, or staff members of the board of trade, such that the committee, or any hearing panel formed by the committee to conduct disciplinary hearings, shall be composed of a majority of persons who are of a different trading status than the respondent; and

"(C) provide that a hearing panel formed by the committee to conduct disciplinary hearings may be composed of fewer than the total number of members of the committee.

"(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), a disciplinary committee member's trading status shall be determined by whether such member is a—

"(A) floor broker or floor trader;

"(B) member of the board of trade other than a member who acts primarily as a floor broker or floor trader; or

"(C) staff member of such board of trade.

"(f)(1) The Commission shall issue regulations requiring each contract market to establish and make available to the public a schedule of major violations of any rule within the disciplinary jurisdiction of such contract market.

"(2) The regulations issued by the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall prohibit, for a period of time to be determined by the Commission, any individual who is found to have committed any major violation from service on the governing board of any contract market or registered futures association, or on any disciplinary committee thereof."

(b) **REGISTERED FUTURES ASSOCIATIONS.**—Section 17 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 21), as amended by section 202, is amended by inserting after subsection (q) the following:

"(r)(1) The Commission shall issue regulations requiring each registered futures association to establish and make available to the public a schedule of major violations of any rule within the disciplinary jurisdiction of such registered futures association.

"(2) The regulations issued by the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall prohibit, for a period of time to be determined by the Commission, any member of a registered futures association who is found to have committed any major violation from service on the governing board of any registered futures association or contract market, or on any disciplinary committee thereof."

(c) **OUTSIDE REPRESENTATION ON GOVERNING BOARDS.**—(1) Section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a) is amended by—

(A) striking "and" at the end of paragraph (1); and

(B) adding at the end the following:

"(13) ensure that outside members, as defined in regulations issued by the Commission, comprise at least 20 percent of the governing board of such contract market; and"

(2) Section 17(b) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 21(b)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph 3 by striking "or" at the end;

(B) in paragraphs (3)(D), (4)(A), (4)(B), (4)(C), (4)(D), (4)(F), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (9)(A), (9)(B), and (9)(D) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in paragraphs (4)(E), (9)(C), and (10) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

"(11) at least 20 percent of the members of the governing board thereof are outside members, as defined in regulations issued by the Commission."

(d) **REGULATIONS.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue the regulations required by sections 5a(13), 8c(e), 8c(f), 17(b)(11), and 17(r) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as added by this section, no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 205. REQUIRED REGISTRATION OF FLOOR TRADERS.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—Section 2(a)(1)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2) is amended by inserting after the sentence beginning "The words 'floor broker' " the following: "The words 'floor trader' shall mean any person who, in or surrounding any 'pit', 'ring', 'post', or other place provided by a contract market for the meeting of persons similarly engaged, shall purchase or sell solely for such person's own account any commodity for future delivery on or subject to the rules of any contract market."

(b) **FLOOR TRADER REGISTRATION.**—Section 4e of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6e) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4e. It shall be unlawful for any person to act as floor trader in executing purchases and sales, or as floor broker in executing any orders for the purchase or sale, of any commodity for future delivery, or involving any contracts of sale of any commodity for future delivery, on or subject to the rules of any contract market unless such person shall have registered, under this Act, with the Commission as such floor trader or floor broker and such registration shall not have expired nor been suspended nor revoked."

(c) **REGISTRATION PROCEDURE.**—Section 4f(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6f(1)) is amended by striking "or floor broker" and inserting "floor broker, or floor trader".

(d) **REPORTS; BOOKS AND RECORDS.**—Section 4g(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6g(1)), as so redesignated by section 201(a)(1), is amended by striking "or floor broker" and inserting "floor broker, or floor trader".

(e) **JURISDICTION OF THE STATES.**—(1) Section 6d(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 13a-2(1)) is amended by striking "or floor broker" and inserting "floor broker, or floor trader".

(2) Section 6d(8)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. section 13a-2(8)(A)) is amended by inserting ", floor trader," after "floor broker".

(f) **COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO REGISTER FLOOR TRADERS.**—Section 8a(1) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(1)) is amended by striking "and floor brokers" and inserting "floor brokers, and floor traders".

(g) **REFUSAL TO REGISTER.**—(1) Section 8a(2)(C)(i) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(2)(C)(i)) is amended by inserting "floor trader," after "floor broker".

(2) Section 8a(2)(D)(ii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(2)(D)(ii)) is amended by inserting "floor trader," after "floor broker".

(3) Section 8a(3)(E)(ii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(3)(E)(ii)) is amended by inserting "floor trader," after "floor broker".

(h) **REGULATIONS.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue any regulations necessary to implement the amendments made by this section no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 206. ENHANCEMENT OF REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **INUNCTIONS.**—Section 8a(2)(C)(ii) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(2)(C)(ii)) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) engaging in or continuing any activity where such activity involves embezzlement, theft, extortion, fraud, fraudulent conversion, misappropriation of funds, securities or property, forgery, counterfeiting, false pretenses, bribery, gambling, or any transaction in or advice concerning contracts of sale of a commodity for future delivery, concerning matters subject to Commission regulation under section 4c or 19, or concerning securities".

(b) CERTAIN VIOLATIONS OF LAW.—Section 8a(2)(D)(iv) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(2)(D)(iv)) is amended by—

- (1) inserting "1001," after "152,";
- (2) striking "or" after "1342,";
- (3) inserting "1503, 1623, 1961, 1962, 1963, or 2314," after "1343,"; and
- (4) inserting ", or section 7201 or 7206 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986" after "Code".

(c) OTHER VIOLATIONS OF LAW.—Section 8a(2)(E) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(2)(E)) is amended—

- (1) by striking "by any court of competent jurisdiction," and inserting "in a proceeding brought"; and
- (2) in clause (i) by inserting "chapter 96 of title 18 of the United States Code," after "1977,".

(d) REGISTRATION REVOCATION BASED ON INACCURATE STATEMENTS.—Section 8a(2)(G) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(2)(G)) is amended by—

- (1) striking "subparagraphs (A) through (F) of this paragraph," and inserting "this paragraph and paragraph (3),";
- (2) striking "material" the first place it appears and inserting "materially"; and
- (3) striking "application" and inserting "application or any update thereto".

(e) GENERAL FELONY CONVICTIONS.—Section 8a(3)(D) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(3)(D)) is amended by—

- (1) inserting "pleaded guilty to or" after "person";
- (2) inserting a comma after "section" the first place it appears;
- (3) striking "within ten years preceding the filing of the application or at any time thereafter,";
- (4) striking ", including a felony"; and
- (5) striking ", more than" and inserting "more than".

(f) SPECIAL FELONY CONVICTIONS.—Section 8a(3)(E) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(3)(E)) is amended—

- (1) by inserting "pleaded guilty to or" after "person";
- (2) by striking "within ten years preceding the filing of the application for registration or at any time thereafter"; and
- (3) in clause (iv) by inserting ", or section 7203, 7204, 7205, or 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986" after "Code".

(g) REGISTRATION DENIED OR CONDITIONED BASED ON INACCURATE STATEMENTS.—Section 8a(3)(G) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(3)(G)) is amended by—

- (1) striking "material" the first place it appears and inserting "materially";
- (2) striking the comma after "application";
- (3) inserting "or any update thereto," after "application";
- (4) striking "thereunder, or" and inserting "thereunder,"; and
- (5) inserting "or in any registration disqualification proceeding" after "Commission".

(h) NON-FEDERAL CRIMINAL CONDUCT.—Section 8a(3)(H) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(3)(H)) is amended by inserting ", in a United States military court," after "State court".

(i) EXISTING RESTRICTIONS ON MEMBERSHIPS.—Section 8a(3)(J) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12a(3)(J)) is amended by—

(1) striking "or" after "association," the first place it appears;

(2) inserting "or any foreign regulatory body that the Commission recognizes as having a comparable regulatory program," after "organization," the first place it appears;

(3) striking "or" after "association," the second place it appears; and

(4) striking "organization;" and inserting "organization, or foreign regulatory body;".

SEC. 207. ENFORCEMENT OF CIVIL MONEY PENALTIES.

(a) MONEY PENALTIES.—Section 6 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 8 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (a) through (d) as subsections (b) through (e), respectively;

(2) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 6.";

(3) in subsection (a), as so redesignated, by striking "paragraph (a)" and inserting "subsection (b)";

(4) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "paragraph (b) of this section" and inserting "subsection (c)"; and

(B) by striking "section 6(b) of this Act" and inserting "subsection (c)"; and

(5) by amending subsection (e), as so redesignated, to read as follows:

"(e)(1) In determining the amount of the money penalty assessed under subsection (c), the Commission shall consider the appropriateness of such penalty to the gravity of the violation.

"(2) Unless the person against whom a money penalty is assessed under subsection (c) shows to the satisfaction of the Commission within 15 days from the expiration of the period allowed for payment of such penalty that either an appeal as authorized by subsection (c) has been taken or payment of the full amount of the penalty then due has been made, at the end of such 15-day period and until such person shows to the satisfaction of the Commission that payment of such amount with interest thereon to date of payment has been made—

"(A) such person shall be prohibited automatically from trading on all contract markets; and

"(B) if such person is registered with the Commission, such registration shall be suspended automatically.

"(3) If a person against whom a money penalty is assessed under subsection (c) takes an appeal and if the Commission prevails or the appeal is dismissed, unless such person shows to the satisfaction of the Commission that payment of the full amount of the penalty then due has been made by the end of 30 days from the date of entry of judgment on the appeal—

"(A) such person shall be prohibited automatically from trading on all contract markets; and

"(B) if such person is registered with the Commission, such registration shall be suspended automatically.

If the person against whom the money penalty is assessed fails to pay such penalty after the lapse of the period allowed for appeal or after the affirmation of such penalty, the Commission may refer the matter to the Attorney General who shall recover such penalty by action in the appropriate United States district court."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2(a)(1)(B)(iv)—

(A) in subclause (I) by striking "section 6(b)" and inserting "section 6(c)"; and

(B) in subclause (II) by striking "section 6(a)" and inserting "section 6(b)";

(2) in section 5(6), as so redesignated by section 201(b)(2), by striking "paragraph (b) of section 6" and inserting "section 6(c)";

(3) in section 5b by striking "paragraph (a) of section 6" and inserting "section 6(b)";

(4) in section 6a(1) by striking "paragraph (a) of section 6" and inserting "section 6(b)";

(5) in section 6b by striking "paragraph (a) of section 6" and inserting "section 6(b)";

(6) in section 8a—

(A) in the first proviso to paragraph (2) by striking "section 6(b)" and inserting "section 6(c)";

(B) in the second proviso to paragraph (3) by striking "section 6(b)" and inserting "section 6(c)"; and

(C) in paragraph (4) by striking "section 6(b)" each place it appears and inserting "section 6(c)";

(7) in section 14(e) by striking "paragraph (b) of section 6" and inserting "section 6(c)"; and

(8) in section 17—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (3)(B) by striking "section 6(b)" and inserting "section 6(c)"; and

(ii) in paragraph (4)(F) by striking "subsection (b) of section 6" and inserting "section 6(c)";

(B) in subsection (i)(4) by striking "section 6(b)" and inserting "section 6(c)"; and

(C) in subsection (o)(4) by striking "section 6(b)" and inserting "section 6(c)".

SEC. 208. ETHICS TRAINING FOR REGISTRANTS.

(a) MANDATORY TRAINING FOR REGISTRANTS.—Section 4p of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6p) is amended by—

(1) inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 4p."; and

(2) adding at the end the following:

"(b) The Commission shall issue regulations to require new registrants, within 6 months after receiving such registration, to attend a training session, and all other registrants to attend periodic training sessions, to ensure that registrants understand their responsibilities to the public under this Act, including responsibilities to observe just and equitable principles of trade, any rule or regulation of the Commission, any rule of any appropriate contract market, registered futures association, or other self-regulatory organization, or any other applicable Federal or State law, rule or regulation."

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue the regulations required by section 4p(b) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as added by subsection (a), no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 209. NATIONWIDE SERVICE OF PROCESS AND VENUE.

Section 22(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 22(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The United States district courts shall have exclusive jurisdiction of actions brought under this section. Any such action shall be brought not later than 2 years after the date the cause of action arises. Any action brought under subsection (a) of this section may be brought in any judicial district wherein the defendant is found, resides, or transacts business, or in the judicial district wherein any act or transaction constituting the violation occurs. Process in such action may be served in any judicial district of which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found."

SEC. 210. MONITORING OF HEDGE EXEMPTIONS.

(a) MONITORING BY CONTRACT MARKETS.—Section 4a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 6a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (1) by striking "subparagraphs 2 (A) and (B)" and inserting "paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b)";

(2) in subsection (3) by—

(A) striking "subsection (1)" and inserting "subsection (a)";

(B) striking the last sentence; and

(C) adding at the end the following:

"The Commission shall issue regulations to require each contract market to monitor closely

the trading activities of any person granted an exemption from subsection (a) under this subsection to ensure that such person has not acquired or is not maintaining any position in excess of any position limit established pursuant to this section other than what is shown to be a bona fide hedging position, or otherwise exempt pursuant to this section, or otherwise acts in a manner inconsistent with the conditions for an exemption granted under this subsection. If the contract market determines that such person has acquired or is maintaining a position in excess of any position limit established pursuant to this section other than what is shown to be a bona fide hedging position, or otherwise exempt pursuant to this section, or is otherwise acting in a manner inconsistent with the conditions for such exemption, the contract market shall notify such person and take such action as is appropriate under the circumstances. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the Commission or a contract market to act immediately to restrict such person's transactions or positions in accordance with the limits established under this section."

(3) by redesignating subsections (1) through (5) as subsections (a) through (e), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (b), as so redesignated, by redesignating paragraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue the regulations required by section 4a(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as so redesignated by subsection (a), no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 211. PENALTIES FOR FELONY VIOLATIONS.

Section 9 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "\$500,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$100,000" and inserting "\$500,000";

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking "\$500,000" and inserting "\$1,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$100,000" and inserting "\$500,000";

(3) in subsection (d) by striking "\$100,000" and inserting "\$500,000"; and

(4) in subsection (e) by striking "\$100,000" and inserting "\$500,000".

SEC. 212. CONTRACT MARKET EMERGENCY ACTIONS.

(a) PRIOR COMMISSION NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Section 5a(12) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a(12)), as amended by section 204(c), is amended by striking the last 2 sentences and inserting the following:

"The Commission shall issue regulations to specify the terms and conditions under which, in an emergency as defined by the Commission, a contract market may, by a two-thirds vote of its governing board, make a rule (hereafter in this section referred to as an 'emergency rule') effective on a temporary basis without prior Commission approval, or without compliance with the 10-day notice requirement under this paragraph, or during any period of review by the Commission, if the contract market makes every effort practicable to notify the Commission of such emergency rule, along with a complete explanation of the emergency involved, prior to making the emergency rule effective. If the contract market does not provide the Commission with such notification and explanation before making the emergency rule effective, the contract market shall provide the Commission with such notification and explanation at the earliest possible date. The Commission may delegate the power to receive such notification and explanation to such individuals as the Commission

determines necessary and appropriate. Within 10 days of the receipt from a contract market of notification of such an emergency rule and an explanation of the emergency involved, or as soon as practicable, the Commission shall approve or disapprove such emergency rule and submit a report justifying its approval or disapproval of such emergency rule to the affected contract market, to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate. If such report is submitted more than 10 days after the Commission's receipt of notification of such an emergency rule from a contract market, the report shall include a full explanation and justification as to why submission within such 10-day period was not practicable. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under section 8a(9)."

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall issue regulations to implement section 5a(12) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as added by subsection (a), no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Until the effective date of such regulations, any regulation of the Commission that implements the last 2 sentences of section 5a(12), as such sentences were in effect immediately before the date of enactment of this Act, shall remain in effect.

SEC. 213. PROHIBITION AGAINST INSIDER TRADING.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 9 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 13) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) It shall be a felony for any person who is an employee, member of the governing board, or member of any committee of a board of trade, contract market, or registered futures association to willfully use or disclose, in violation of a regulation adopted by the Commission, for any purpose other than the performance of such person's official duties as such employee or member, any material, nonpublic information obtained in the performance of such duties. Such felony shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$100,000 plus that amount of any profits realized from such use or disclosure made in violation of this subsection, or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution.

"(g)(1) It shall be a felony for any individual willfully, and in violation of a regulation issued by the Commission, to use as the basis for any commodity contract transaction for the account of such individual any material, nonpublic information as to one or more present or anticipated cash commodity transactions or commodity contract transactions by any person of whom such individual is a principal or employee, if such present or anticipated transactions, in the aggregate, are in amounts greater than the reporting levels specified by the Commission pursuant to section 4i. Such felony shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$100,000 plus that amount of any profits realized from such use in violation of this subsection, or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution.

"(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) the term 'commodity contract transaction' shall mean any transaction in a contract for the purchase or sale of any commodity for future delivery, or in any option to purchase or sell any commodity or any such contract, made or to be made on or subject to the rules of any contract market; and

"(B) the term 'principal' shall mean a general partner, officer, director, or individual occupying a similar status or performing similar functions, and any holder or beneficial owner of 10 percent or more of the outstanding shares of any class of stock of the person.

"(h)(1) It shall be a felony for any individual willfully, and in violation of a regulation issued by the Commission, to disclose any material, nonpublic information as to one or more present or anticipated cash commodity transactions or commodity contract transactions by any person of whom such individual is a principal or employee if—

"(A) such transactions, in the aggregate, are in amounts greater than the reporting levels specified by the Commission pursuant to section 4i;

"(B) such disclosure is with the intent that any recipient of the information engage in commodity contract transactions on the basis of the disclosed information; and

"(C) such disclosure is unrelated to the legitimate business of the person of whom the individual is a principal or employee.

Such felony shall be punishable by a fine of not more than \$100,000 plus that amount of any profits realized from such disclosure in violation of this subsection, or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both, together with the costs of prosecution.

"(2) For the purpose of paragraph (1), the terms 'commodity contract transaction' and 'principal' shall have the same meaning as specified in section 9(g)."

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Commission shall issue regulations to implement the amendments made by this section not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 214. QUALIFICATIONS OF COMMISSIONERS.

Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 4a(a)(1)) is amended by striking the second and third sentences and inserting the following: "The Commission shall be composed of five Commissioners who shall—

"(i) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate; and

"(ii) each have demonstrated knowledge in futures trading or its regulation, or the production, merchandising, processing or distribution of one or more of the commodities or other goods and articles, services, rights, and interests covered by this Act.

In nominating persons for appointment, the President shall seek to ensure that the demonstrated knowledge of the Commissioners is balanced with respect to such areas."

SEC. 215. MONITORING OF MARGINS ON EQUITY INDEX INSTRUMENTS.

Section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2, 2a, 4, and 4a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(12)(A) The Commission shall monitor the margin level initially required and subsequently maintained on any contract of sale for future delivery of a group or index of equity securities (or any interest therein or based upon the value thereof) to ensure that such margin level is sufficient—

"(i) to maintain the integrity of the futures markets; and

"(ii) to protect the public interest.

"(B) If the Commission determines that such margin level on any such contract presents a clear and present danger to the interests specified in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (A)(ii), the Commission shall, after consultation with the relevant contract market, take such action as it deems necessary to ensure that such margin level is sufficient to protect such interests. If the Commission takes action pursuant to this subparagraph with respect to any contract market, the Commission may, notwithstanding the provisions of section 5a(12), require such contract market to submit all rules, as defined in section 5a(12), relating to the setting of levels of margin to the Commission for the Commission's prior approval or for review in accordance with the 10-day notice provisions of section 5a(12)."

SEC. 216. MONITORING OF INDEX ARBITRAGE TRADING.

Section 2(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2, 2a, 4, and 4a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(13)(A) The Commission shall monitor arbitrage trading, including the use of computers to execute such arbitrage trading, on contracts of sale for future delivery of a group or index of equity securities (or any interest therein or based upon the value thereof) to ensure that such arbitrage trading does not—

"(i) threaten the integrity of the futures markets;

"(ii) create excessive volatility in the futures markets; or

"(iii) otherwise adversely affect the public interest.

"(B) It is the sense of Congress that if the Commission determines that such arbitrage trading presents a clear and present danger:

"(i) to the integrity of the futures markets;

"(ii) of creating excessive volatility in the futures markets; or

"(iii) of otherwise adversely affecting the public interest;

the Commission should take such action pursuant to its existing authority as it deems necessary to ensure that such arbitrage trading does not present such a clear and present danger."

SEC. 217. PROHIBITION ON VOTING BY INTERESTED MEMBERS.

Section 5a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7a) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

"(14) ensure that no member of a governing board or committee thereof votes on any rule, as defined in paragraph (12), if, as determined in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commission—

"(A) the member;

"(B) a legal entity of which the member is an officer or employee;

"(C) a legal entity in which the member owns a substantial interest; or

"(D) a legal entity which is the parent or subsidiary of any legal entity specified in subparagraph (B) or (C);

has a direct financial interest in the subject matter of the rule. Any member prohibited from voting on a rule pursuant to this paragraph shall not be included in determining whether there has been a two-thirds vote of a governing board for purposes of paragraph (12). For purposes of this paragraph the term 'legal entity' includes a corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship, or joint venture."

SEC. 218. STUDY OF DELIVERY POINTS FOR AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY CONTRACTS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the provision for, and functioning of, delivery points regarding contracts of sale for future delivery of any agricultural commodity to determine whether the objectives of section 5a(10) of the Commodity Exchange Act are being achieved. The study shall also examine such issues as—

(1) whether the objectives of such Act relative to such delivery points need to be revised;

(2) whether the availability and adequacy of storage facilities for agricultural commodities at such delivery points affect prices;

(3) whether the number, accessibility, and volume of storage facilities at such delivery points contribute to consistency and reasonableness in price discovery in the contract market; and

(4) such other issues relating to such delivery points as the Comptroller General determines relevant to the efficient operation and improvement of contract markets for agricultural commodities.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller

General shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), together with any appropriate recommendations.

SEC. 219. STUDY OF ASSESSMENTS ON TRANSACTIONS.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine whether—

(1) it is feasible to fund some or all of the enforcement and market surveillance activities of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as required by the amendments to the Commodity Exchange Act made by the Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991, through the imposition of an assessment on commodity futures and options transactions executed pursuant to the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(2) a program of assessment-based funding for some or all of such enforcement and market surveillance activities would better provide resources to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to enable the Commission to—

(A) protect the interests of market users (including hedgers and speculators), producers of commodities traded on the futures markets, and the general public; and

(B) maintain and enhance the credibility of such futures and options markets.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the Comptroller General's determinations pursuant to subsection (a), together with any appropriate recommendations for the implementation of such a program of assessment-based funding for some or all of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission's enforcement and market surveillance activities.

SEC. 220. COMPETITIVENESS STUDY.

No later than 18 months following the enactment of this Act, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission shall study the competitiveness of boards of trade over which it has jurisdiction compared with the boards of trade (or their foreign equivalent) over which foreign futures authorities, as defined in section 2(a)(1)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2(a)(1)(A)), have jurisdiction, and submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report of its findings with respect to—

(1) the overall competitive status of United States boards of trade in the world market;

(2) a comparison of applicable statutes, rules, or regulations as they relate to futures and options administered and enforced by the Commission and those administered and enforced by foreign futures authorities;

(3) any trends in, or movements of, volume of futures and options trading to or from United States boards of trade during the period of the study;

(4) whether the trends or movements, if any, were the result of the adoption of statutes, regulations, or other enforcement mechanisms in foreign countries or the United States; and

(5) any recommendations the Commission may have as a result of its study to enhance the competitive status of United States boards of trade in the world market that will not impair customer confidence in United States boards of trade.

SEC. 221. COMPUTERIZED FUTURES TRADING.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Commodity Futures Trading Commission (hereinafter in this section referred to as "the Commission") shall conduct a study to determine—

(1) whether it is or may be feasible for all, or substantially all, trading in futures and options subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission under the Commodity Exchange Act to be conducted by a system of computers or by other electronic means; and

(2) whether such a system of trading would enhance access to the futures and options markets by potential market participants, improve the ability of the Commission to audit the activities of the futures and options markets, reduce the opportunity for trading abuses, and otherwise be in the public interest.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), together with any appropriate recommendations.

(c) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—Effective 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish a pilot program to collect information on, and encourage, the use of computers and other electronic means to effect trading in the futures and options markets within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Commission.

SEC. 222. MONEY PENALTIES IN CIVIL COURT ACTIONS.

Section 6c of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 13a-1) is amended by adding after the third sentence two new sentences to read as follows: "In any action brought under this section, the Commission may seek and the court shall have jurisdiction to impose, upon a proper showing, upon any person found to have committed any violation in such action a civil penalty for each violation in the amount of not more than the higher of \$100,000 or triple the monetary gain to such person. If a person upon whom such a penalty is imposed shall fail to pay such penalty within the time prescribed in the court's order, the Commission may refer the matter to the Attorney General who shall recover such penalty by action in the appropriate United States district court."

TITLE III—ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITIES**SEC. 301. DEFINITION OF FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITY.**

Section 2(a)(1)(A) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 2), as amended by section 205(a), is amended by adding at the end the following: "The term 'foreign futures authority' means any foreign government, or any department, agency, governmental body or regulatory organization empowered by a foreign government to administer or enforce laws, rules, or regulations as they relate to futures or options matters, or any department or agency of a political subdivision of a foreign government empowered to administer or enforce laws, rules or regulations as they relate to futures or options matters."

SEC. 302. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.

The third sentence of section 6(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 15), as so redesignated by section 207(1), is amended by inserting "or for purposes of any action taken under section 12(f) of this Act," after "under this Act,".

SEC. 303. COOPERATION WITH FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITIES.

Section 12(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 16(a)) is amended by inserting after "thereof," the following: "any foreign futures authority, any department or agency of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof,".

SEC. 304. INVESTIGATIVE ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITIES.

Section 12 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 16) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f)(1) On request from a foreign futures authority, the Commission may, in its discretion, provide assistance in accordance with this section if the requesting authority states that the requesting authority is conducting an investigation which it deems necessary to determine whether any person has violated, is violating, or is about to violate any laws, rules or regulations relating to futures or options matters that the requesting authority administers or enforces. The Commission may conduct such investigation as the Commission deems necessary to collect information and evidence pertinent to the request for assistance. Such assistance may be provided without regard to whether the facts stated in the request would also constitute a violation of the laws of the United States.

"(2) In deciding whether to provide assistance under this subsection, the Commission shall consider whether—

"(A) the requesting authority has agreed to provide reciprocal assistance to the Commission in futures and options matters; and

"(B) compliance with the request would prejudice the public interest of the United States.

"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission may accept payment and reimbursement, in cash or in kind, from a foreign futures authority, or made on behalf of such authority, for necessary expenses incurred by the Commission, its members, and employees in carrying out any investigation, or in providing any other assistance to a foreign futures authority, pursuant to this section. Any payment or reimbursement accepted shall be considered a reimbursement to the appropriated funds of the Commission."

SEC. 305. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITIES.

Section 8 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a)(1), as so redesignated by section 203(1), the following:

"The Commission shall not be compelled to disclose any information or data obtained from a foreign futures authority if—

"(1) the foreign futures authority has in good faith determined and represented to the Commission that disclosure of such information or data by that foreign futures authority would violate the laws applicable to that foreign futures authority; and

"(2) the Commission obtains such information pursuant to—

"(A) such procedure as the Commission may authorize for use in connection with the administration or enforcement of this Act; or

"(B) a memorandum of understanding with that foreign futures authority;

except that nothing in this subsection shall prevent the Commission from disclosing publicly any information or data obtained by the Commission from a foreign futures authority when such disclosure is made in connection with a congressional proceeding, an administrative or judicial proceeding commenced by the United States or the Commission, in any receivership proceeding commenced by the United States or the Commission, or in any proceeding under title 11 of the United States Code in which the Commission has intervened or in which the Commission has the right to appear and be heard. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the Commission to withhold information on data from Congress"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following: "This subsection shall not apply to the disclosure of data or information obtained by the Commission from a foreign futures authority."

SEC. 306. DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION TO FOREIGN FUTURES AUTHORITIES.

Section 8(e) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 12(e)) is amended—

(1) in the fifth sentence—

(A) by inserting "or any foreign futures authority" after "jurisdiction," the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting "foreign futures authority," after "such"; and

(2) in the last sentence—

(A) by inserting "foreign futures authority or to a" after "information to a";

(B) by inserting "foreign futures authority," after "disclosed by such"; and

(C) by inserting "or foreign futures authority" after "or agency thereof".

TITLE IV—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS; TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS; EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 12(d) of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 16(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

"(1) \$48,500,000 for fiscal year 1992; and

"(2) \$53,000,000 for fiscal year 1993."

SEC. 402. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking "commission" in—

(A) section 4a, as amended by section 210(a), each place it appears other than in subsection (d) as so redesignated;

(B) section 6(b), as so redesignated by section 207(a)(1), each place it appears;

(C) section 6(c), as so redesignated by section 207(a)(1);

(D) section 13(c); and inserting "Commission";

(2) in section 4b—

(A) by redesignating subdivisions (A) through (D) as subdivisions (i) through (iv), respectively;

(B) by striking "(a)", "(b)", and "(c)", and inserting "(A)", "(B)", and "(C)", respectively;

(C) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 4b."; and

(D) by inserting "(b)" before "Nothing in this section or"; and

(E) by inserting "(c)" before "Nothing in this section shall";

(3) in section 4c(d)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(iv) by striking "(15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(12))" and inserting "(15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(12))"; and

(B) in the matter following subparagraph (C) by striking "section (2)(a)" and inserting "section 2(a)";

(4) in section 4f(b), as so redesignated by section 101(a)(1), by striking "within nine months after the effective date of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission Act of 1974, and subsequently" and inserting a comma;

(5) in section 6(c), as so redesignated by section 207(a)(1), by striking "offending person." and inserting "offending person";

(6) in section 6(c), as so redesignated by section 207, and in section 8(f) by striking "subpena" and "subpenas" each place they appear and inserting "subpoena" and "subpoenas", respectively;

(7) in section 6a, as amended by section 207(b)(4), by redesignating subsections (1) and (2) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively;

(8) by striking "the Secretary of Agriculture or"—

(A) in the first sentence of section 6(b), as so redesignated by section 207(a)(1);

(B) in the first sentence of section 6(c), as so redesignated by section 207(a)(1); and

(C) in section 13(c);

(9) in section 8a—

(A) in paragraph (5) by striking "and" at the end; and

(B) in paragraph (7) by striking "matters as:" and inserting "matters as—";

(10) in section 14(g) by striking "fifteen months" the second place it appears and inserting "15-month";

(11) in section 17—

(A) in subsection (a) by indenting the left margin of paragraphs (1) and (2) by 2 ems; and

(B) in subsection (1)(2)(B)—

(i) by striking "the Commodity Exchange" and inserting "this"; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and";

(12) by striking section 21;

(13) in section 22(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking "clauses (A) through (D)" and inserting "subparagraphs (A) through (D)"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D) by striking "clause (B)" and inserting "subparagraph (B)"; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking "17b(10)" and inserting "17(b)(10)"; and

(14) by striking section 23.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] rise?

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 707 and request allocation of half the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Louisiana opposed to the bill?

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. speaker, I am in support of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] therefore qualifies.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chairman recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, the Commodity Futures Trading Act of 1991, extends the authority of the CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and provides the power and the regulatory tools it needs to effectively protect investors and the American public in the new age of global trading of commodity futures contracts.

The bill is nearly the same as passed this House in 1989 by a vote of 420 to nothing.

Basically, let me say that the difference between this bill and the 1989 bill which was approved 420 to nothing consists of five items.

The bill authorizes appropriations for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the fiscal years 1992 and 1993. This is different, of course, from last year.

Second, it amends the legislation authorizing the Commission to seek

money penalties in court actions. Third, it has an amendment to the provisions authorizing penalties for felony violations of the bill's insider trading provision. Fourth, it contains a technical clarification of the language regarding the enforcement of civil penalties. And fifth, it has an amendment deleting from the bill an unrelated technical amendment that has since been enacted in other legislation.

Those, my colleagues, are the differences from the 1989 bill. Let me say that it has provisions pertaining to the authorization for appropriations, limitations on certain trading practices, audit trail requirements, regulation of stock index futures, penalties, enforcement powers, self-regulatory requirements, enhancement of registration requirements, qualifications for CFTC commissioners, court jurisdictions, and then it authorizes several studies.

Basically, it is the same legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is time to give the Commodity Futures Trading Commission the power and the regulatory tools it needs to effectively protect investors and the American public in the new age of global trading of commodity futures contracts.

H.R. 707, the Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991, is regulatory reform legislation designed to achieve the level of protection investors and the public deserve. This bill is nearly identical to legislation unanimously approved by the House in 1989 by a vote of 420 to 0. H.R. 707 has four major components:

First, it will significantly strengthen the powers of the Commission in regulating the futures markets.

Second, it will put in place important trade practice reforms of the futures exchanges themselves.

Third, the bill will substantially increase penalties which may be imposed for criminal violations of the Commodity Exchange Act. It will also prohibit those individuals who have been convicted of criminal violations from being registered as a broker or other market participant under the Commodity Exchange Act.

And fourth, H.R. 707 will give the CFTC the authority it has requested to become a full partner in international efforts to coordinate futures market regulation and enforcement for the benefit of market users and the general public.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago public confidence in the integrity of the futures trading industry and the Federal regulation agency that oversees its activities was severely shaken.

In January 1989 the Justice Department revealed that it had conducted an undercover investigation of alleged illegal trading activities in the pits of the Chicago futures exchanges. The investigations revealed that some floor traders were using their positions to

reap illicit profits at the expense of futures market users.

It was in the aftermath of that investigation back in 1989 that the House Agriculture Committee set out to address various shortcomings in current futures trading laws and develop legislation to limit opportunities for abuse.

The Committee on Agriculture reported H.R. 2869, the Commodity Futures Improvement Act, to the House on September 7, 1989. On September 13, 1989, the House unanimously passed the bill by a vote of 420 to 0. The bill before us today, H.R. 707, is nearly identical to the 1989 legislation approved by the House.

Despite the broad support for this legislation expressed by the House in 1989, floor action in the other body never occurred during the 101st Congress. No conference was possible and the legislation died.

What happened? It's simple. The real need to strengthen futures trading regulation was forced to take a back seat to a purely Washington syndrome known as a turf fight. At issue was a blatant jurisdictional grab by another Federal agency to regulate a financial instrument called stock index futures.

This jurisdictional turf grab was attempted at the expense of the clearly expressed desire of the House in 1989 to protect the public's interest through enactment of responsible legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get the ball rolling again and I urge the House to once again approve this significant legislative enhancement of the powers of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

To the credit of the Commission and its chairman, Wendy Gramm, the agency has used its current powers and resources effectively. The Congress needs to do its part by giving the Commission the authority it needs to ensure the fairness and integrity of the ever-changing futures market.

Mr. Speaker, passage and enactment of H.R. 707 into law will result in increased public confidence in the integrity of the futures trading industry. Improved public confidence in the markets will lead to increased participation by farmers, individual investors, institutional investors and other market participants, both domestically and around the world, who can capitalize on the benefits afforded by futures markets when the trading is unquestionably fair and open.

This bill will also benefit the Nation by assuring that the U.S. commodity futures industry maintains its status as the preeminent futures market in the world.

I commend the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development, and its chairman, Congressman GLENN ENGLISH and its ranking minority member, TOM COLEMAN for their work over the past 2 years on this issue.

This bill is long overdue and I urge my colleagues to lend it their support. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation and summary of H.R. 707 be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF H.R. 707, COMMODITY FUTURES IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1991

Authorization of appropriations.—Authorizes appropriations for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission in the amount of \$48.5 million for fiscal year 1992 and \$53 million for fiscal year 1993. This compares to the appropriated funding level of \$43,960,000 for fiscal year 1991.

Limitations on certain trading practices.—Amends the Commodity Exchange Act to prohibit dual trading by a floor broker in any contract market in which the Commodity Futures Trading Commission has determined the average daily trading volume to be equal to or greater than a threshold trading level of 7,000 contracts, but the Commission may increase or decrease the threshold trading level if a change is warranted, considering the effects of the prohibition against dual trading on price volatility, bid-ask spreads, or the public interest.

The Commission must exempt a contract market from the dual trading prohibition if the Commission determines that the exemption is in the public interest and the contract market can demonstrate that its surveillance systems and procedures, including its audit trail, (1) can detect those instances of trading violations attributable to dual trading, and (2) is fully verifiable.

The Commission retains the authority to further restrict or completely prohibit dual trading.

Limits trading among members of broker associations.

Audit trail requirements.—Requires each contract market to maintain an audit trail including such information as the Commission determines necessary to rapidly reconstruct an accurate record of the transactions executed on such contract market. The time of execution of contract market transactions must be verifiable and must: (1) be stated in one minute increments beginning not later than one year after enactment of the bill; and (2) be stated in 30 second increments beginning not later than three years after enactment of the bill.

A board of trade's audit trail for all of the contracts designated for that board of trade must comply with the one minute and 30 second recording requirements before the Commission can designate the board of trade as a contract market for any new contracts.

Regulation of stock index futures.—Requires the Commission to monitor margin levels on a group or index of equity securities and to take necessary action to ensure that market integrity and the public interest are protected.

Requires the Commission to monitor arbitrage trading to ensure that it does not threaten the public interest.

Penalties.—Makes it a felony for exchange employees or certain other persons to use or disclose certain material, nonpublic information. A violation of this prohibition will be punishable by a fine of up to \$100,000, plus any profits realized from such use or disclosure, and imprisonment for up to three years.

Increases the penalties for certain felony violations of the Commodity Exchange Act from \$500,000 to \$1 million for corporations and similar legal entities, and from \$100,000 to \$500,000 for individuals.

Enforcement powers.—Requires the Commission to continue to request the assistance of and cooperate with the appropriate Federal agencies in conducting investigations, including undercover operations, under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Authorizes the Commission to cooperate with, offer investigative assistance to, accept information from, and disclose certain information to, foreign futures authorities.

Self-regulatory requirements.—Requires each registered futures association to specify the factors it will consider in determining whether to require a member to adopt special supervisory procedures regarding telephone solicitations. Such procedures must include a three day "cooling off" period during which a member who solicited an inexperienced customer by telephone to open a futures or options account may not trade such account on behalf of the customer.

Requires a system of contract market disciplinary committees and a schedule of major violations of the rules of contract markets or registered futures associations. The bill prohibits any person found to have committed a major violation of such contract market rules from service on the governing board or a disciplinary committee of any contract market or registered futures association.

Requires that outside members comprise at least 20 percent of the membership on the governing boards of contract markets and registered futures associations.

Prohibits voting on a rule by any exchange board member with a direct financial interest in the subject matter of the rule.

Requires each contract market to monitor closely the trading activities of any person granted a hedging exemption to ensure that such person does not obtain a position in excess of such exemption.

Requires each contract market to make every effort practicable to give the Commission prior notification of any emergency action proposed by the contract market and requires the Commission to notify the contract market and the House and Senate Agriculture Committees of its approval or disapproval of the emergency action within 10 days, or as soon as practicable, after the Commission receives such notification.

Enhancement of registration requirements.—Requires the registration of floor traders, enhances the Commission's and contract markets' authority to disqualify registrants, and provides for the suspension of registration and trading privileges for the nonpayment of civil money penalties.

Requires that registrants attend periodic ethics training sessions.

Qualifications of CFTC commissioners.—Requires that each Commissioner on the Commission have demonstrated knowledge in futures trading or its regulation, or knowledge of the commodities, services, rights and interests covered by the Commodity Exchange Act, and the President is to seek a balance among the Commissioners of the areas of demonstrated knowledge.

Court jurisdiction.—Provides for nationwide service of process and venue for parties bringing a private right of action under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Studies.—Requires the General Accounting Office to study the delivery points for futures contracts for agricultural commodities and to study the feasibility of funding Commission surveillance activities through an assessment on futures transactions.

The bill also requires the Commission to conduct a study of the competitiveness of U.S. futures exchanges compared to those in

foreign countries, and to study the feasibility of computerized trading.

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

□ 1300

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as those of us who served in this body in the last Congress know, H.R. 707 represents many months of work and investigation by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] and myself and the combined Agriculture Committee staff as well as personnel of the General Accounting Office. The staff work was tedious and exhaustive; the product, the legislation we consider today, is a credible document. It is just as important today as it was when the House passed this legislation, as H.R. 2869, September 13, 1989, without a single opposing vote.

The wisdom of this bill is being confirmed by proposed or final rulemakings of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and changes made by the self-regulatory organizations, the futures exchanges, themselves.

For those changes and the intent to make further improvements in their regulatory and trading systems, I commend Chairman Gramm and her colleagues at the CFTC as well as officials at the exchanges around the country. The progress made to date, especially at the larger exchange in Chicago and New York, in bringing their audit trail and trade recordation systems into the electronic age is exemplary. The exchanges should be applauded for this work. I know it is a difficult task to meet these new goals while retaining the traditions and trademarks of the U.S. futures industry, such as the open outcry trading system.

The CFTC has been extremely busy the last several months studying various aspects of its regulatory program such as dual trading, the registration and regulation of broker associations, and enhanced audit trails.

The Commission has expanded its routine floor surveillance and joined with international regulators to define and develop principles on the oversight of global trading systems such as the Chicago Mercantile Exchange's Globex system.

And, of course, the Commission continues to work closely with the Securities and Exchange Commission in their joint program to regulate the cash and derivative securities markets. But, I think I would be remiss if I did not point out that the CFTC also works closely with the Department of Agriculture in monitoring cash and futures agricultural markets just as the CFTC and the Energy Department monitor the energy markets.

However, the Congress must continue to vigorously monitor the markets, the self-regulatory organizations and the

CFTC to ensure that our markets continue to be the envy of the world.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this bill, as a whole, is sound legislation and should be adopted once again by the House.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, and Rural Development.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, I think, has been summed up very well by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN]. It is basically the same legislation, as has been pointed out, that passed this Chamber unanimously some nearly 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this is legislation that is very tough. Some have said, quite frankly, that it is too tough, but we have found, since that time, that instead of having difficulty in meeting its standards, instead of resisting meeting those standards, we have found that the futures industry itself is moving toward meeting what is without question some of the toughest standards ever laid down to the futures industry.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation is legislation which had passed the House Committee on Agriculture in August of 1989, and it passed on the day that the U.S. attorney in Chicago laid out his findings with regard to the FBI investigation and that led up to the indictments with regard to some wrongdoing. I called the U.S. attorney and asked him to review this legislation to see if, in fact, there were any areas that were uncovered, any areas of wrongdoing that were uncovered by their investigation which were not addressed by this legislation, but needed to be addressed, and he responded to me that there were not. I felt that that was a testimony to the fine investigation that was carried out by the staff of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation was independent of the FBI investigation. We were not aware of their findings, and I think it certainly underscores the importance of this particular legislation.

As the chairman pointed out, it contains a number of reform, tighter restrictions and enhanced capability for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and, in fact, for the first time it will provide for the resources, and I might say the authority, to the CFTC to conduct its own undercover operations in the future instead of being required to rely on investigative agencies such as the FBI.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good bill, it is a tough bill, and it is one, quite frankly, that will, I think, make the American public who trades in the fu-

tures industry feel far more confident and secure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 707 because of one provision, a provision relating to stock index futures. I think, except for this provision, this is a good bill, a strong bill, it has a lot of teeth in it, and I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], as well as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], for the work that they did, not only 2 years ago, but this year for this legislation.

It is true. This legislation is very similar to the bill that was considered in the last Congress. In the last Congress I offered amendments on the floor regarding stock index futures with the understanding that this would be addressed, and strengthened and cleaned up in conference.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has happened since then. This issue proved to be so controversial that the Senate could not even reach agreement to bring the measure to the floor of that body, and it became apparent that the bill managers did not want to address the issue, or certainly they would have during the hearing process, the markup process in subcommittee or committee before we reached here, the floor of the House.

What are we talking about? Stock index futures. Stock index futures are a bet, a bet on what is going to happen on the New York Stock Exchange. The most popular futures index is the S&P 500 index, and the question before us today is: What margin level should one have to put up? How much money should one have to put up before they are allowed to take a position in the S&P 500 futures index?

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, if you go to a stock broker, and you want to buy the equivalent stock, you have to put up 50 percent. If you go, and you want to buy a futures contract, there have been times in the past when you could put up as little as 2 percent.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in the meltdown, the great stock market crash of October 1987, the margin requirement then was 3.6 percent. Two years later, in October of 1989, the margin requirement was only 2.2 percent. That means that there have been times when I could buy one futures contract which is \$185,000 by putting up as little as \$4,000, whereas it would cost me \$92,000 to buy that much stock, equivalent stock, in New York.

To give my colleagues an idea of what we are talking about volumewise, dollarwise, let me refer to today's Wall Street Journal, a futures contract here, one line, the S&P futures contract. Do my colleagues know how much the dollar volume traded yesterday was on this one line? Eleven point

one billion dollars; not million, billion. There was as much traded there as there was in the entire New York Stock Exchange where there is page after page listed of the various stocks in America.

Why? Because this margin level is so low, and that is the question before us today: Should our Government, should we, regulate? Should we be involved in determining what this margin level is?

There are actually four different positions that have been suggested that are on the table. Secretary of the Treasury Brady in a letter to me earlier this month stated that he feels Treasury's proposal, which says the SEC, the Securities and Exchange Commission, should regulate stock index futures, should be a part of the bill before us today. He feels that they should be regulated.

□ 1310

Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, in recent testimony stated that it has become obvious through the years that stock index futures should be regulated, because the exchanges tend to set them too low in normal times, and then, when they get in trouble, they have no room to move.

Wendy Gramm, Chairman of the CFTC, just within the last 2 weeks has reversed herself, and now feels that stock index futures should be regulated. Of course, she feels the CFTC should now regulate them.

Then we have the fourth position, the position of the bill before us today, which says let us let the stock exchanges set their own margin requirements.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the lower the margin requirement is, the greater the dollar volume that is traded, and the greater the dollar volume that is traded, the greater the profits of the exchanges. The greater the dollar volume that is traded, the greater the profits of the exchanges.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we are talking about the wealth of America here when we are talking about these massive bets, \$11 billion a day, being placed on what the stock market, the Standard & Poor 500 Index, is going to do in New York.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the prudent thing for us to do, when you have all of these bodies, all of these voices crying out and saying yes, we should regulate, yes, it should be regulated, I would urge Members, let us defeat this legislation on suspension and come back with an open rule, so that we, the Members of Congress, we, the people's body, can have some say, some voice, some participation on what the position of the House should be, rather than letting it be determined in conference.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge defeat of H.R. 707.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say very quickly that for those who may not be that aware, that a futures industry and a stock are two different instruments. They have different purposes.

One is to facilitate the price discovery and shift the risk, and that is called a future. It is usually held for a short period of duration. A stock is a capital formation item, and is usually held for a long period of time.

The markets are regulated differently. The margins that they have serve different purposes.

For instance, as far as the clearinghouse for a futures contract, it acts as a guarantee to make sure that both the buyer and the seller are satisfied, and that exchange financially has to stand behind it or they lose it. When we talk about the stock exchanges, they do not guarantee any type of performance.

Basically these are different instruments, different purposes, different aims, and are regulated differently. So I think in order to get a handle on this issue, and it is one that has divided the futures industry and the securities industry and caused great debate between regulatory agencies, and that is basically what we are talking about, turf battles, between the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

But perhaps the best way to get at the bottom line on this is recently, in fact, last year, there was published a study entitled, "The Effects of Margins on the Volatility of Stock and Derivative Markets: A Review of the Evidence." This is by a professor of finance, Don Chance, who is with the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. He was not taking sides, but simply reviewing all the studies that have been done by all the experts in this field.

In this particular paper, Professor Chance notes that the rapid growth in the use of derivative security products, most notably the stock index futures, has led some to believe that these instruments, with their relatively low margins, are in some way to blame for the market crashes in October 1987, and in the minicrash of 1989.

The belief that the margins can be effective in controlling volatility in the markets has led for calls, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] does, for tighter regulations of margins and higher margin levels.

The paper itself contains 60 academic articles on the subject of margins and volatility. In the analysis of all this material, all the studies that have been done in this literature, Professor Chance concluded that the evidence does not support the proposition that tighter regulation and higher margin

levels can effectively control volatility. In fact, he finds from all the experts all across the country that the opposite is true. These experts that have looked into this, in fact, have come to the conclusion that there is overwhelming evidence that margin requirements cannot be used in controlling volatility.

At best, Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with here on this issue is a lot of theory, and a lot of people who have an interest, namely turf, in trying to push forward those theories and trying to deal with this issue.

I would suggest that we have before us today is the reauthorization of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and not the issue before us of trying to decide whether in fact margins do or do not have an impact with regard to the securities industry.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLISH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission already has emergency powers, which are continued under this bill, to deal with margins in those emergency situations? Is that not true already?

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, they not only have the authority for emergencies, but also in this legislation go a step further. What the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] agreed to 18 months ago was in fact a compromise which gave them even further authority.

So, yes, there are emergency powers. In fact, there are powers under the provision of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] that were contained in the bill, even requiring them to take steps further, should they find even a danger of an emergency.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what the gentleman is saying is that the language of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] is already contained in this bill from 2 years ago, which basically raises it to a higher level of standard, if you will, over an emergency as we know it now.

I think the concern of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] as expressed in committee, he would like to see the Commission involved in daily margin settings, if you will, as opposed to letting the exchanges do it with oversight by the Commission now.

I think the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] also in the discussions in committee basically does not like derivative instruments and contracts based upon stock markets.

Mr. Speaker, in this case the stock market is the cash market. Wall Street is a cash market. The futures market in Chicago on the S&P 500 is a futures instrument.

Mr. Speaker, we just have a different philosophy. But America leads the world in these instruments. It is the center of the world for them. If we start fooling around with margins and trying to find out other experts' opinion on this thing, we are going to ship all this overseas and America will not be No. 1 in this area. It will all be shipped overseas, and we will have no control over it.

Would the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] agree with that?

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would agree, and simply go one step further in saying not only do we have that, but to ensure that margins do not get too low, the exchanges themselves have to put up their own money. In other words, if there is a loss, it is the exchanges that are going to lose.

Certainly with the CFTC having not only the right, but the obligation, the responsibility to act in case of any kind of an emergency should they misjudge, I think is more than appropriate authority.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is recalling the clearinghouse function of the exchanges, where you have to balance off each one of these accounts every 24-hour period. Whereas on the New York Stock Exchange or any other stock exchange, there is no such feature at all.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in fact, as I understand it, they have something like 5 days, and they are hoping to get that down to 3 days. So, as I pointed out, they are entirely different industries. We regulate them entirely differently. There are entirely different rules and regulations. I suppose it would be highly unusual if they did not have different margin requirements.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think that is why we need to support the bill.

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

I would like to attempt to respond to the point that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] raised. First of all, there are numerous studies out. Many of those studies suggest that there is a direct link. Secretary of Treasury Brady feels very strongly that there is a direct link between stock index futures and the performance of the actual stock market.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain how this situation works. There are companies, I will point out to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], that do nothing, their sole business is buying in one market and selling in the other to keep them in balance. So if there is excessive selling in Chicago, they will buy Chicago and sell New York, to bring them into balance.

So I think there is a direct linkage, and most economists suggest that there is a direct linkage, between the effects of what takes place in Chicago on the S&P 500 and the performance on the New York Stock Exchange.

□ 1320

We talked about emergency powers, and that is the problem. When you get into an emergency, it is too late, because it is true, they operate differently in Chicago in a futures contract than they do in New York where you own the stock. And what they do, ladies and gentleman, is if you cannot come up with their margin requirements, they liquidate you immediately.

This means if the market is dropping, and it is dropping drastically, the gentleman from Oklahoma is exactly right, this is the exchanges' money, and if you as an individual cannot come up to cover your margin call immediately, they liquidate you, they take you out to protect themselves. That is why they never lose any money.

What does that do when they start liquidating? That further compounds the problem of markets falling.

That is why we need regulation and oversight, not in a time when we get into a crisis situation, but in normal times to see that this margin requirement is not too low. It has been at the level of 2 or 3 percent. Today, just before the war in the Persian Gulf, the exchanges took it upon themselves to raise the margin level. I understand it is some 11 percent now.

But certainly if we do nothing to regulate, history points out that it drifts back down again, because again, let me point out that the lower the margin requirement is the more money someone has to buy futures with, so the more he buys, and the more he buys the more the exchanges make.

I suggest, I strongly urge my colleagues, let us consider we, the Government, should have some say, some involvement, because we are really talking about the wealth of America here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART].

Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, something worse than no regulation is the pretense of regulation, and this bill is a great pretender. In fact, it fails to address, in a way articulated so eloquently by my colleague from Louisiana, the real threat to the development of new instruments, real instruments and reliable instruments in a meaningful way.

My colleague from Missouri mentioned that America will lose its lead. The fact of the matter is that the new instruments developed, the two most recently newly developed instruments in these areas were in fact developed

beyond the shores of the United States simply because of ongoing Federal court decisions having created a level of uncertainty that does not allow them to be developed here.

If in fact we had the coordination suggested by my colleague from Louisiana, if in fact a proper definition of futurity was applied to financial instruments to reflect the way they are actually issued in the marketplace, we would reject out of hand the so-called suggestions of the bill before us and move forward in a realistic way as my colleague from Louisiana suggests.

This is a classic bill of self-interest by the Commodities Exchange to protect their own self-interest. The fact simply remains that America cannot be in the forefront of new financial interests, that consumers of financial instruments such as what this legislation envisions will not be protected unless the protections envisioned by my colleague from Louisiana and others are brought to bear as part of this matter.

This is an entirely different industry. It is not subject to the same kind of vagaries that it once was when it was an opportunity for farmers to guarantee and predict a price out into the future and protect themselves from weather and other matters beyond their control. This has become a different form of Las Vegas. It has gone beyond the penumbra of farmers helping themselves, of farmers trying to assist and protect themselves now to an arena that is so sophisticated where if investors do not have the appropriate filings and disclosure forms of every other financial instrument in this country, they proceed as they see fit.

What are we told of the protections we are guaranteed? We are told that the commission, who is egregiously embarrassed by having to have other agencies of this Federal Government swoop down in the middle of the night and seize records because they were found asleep, it is the watchdog that became the lapdog, sitting there idly licking the fingers of those who feed him, and this legislation only puts more meat on the table for that lapdog.

My colleague from Louisiana has sketched out for this chamber in a very real and pragmatic way the fundamental failure of this legislation to protect American consumers, to secure the integrity of the marketplace, to define new financial instruments with a predictability and insurability that consumers will be protected.

No, the pretense of regulation is worse than no regulation at all, and this legislation is a pretender to regulate those in the marketplace who seek to take advantage of these instruments. The legislation deserves to be defeated. We need to take a good, hard look at how all of these instruments in their entirety should be regulated with much more predictability and cer-

titude than what this committee has brought forward.

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

Mr. ECKART. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting, the difference of opinion evidently between the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman in the well. The gentleman from Louisiana differs only on this one part. Evidently perhaps the gentleman in the well is familiar with the legislation and the provision contained therein. I noticed, for instance, that he would imply that the CFTC had the authority to carry on investigations, when the law itself requires that such investigation be carried out by the FBI.

As I pointed out in my opening statement, perhaps the gentleman was not here to hear it, we went through this legislation with the U.S. attorney in Chicago who carried out those investigations, and there was not one single feature that he could come up with that is either not covered by present law or covered by this legislation.

Also, I would point out that there are a number of points with regard to this legislation in which there have been strong objections from the industry itself because they felt this legislation was in fact too tough.

Now I can appreciate the gentleman's opinions and where he comes from. I understand that he is more familiar with regard to the regulation of the securities industry. But that is exactly the point. What we have dealt with here, and what has been the case all the way through, is not based on fact but is in fact based on opinion, tough battles.

Mr. ECKART. Let me reclaim my time and express my opinion. Indeed, I did hear the gentleman's speech on the floor earlier, which is what drew me over here to participate.

Let me certainly assert to my colleagues that what is going on here, and my colleague from Louisiana has touched upon it, is the fundamental question of integrity of both the dealers and the process. When he speaks about the margin setting, margin setting authorities, I think that is the fundamental question here. I do not seek the floor to speak about a much broader reform, which I think would in fact be in order. I am here to assert what I believe to be the accuracy of the gentleman's statements about creating a financial marketplace for those who choose to participate that has as its financial underpinnings the integrity of a system that makes sense for investors.

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

Mr. ECKART. I am happy to yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the gentleman from Okla-

homa, as he well knows, the amendment that was offered 2 years ago was only to get a foot in the door to go to conference. We did not go to conference. We started over with this bill.

The gentleman from Oklahoma, who managed the bill through the committee, was opposed to making any changes whatsoever. In fact, at one time he stated we should just drop the entire section. I suggest, as the gentleman from Ohio has said, poor regulation is probably the worst of all worlds here, and all we have allowed is in time of dire emergency for regulation. Certainly it is a function, as so eloquently pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio, that we should be involved in for the integrity of the market, for the integrity of the consumer, for the integrity of America.

Mr. ECKART. I thank my colleague from Louisiana, and I urge the defeat of the legislation.

□ 1330

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 707, the Commodity Futures Improvements Act of 1991. As approved unanimously by the House in 1989, H.R. 707 will ensure integrity of the commodity futures markets and provide greater protection to the public by strengthening the enforcement capabilities of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the CFTC.

Through the leadership of Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COLEMAN, the House Agriculture Committee has brought forth this legislation which gets to the heart of existing problems with futures trading.

These are the key points to H.R. 707: Prohibit dual trading by a floor broker in any contract market in which the CFTC has determined the average daily trading volume to be equal to or greater than a trading level of 7,000 contracts.

Require each contract market to maintain an audit trail that must be stated in 1 minute increments beginning 1 year after enactment of the bill. The audit trail must be stated in 30 second increments 3 years after enactment of the bill.

Prohibit any person who has committed major violations of contract market rules from service on governing boards.

Prohibit voting on a rule by any exchange board member with a direct financial interest in the subject matter of the rule.

Require each contract market to monitor closely the trading activities of any person granted a hedging exemption.

Require registration of floor traders, enhanced the CFTC's and contract

markets' authority to disqualify registrants, and provide for the suspension of registration and trading privileges for the nonpayment of civil penalties.

Make it a felony for exchange employees to use disclosed nonpublic information—fine up to \$500,000 plus profits from use disclosures.

As part of H.R. 707, I included section 220—competitiveness study. This would require that the CFTC, no later than 18 months following the date of enactment of H.R. 707, study the competitiveness of boards of trade over which it has jurisdiction compared with the boards of trade—or their foreign equivalent—over which foreign futures authorities have jurisdiction. The CFTC is to submit its findings to the Committees on Agriculture with respect to:

First, the overall competitive status of U.S. boards of trade in the world market;

Second, a comparison of applicable statutes, rules or regulations as they relate to futures and options trading administered and enforced by the CFTC and those administered and enforced by foreign futures authorities;

Third, any trends in, or movements of, volume of futures and options trading on or from U.S. boards of trade during the period of the study;

Fourth, whether the trends or movements, if any, were the result of the adoption of statutes, regulations, or other enforcement mechanisms in foreign countries or the United States; and

Fifth, any recommendations the CFTC may have as a result of its study to enhance the competitive status of U.S. boards of trade in the world market that will not impair confidence in U.S. boards of trade.

Futures trading stands on the brink of a new era. Links between the world's leading futures markets—in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan—are being proposed which would usher in a system of truly global futures trading. An international market in futures trading has been made possible by recent growth and innovations in futures trading in London and in Japan. The dominant position of the Chicago exchanges, which only a few years ago seemed secure and unassailable, can no longer be taken for granted.

It is imperative that the changes in regulations we make through H.R. 707 do not impede the U.S. ability to compete with international futures markets. Through this study, the CFTC can identify if regulations in any way reduce the competitiveness of U.S. commodity futures markets and trading activity.

Additionally, as H.R. 707 places limits on dual trading practices, I included report language which recognizes the CFTC's current effort to issue regulations restricting dual trading. This language clarifies that the House Agri-

culture Committee is aware that in January 1990 the CFTC issued proposed rules that would restrict dual trading. The committee understands that the CFTC is currently analyzing the large number of comments received on the proposed rules prior to issuing final rules later this year. The committee does not intend that the completion of such rulemaking by the CFTC will be impeded by the provisions of section 101 of the bill in cases where such rulemaking is not inconsistent with the provisions of H.R. 707.

Again, I would like to thank Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. COLEMAN for their work in crafting this legislation to retain confidence in the commodity futures markets and improve the operation and competitiveness of the United States commodity futures markets.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do so to follow up on what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said and also our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio. He has another agenda for his particular reasons.

So I would simply reply to him that we find ourselves here debating with our distinguished colleague and very distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY], because the subcommittee did not agree to the amendment he offered, and the full committee did not agree to the amendment he offered. That is the reason we are here.

Also, let me say that this is a very complex area in which people from every walk of life involve themselves either to keep from losing money or to make money. So you cannot be pointing the finger at anyone.

I might say, without getting involved in the other areas, there are those who wish to combine the jurisdictions. But it should be pointed out under that with the trading of stocks, et cetera, there has also been wrongdoing, and some gentlemen have gone to jail on that.

On the floor of the futures exchanges, there has been some evidence of wrongdoing, and people have paid for that. Never was the margin level at issue with any wrongdoing. It was the human element of abuse in both New York and Chicago.

There is no self-interest here, as our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, mentioned. All of us are trying to do the right thing as we see it, and we had everyone from every aspect of this industry testify. This is good legislation as per the words of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, except that he has a basic disagreement on this one issue.

The rest of the bill is good, according to him, so I would hope, and I repeat the words of a prior speaker, that you should not penalize this.

The gentleman from Louisiana was accommodated to some extent the last time that we had this legislation on the floor in 1989. Perhaps there is yet still the possibility of some accommodation, but this is the route that this bill has taken for obvious reasons, 420 to nothing.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I was taken aback by the gentleman from Ohio coming to the floor and trying to characterize this bill as a sham and a pretense at regulation when he himself on September 18, 1989, voted for this bill without comment.

I do not think it was a sham then, and I do not think it is a sham now. It is not a pretense.

In fact, if we hold this thing up to the light of day, and we have done a lot of good, positive, strong reforms in this bill, and it is a little disheartening after all the time and effort put into this that people will come here and misconstrue this bill and characterize it as something that it is not.

I think the gentleman from Ohio was right 2 years ago when he voted for it, and he is wrong today to speak against it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes, the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel that this is a very good bill, a very strong bill, except for the one provision of stock index futures, but that is no minor provision, ladies and gentlemen.

The other body could not reach agreement, and could not bring the bill to the floor last year in the last Congress because of this one provision.

We were supposedly going to address that provision in the last Congress. We did not get to conference.

The process started over. The bill manager elected to make no changes in the bill. The question now before us is: Does the Federal Government, through one of its various agencies, regulate the margin requirements for stock index futures? No small thing.

The sum of \$11 billion was traded in Chicago yesterday on the S&P 500 futures index, more than was traded on the entire New York Stock Exchange, and we have got the powerful Securities and Exchange Commission regulating the New York Stock Exchange, yet no one is regulating margin requirement levels for the S&P 500 contract.

Within the last 30 days, Secretary of the Treasury Brady has called and spelled out in a letter to me that he feels it should be regulated. It should be regulated by the SEC. Chairman Wendy Gramm reversed her position, chairman of the CFTC, and now says that it should be regulated, in a press

release just 2 weeks ago. Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, in testimony to the other body 2 weeks ago, says it should be regulated; they tend to set their margin levels too low, and as a compromise, he volunteered for the Fed to be the regulator.

The fourth alternative before us is for them to continue to regulate themselves. I think this is wrong. I think it is time that this body should make the decision.

I would urge the defeat of H.R. 707. Let us bring it back to the floor with an open rule to make these four alternatives and let the House choose which of those they feel is proper.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, again, let me state what the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana is arguing about is the amendment that was adopted at his insistence when the bill passed 420 to 0 in 1989.

□ 1340

He may have understood that there would be further action on this, but the reason there was no further action this year was that the subcommittee did not want to adopt his amendment, and the managers of the bill, either myself or the gentleman from Oklahoma, had nothing to do with that. The committee of jurisdiction did not adopt this amendment. It was not the choice of the managers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman summed it up: 420 to 0, overwhelmingly this House voted. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] agreed with that amendment. He agreed that the language would be adjusted to fit the intent, because it was hastily drawn on the floor. There was never any agreement on this floor. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] knew there was no agreement on this floor to change the intent of that amendment. This language contains the amendment as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] agreed to, and as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] agreed to in compromise.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, that basically the other body has had difficulty, because of their rules, not because of the lack of majority in the other body to pass this legislation, but because of the rules of the other body, it makes it difficult for a very small number of people to prevent legislation coming to the floor. Hopefully, they will reach some kind of an agreement. We will work out whatever differences there are in conference, but the bottom line is that the gentleman from Louisiana reached an agreement 18 months ago. That agreement is con-

tained in this legislation. There was never anything about changing the intent of that legislation. There was never any agreement that if the legislation did not pass then all bets were off.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House report accompanying H.R. 707.

I commend the Agriculture Committee for taking interest in this legislation and for moving it forward so quickly in the early weeks of the 102d Congress. This bill addresses several consumer concerns which will help to prevent fraudulent trading practices. First, this bill prohibits dual trading in most contract markets and makes insider trading on the futures exchanges a felony. It also places limits on hedging and on trading among members of broker associations. These provisions follow in the footsteps of the significant legislative achievements of last session namely, market reform, civil remedies, and penny stock legislation.

I note with special interest section 216 of the bill which deals with the monitoring of index arbitrage trading. It states:

As provided in current law, the (Commodity Futures Trading) Commission's authority does not apply to securities transactions * * * (and) does not amend or alter the current allocation of jurisdiction between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the (Commodity Futures Trading) Commission.

Chairman DINGELL and I appreciate the gentleman's assistance in clarifying this point. Unfortunately, this legislation does not deal with the jurisdictional dispute between the SEC and the CFTC, which must be addressed to curb the abusive trading practices currently employed in the financial marketplace and noted in the 1988 Brady Commission Report.

I have long believed that the regulation of stock index futures must be altered to reflect the changing reality of the financial marketplace. We must bridge the regulatory blackhole that has grown between the futures and equities markets. The summer before the October crash I held the first hearing on the problems of program trading and flagged this issue for increased attention by the SEC. Since that crash, I have championed the recommendations of the Brady Commission.

The Brady Commission identified the fundamental relationship between the stock, options, and stock index futures markets: Namely that they operate as one unified market and that what occurs at one exchange is very quickly transmitted to the other exchanges. From this fundamental finding of the Brady Commission flowed its recommendations to consolidate regulation over intermarket issues in one regulator and to require the harmonization of margins across markets. Unfortunately, Congress has failed to take heed of this recommendation. The Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee, which I chair, has held a series of hearings on this subject which have reflected a need for regulatory reform in this area in order to assure the integrity and stability of our financial markets.

During the 100th Congress, Representative JIM COOPER and I introduced H.R. 4997, the

Securities Market Reform Act of 1988, which would have transferred jurisdiction over stock index futures to the SEC and required the Federal Reserve Board to set margins on such futures at a level comparable to stocks. Last year, at the request of the Bush administration, I joined Energy and Commerce Chairman, JOHN DINGELL, and ranking Energy and Commerce Committee member, NORMAN LENT, in introducing the Capital Markets Competition, Stability and Fairness Act of 1990. This bill also would have transferred the regulation of stock index futures from the CFTC to the SEC. In addition, it would have granted regulatory oversight of margin setting on stock index futures to the SEC and allowed for the trading of new hybrid products on securities exchanges.

I must note with some dismay that the House version of the CFTC reauthorization bill does not address one key aspect of the financial regulatory structure: Federal oversight of margin levels of stock index futures. This is the provision which killed the bill in the Senate last year. A bill has been introduced in the Senate this year by Senator LEAHY which does deal with this important issue. S. 207 would place Federal oversight of margins for stock index futures with the Federal Reserve System. This is an important step in correcting an abuse that contributed to the extreme market volatility associated with both the October 1987 and 1989 crashes.

It is in the best interest of the U.S. securities markets and of the individual consumer to address this jurisdictional face-off between the SEC and the CFTC. As stated in the Brady Commission Report as well as the above mentioned bills, regulatory reform of the securities industry cannot be complete without the coordination of all securities markets. We must continue to build upon the remarkable legislative achievements of last year in the securities area and pass legislation coordinating all securities markets. This bill, while providing for many important reforms, does not go far enough. It is my hope and expectation that we can begin to resolve the SEC-CFTC jurisdictional issue in conference and I look forward to working with my colleagues toward that goal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 707, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FOREIGN RELATIONS PERSIAN GULF CONFLICT EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1176) to provide supplemental authorizations of appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of State for certain emergency costs associated with the Persian Gulf conflict, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:
H.R. 1176

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Foreign Relations Persian Gulf Conflict Emergency Supplemental Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1991".

SEC. 2. SALARIES AND EXPENSES.

In addition to such amounts as are authorized to be appropriated in section 101(a)(1) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 as emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for "Salaries and Expenses" for the Department of State. Funds authorized to be appropriated under this section are designated emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 3. EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.

In addition to such amounts as are authorized to be appropriated in section 101(a)(4) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991, there are authorized to be appropriated \$9,300,000 as emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for "Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service" for the Department of State to be available only for costs associated with the evacuation of United States Government employees (including contractor employees) and their dependents and other United States citizens from diplomatic posts. Funds authorized to be appropriated under this section are designated emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL PURPOSE PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES.

Section 2 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2669) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (j) by striking "and";
- (2) in subsection (k) by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and
- (3) by adding after subsection (k) the following new subsection:

"(l) purchase special purpose passenger motor vehicles without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law."

SEC. 5. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT EMERGENCY EVACUATION EXPENSES.

There are authorized to be appropriated \$6,000,000 as emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for the operating expenses of the Agency for International Development. Such funds shall be available only for the costs of evacuating United States Government employees and personal service contractors, and their dependents, and for subsistence allowance payments. Funds authorized to be appropriated under

this section are designated emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 6. BURDENSARING.

The Congress—
(1) takes note of the commendable efforts on the part of the President and the Secretary of State to encourage our allies to assist financially in the effort to liberate Kuwait; and
(2) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to take such actions as are necessary to ensure that the burdensharing promises made to the American people by our allies are fulfilled.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, at the time the bill passed the Foreign Affairs Committee, it was thought that only the State Department would require additional authorization for its supplemental funding.

The reason for its introduction "as amended" is that the Agency for International Development has need of further authorization to accommodate its increased appropriation.

This bill is required because of increased costs associated with Desert Shield/Desert Storm. The State Department has incurred extraordinary costs which cannot be accommodated within its current appropriation levels. Because of this, the Department will require an additional \$49 million in appropriations.

While the greatest share of a supplemental appropriation already has authorization within ceilings set for the year, two accounts fall short.

The first account is the salaries and expenses account, which will need an additional \$10 million authorization toward a \$39.7 million appropriation.

The second account in need of authorization is the emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service account, which will need an additional \$9.3 million in authorization. This account has been entirely emptied by the necessity to evacuate such large numbers of U.S. Government personnel and dependents from posts abroad.

The supplemental authorization also addresses the technical requirement to designate that there exists an emergency situation, ensuring that none of the money appropriated will trigger sequestration.

In addition, the supplemental authorizes \$6 million to be appropriated to the Agency for International Development [AID] for similar evacuation costs associated with the gulf crisis.

I would like to note for the RECORD that USIA is also seeking an urgent Desert Shield/Desert Storm-related supplemental appropriation of \$4.4 million in salaries and expenses. According to the USIA, in consultation with the committee staff and the House Appropriations Committee staff, USIA does not see the need for further authorization for this purpose.

At this point, I would like to submit for the RECORD the OMB statement of approval of this supplemental, the detailed justifications of the State and AID portions of the request, and a cost-estimate from the Congressional Budget Office.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
The Administration supports House passage of H.R. 1176.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 4, 1991.

Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the attached cost estimate on H.R. 1176, the Foreign Relations Persian Gulf Conflict Emergency Supplemental Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1991, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 28, 1991.

Should the Committee so desire, we would be pleased to provide further details.

Sincerely,
ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE, MARCH 4, 1991

1. Bill number: H.R. 1176.
2. Bill title: Foreign Relations Persian Gulf Conflict Emergency Supplemental Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1991.
3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 28, 1991.
4. Bill purpose: The bill authorizes supplemental appropriations for the State Department.
5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Authorization level	19.3				
Estimated outlays	14.7	3.8	0.5	0.2	0

Note.—Costs of this bill fall within budget function 150.

Basis for Estimate: The estimate assumes enactment of the bill by June 1, 1991 and subsequent appropriation of the authorized amounts. Authorization amounts are stated in the bill and outlays were estimated using historical spendout rates. The authorization amounts in the bill, combined with funds previously authorized but unappropriated, would provide sufficient authorization for the President's requested emergency supplemental for the State Department.

6. Pay-as-you-go considerations: Section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1995. This bill authorizes discretionary appropriations and therefore has no pay-as-you-go implications.

7. Estimated cost to State and local governments: None.

8. Estimate comparison: None.

9. Previous CBO cost estimate: None.
 10. Estimate prepared by: Kent R. Christensen (202) 226-2840.
 11. Estimate approved by: C.G. Nickels (for James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis).

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, 1991 SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/STORM (Dollars in thousands)

Appropriation: Salaries and Expenses.
 HR: PL 101-515.
 Appropriation to Date: \$1,870,217.
 Request: \$39,700.
 Amended Appropriation Requested: \$1,909,917.

OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/STORM
 EXTRAORDINARY COSTS

Since the beginning of the crisis in the Persian Gulf, the Department has provided around-the-clock consular services to United States Government employees, dependents, and American private citizens. In addition, the resources of our Middle Eastern and European posts have been strained well beyond capacity to provide ongoing crisis support and reporting. Also, in response to the conflict and terrorist threats at posts worldwide and at domestic facilities, we have greatly increased our security posture. Finally, expenses related to the travel of the President, Vice President and Secretary while attempting to negotiate a settlement before the U.N. deadline, build the Allied coalition, and elicit financial support are all incremental, unbudgeted, and cannot be absorbed.

The Department of State is requesting \$39.7 million in the Salaries and Expenses appropriation in order to cover the costs of crisis operations, security, travel and evacuation-related claims that are consuming our already severely constrained Salaries and Expenses account.

JUSTIFICATION

Desert Shield/Storm Extraordinary Costs, \$39,700,000.

There are five major areas in which the Department of State is experiencing extraordinary costs associated with the Persian Gulf conflict and support to Desert Shield/Storm:

Security, \$21,843,000: The Department faces extraordinary demands to protect life and property in response to terrorist threats at posts worldwide, at domestic facilities, and in response to threats against official foreign dignitaries in the U.S. As a result, the Department has taken the following actions:

Increased local guard protection and residential security at posts (\$13,060,000);

Increased domestic security protection (\$3,324,000);

Increased protection of resident foreign officials, the Secretary, domestic dignitaries, and the Washington diplomatic corps (\$5,459,000).

Communications Equipment, \$7,300,000: The Department has taken extraordinary actions to expand secure voice, imaging, and data networks to Gulf posts and provide extended communications coverage to meet significantly increased crisis demands. The following extraordinary costs have been generated by Operation Desert Shield/Storm:

Installation of additional encryption devices at high risk diplomatic and consular posts (\$907,000).

Procurement and dispatch of radios dedicated to Operation Desert Shield/Storm to Saudi Arabia and to Washington and area networks in support of foreign dignitary protection and counterterrorism programs (\$1,699,000).

Continuous communications support of increased travel performed by the Secretary of State specifically related to Operation Desert Shield/Storm (\$1,869,000).

Temporary duty communications support to numerous posts in the Middle East for the substantial increase in communications traffic resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Storm (\$2,475,000).

Increased costs for diplomatic mail and pouch service caused by commercial airline restrictions on air cargo and by post closings in the Middle East (\$350,000).

Crisis Operations, \$6,350,000: The Department has provided around-the-clock consular services to USG employees, dependents, and American private citizens through task forces and communications links. The costs of operating the Kuwait/Iraq task force since the August 2 invasion, dedicated telephone links, temporary duty assignments, and overtime and other support at contiguous Middle Eastern posts total \$6,350,000. These costs are incremental only and do not include salaries of Department of State personnel.

Emergency Travel Support, \$2,007,000: The Department has incurred extraordinary costs supporting travel for the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, the President, and the Vice President to attempt to negotiate a settlement before the U.N. deadline, build the Allied coalition, elicit financial support, and visit the troops. These costs include support of White House travel and Secretary of State travel costs directly related to Desert Shield/Storm as well as additional costs incurred at posts because of the increase in VIP visits.

Evacuation Claims Costs, \$2,200,000: In many instances, evacuated employees have been forced to leave much of their personal property behind due to the urgency of the situation. Based on the settlement of claims to date and the settlement of claims from other major evacuations, the Department will face liabilities for personal property claims that will exceed \$2,200,000.

Department of State, 1991 Budget Supplemental, Requirements by Object Class

(Dollars in thousands)

Object class:	Funds
11—Personnel compensation	\$7,580
12—Personnel benefits	529
13—Benefits for former personnel	500
21—Travel and transportation ..	10,677
23—Rents, communications, utilities, and postage	692
25—Other services	14,063
26—Supplies	5
31—Personal property	3,434
41—Claims	2,200
Total	39,700

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

(Dollars in thousands)

Appropriation: Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service.

HR: PL 101-515.

FY 1991 Appropriation to Date: \$4,888.

Request: \$9,300.

Amended Appropriation Requested: \$14,188.

EMERGENCY EVACUATIONS

The Department requests an increase in the amount of \$9,300,000 to defray the extensive costs of the ongoing evacuations of American citizens, USG personnel and their dependents from the following 23 countries affected by the ongoing conflict in the Persian Gulf: Kuwait; Iraq; Yemen; Jordan; Bah-

rain; the United Arab Emirates; Saudi Arabia; Qatar; Israel and the Occupied Territories; Syria; Algeria; Tunisia; Morocco; Pakistan; Bangladesh; India; Djibouti; Tanzania; Rwanda; Sudan; Chad; Mauritania; and Nigeria.

Of the \$9.3 million requested, approximately \$4.3 million funds transportation such as charter flights, commercial airline tickets, ground transportation, and overnight food and lodging expenses for evacuees to return to the United States. The remaining \$5 million funds Subsistence Expense Allowance (SEA) payments to State Department employees and their families awaiting reassignment or return to post. Any remaining balances would be used to meet expenses associated with future emergency situations.

JUSTIFICATION

Emergency Evacuations and Other Activities, \$9,300,000.

This program must provide for all expenses related to the evacuation of U.S. government employees, their dependents and American civilians from diplomatic posts abroad on the basis of national interest or on the threat of imminent danger due to civil unrest or natural disaster.

The total availability of the EDCS appropriation for FY 1991 is \$4.9 million. Since October 1, 1990, the Department has incurred liabilities of approximately this same amount—\$4.9 million—for evacuations of American citizens from Kuwait and Iraq and evacuations of U.S. government employees and their dependents from the following 23 countries affected by the ongoing conflict in the Persian Gulf: Kuwait; Iraq; Yemen; Jordan; Bahrain; the United Arab Emirates; Saudi Arabia; Qatar; Israel and the Occupied Territories; Syria; Algeria; Tunisia; Morocco; Pakistan; Bangladesh; India; Djibouti; Tanzania; Rwanda; Sudan; Chad; Mauritania; and Nigeria. The Department has also conducted evacuations in Cebu, the Philippines; Sofia, Bulgaria; and Mogadishu, Somalia, which are unrelated to the current Gulf crisis. In total, since the beginning of FY 1991, 39 posts have been placed in evacuation status.

We anticipate total requirements of over \$11.7 million for FY 1991 associated with these evacuations. Requirements for other activities within the account, such as repatriation loans, total \$1.4 million, while travel and representational requirements for the Secretary, President and Vice-President total \$2.3 million. This results in total requirements for the fiscal year of \$15.4 million, with a projected deficit of \$10.5 million. We will transfer \$1.7 million from the Salaries and Expenses appropriation to help meet this deficit as authorized by the FY 1991 Appropriations Act, and are still left with a projected deficit of \$8.8 million.

The Department is therefore requesting a supplemental of \$9.3 million to meet this projected deficit and maintain a small reserve of \$5 million for any other emergencies that could arise in the next 8 months of the fiscal year. These funds would meet transportation expenses such as charter flights, commercial airline tickets, ground transportation, and overnight food and lodging for evacuees to return to the United States. In addition, Subsistence Expense Allowance (SEA) payments must be made to State Department employees and their families awaiting reassignment or return to post. Any remaining balances would be used to meet expenses associated with future emergency situations.

Object class: 9100 Unvouchered (total) \$9,300,000.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,

Washington, DC, February 28, 1991.

As the enclosed table indicates A.I.D.'s supplemental request will cover actual costs incurred for the evacuation of direct-hire

personnel and their dependents from the countries listed as a result of Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

In addition to the amount requested, A.I.D. expects to absorb from existing available funds some \$2.62 million in headquarters costs relating to rental of office space, extra

guard services and anticipated personal property losses of evacuated staff.

I'd be happy to provide further details or to discuss the above at your convenience.

RICHARD C. NYGARD,

Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination.

Enclosure:

EVACUATION COSTS

ENE	Travel	Transportation	Per diem initial obs.	Per diem add. commit.	Total
Afghanistan	\$108,945	45,250	294,030	37,754	485,979
Jordan	34,604	254,400	226,512	29,314	544,830
Morocco	72,154	29,550	270,666	34,833	407,203
Pakistan	332,690	133,000	867,240	109,405	1,442,335
Tunisia	101,624	30,700	272,448	35,056	439,828
Yemen	63,000	62,000	162,360	21,295	308,655
Total	713,017	554,900	2,093,256	267,657	3,628,830
APRE:					
Bangladesh	125,000	70,000	450,000	56,250	701,250
India	100,000	80,000	450,000	56,250	686,250
Total	225,000	150,000	900,000	112,500	1,387,500
Africa:					
Chad	25,920	2,880	61,776	10,722	101,298
Mauritania	4,860	540	32,274	9,410	47,084
Somalia	32,670	3,630	147,300	18,413	202,013
Sudan	84,510	9,390	307,620	38,453	439,973
Tanzania	47,520	5,280	105,336	13,167	171,303
Total	195,480	21,720	654,306	90,164	961,670
Grand total	1,133,497	726,620	3,647,562	470,321	5,978,000

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

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1176, as amended, the Foreign Relations Persian Gulf Conflict Emergency Supplemental Authorization Act, fiscal year 1991. I want to congratulate my colleagues, the distinguished chairman of the International Operations Subcommittee, the gentleman from California, [Mr. BERMAN] and the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] for acting on this legislation with both thoroughness and speed.

Mr. Speaker, this authorization is urgently required pursuant to the terms of the State Department Basic Authorities Act and the Foreign Assistance Act, which require that no appropriation may be expended without the benefit of prior authorization. The purpose of the emergency supplemental authorizations contained in the legislation before the House today is to provide needed funding for the Department of State and the Agency for International Development to pay for evacuations and related expenses incurred as a result of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. The amount of funds authorized match the executive branch request which was made pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. As the managers of the bill have explained, the bill also contains a provision requested by the executive branch regarding the purchase of passenger motor vehicles which is technical in nature, an expression of the

Congress commending the President and Secretary of State for encouraging our allies to help shoulder the burden of the costs of the gulf war, and calling on the President and the Secretary to take the necessary actions to ensure that the allies make good on their pledges.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to reinforce what my colleague from California has already stated; that is, that the executive branch supports this legislation. I urge the unanimous adoption of this bill.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for his comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to, very briefly, rise in support of this legislation. I take this opportunity to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], and the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the chairman, and the ranking members of the Subcommittee on International Operations for the speed in which they brought this bill to the floor. It does have the complete support of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, we are all proud of the fine job our military has done during the Persian Gulf crisis. They and the President deserve our deepest congratulations.

Since the beginning of the crisis, other branches of the Government, including the Department of State, have also put forth an extraordinary effort in support of Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

To cover crisis-related costs to these agencies—including operations, security, travel and

evacuation-related claims—the President has requested supplemental fiscal year 1991 authorizations.

This bill fully meets the administration's request by authorizing an additional \$25.3 million in spending. This request is designated as an emergency, so under the budget agreement it will not affect the fiscal year 1991 budget ceiling.

It is important that we support the governmentwide effort that has led to a successful conclusion of Operation Desert Storm. I urge my colleagues to vote for this emergency supplemental bill as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this emergency Desert Storm and Desert Shield State Department supplemental authorization.

Last week the President requested this emergency supplemental in accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act. Because of its urgency, the Foreign Affairs Committee took swift action last Thursday in approving the request. I understand that the Appropriations Committee also plans to expedite this request as a part of the larger Department of Defense Desert Storm supplemental.

The President has requested a supplemental appropriation of \$49 million to cover extraordinary costs borne by the State Department in support of Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield. These costs include emergency evacuations, enhanced communication needs, travel, and security measures.

Specifically, the administration is requesting:

The sum of \$21.8 million for enhanced security measures to respond to the heightened threat of terrorism. This includes: \$13 million for the overseas protection of U.S. diplomatic facilities and both diplomats and private Americans; \$3.3 million for increased domestic security protection; and \$5.5 million for increased protection of foreign dignitaries and U.S. officials within the United States.

The sum of \$7.3 million for extraordinary needs for secure voice and data communications to diplomatic posts in the Persian Gulf and for other greatly enhanced communication needs related to the crisis.

The sum of \$6.4 million for around-the-clock consular services for Americans overseas caught in the crisis and for their families here in the United States.

The sum of \$2 million for emergency support for crisis travel by the President, Vice President, Secretary of State, and Deputy Secretary of State. This travel was associated with the effort to negotiate a settlement prior to the United Nations deadline, to build the anti-Iraq coalition, to gain pledges of financial contributions among our western allies, and to visit the troops.

The sum of \$2.2 million for the emergency claim costs related to the evacuation of U.S. personnel overseas.

The sum of \$9.3 million for the evacuation and repatriation of U.S. officials and private Americans during the crisis.

None of these costs could have been anticipated when we passed the fiscal year 1991 State Department authorization more than a year ago. Because of existing unused authorization authority, however, we will only need to authorize an additional \$19.3 million, which is the amount contained in this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support this Presidential request so that it swiftly can be considered by the other body and be enacted into law.

□ 1350

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by expressing my appreciation to the ranking member of the subcommittee. We were able to move this quickly and in a bipartisan fashion, and as the chairman said, protect the integrity of the authorizing process. I hope it is a precedent for the future.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1176, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to provide authorizations for supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for the Department of State and the Agency for International Development for certain emergency costs associated with the Persian Gulf conflict, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 1176, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT, THE UNITED STATES, AND ALLIED MILITARY FORCES ON SUCCESS OF OPERATION DESERT STORM

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 95) commending the President and United States and allied military forces on the success of Operation Desert Storm.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 95

Whereas the House of Representatives (in H.J. Res. 658 of the 101st Congress) and the Senate (in S. Con. Res. 147 of the 101st Congress) condemned Iraq's August 2, 1990, invasion of Kuwait and declared their support for international action to reverse Iraq's aggression;

Whereas the House of Representatives, by means of its historic debate and courageous passage of H.J. Res. 77 (by a vote of 250-183), authorized the President to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions 600, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 670, 674, and 677;

Whereas the President ordered United States Armed Forces to commence military operations against Iraqi forces during the evening of January 16, 1991, under the code name Operation Desert Storm;

Whereas the commanders and personnel of the United States and allied Armed Forces participating in Operation Desert Storm have brilliantly succeeded in destroying Iraqi offensive capabilities and forcing the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, consistent with the minimization of casualties among United States and allied forces; and the limitation of collateral civilian losses; and

Whereas United States and allied Armed Forces have performed their missions with great courage and distinction in carrying out airstrikes on Iraqi military targets in Iraq and Kuwait and in executing a ground offensive to liberate Kuwait: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States—

(1) acclaims the President for his decisive leadership, unerring judgment, and sound decisions with respect to the crisis in the Persian Gulf;

(2) expresses its highest commendation and sincerest appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces and other members of the international coalition who have participated in Operation Desert Storm and have demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication and professionalism;

(3) conveys its deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of United States and coalition forces who have been injured or killed during this operation, and expresses its compassion for the families of noncombatants who have suffered hardship and personal losses during the Persian Gulf War; and

(4) supports continued efforts to promote peace and stability in the Persian Gulf.

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time on each side be extended to 1 hour for each side.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the original sponsor of this legislation, one which I consider very important and certainly timely in light of everything that has happened, and then I would like to make my remarks after the gentleman has finished.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today we debate a resolution which commends President Bush, the U.S. military, and our allies for their stunning success in Operation Desert Storm.

Tomorrow night we pay tribute to the President as he addresses the Congress and the Nation. He richly deserves this honor.

The President, as Commander in Chief, spearheaded hundreds of thousands of American troops under his command, in what may be the most impressive battlefield performance in history.

This victory comes on top of an equally impressive diplomatic achieve-

ment. In all my years in Congress I have never witnessed anything so successful as the combined Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

From the very beginning the President knew that an illusory peace in our time was no substitute for real and lasting peace in the future.

The President took a bold risk in search of peace. He staked his Presidency on the outcome. He won; America won; and the world won.

We elect Presidents to be decisive in their leadership; unerring in their judgment; and sound in their decisions. The President has demonstrated all of those virtues in a period of great crisis for this Nation. He fully deserves this resolution of commendation.

This resolution also expresses the admiration and respect of a grateful nation to our courageous fighting men and women and those who served with our coalition partners.

These troops demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication, and professionalism on the field of battle. This Nation looks forward to the early return of those to whom we owe so much.

We must also never forget those who made the ultimate sacrifice. This resolution conveys its deepest sympathies to the families and friends of those who bravely fought and died for this Nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is a new sense of patriotism and confidence in America, a sense of purpose and of unity. This would be a good time for this great House to get 100 percent behind our President and our courageous troops. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this important resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of commending the President and United States and allied military forces on the success of Operation Desert Storm.

As a supporter of the bipartisan resolution, House Joint Resolution 77, which authorized the President to use force to implement the 12 U.N. Security Council resolutions, I am proud, as every American is, of the extraordinary performance of our U.S. military service personnel. The U.S. Armed Forces participating in Operation Desert Storm succeeded in destroying the offensive capability of Iraq and forced the withdrawal of Iraq's forces from Kuwait, thus ending the 7-month brutal occupation of Kuwait. The Armed Forces performed their missions

with tremendous courage and distinction. We owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude.

We also must recognize and pay tribute to the contributions of our coalition partners. It was truly a combined and integrated military effort in all aspects. We express our thanks to their efforts and commend them.

We go on record again today, in hope that this remarkable international coalition effort will dissuade future aggressors from adopting the ill-fated policies of Saddam Hussein. Hopefully, these actions will serve to establish the rule of law among all nations and the peoples of those nations.

Throughout Operation Desert Storm, the American people stood behind our Armed Forces without regard to partisan politics. This is not the first time that the Congress has considered a resolution commending our military. In fact, on January 18, 1991, just a day after hostilities began, this body considered Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. This resolution which commended our U.S. military involved in Operation Desert Storm passed by an overwhelming vote of 399 to 6. There was no partisan politics involved. Everyone stood with our troops as we do here today. House Resolution 95 is yet another expression of this bipartisan support. The U.S. Armed Forces have truly made us proud through their bravery, dedication, and professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to convey my deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of U.S. and coalition forces which were injured or killed during this operation. The loss of one life is too great. They are all in our prayers.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the commendation which the gentleman from Michigan expresses along with 167 of his colleagues on the minority side of the aisle certainly is well deserved. In this regard, the Congress as a whole, is expressing its gratitude and our condolences to the families whose members perished during this conflict and who gave their lives so that the values we hold dear would be preserved.

I think there are so many things that we need to be grateful for besides the courage and the patriotism of the people who went to battle and unfortunately died there. Chief among these is the competence of those who fought in this conflict along with their leaders. It showed for those who had any doubt about the commitment and professionalism of the American military establishment, either the personnel or the equipment, that they were mistaken, that we had the highest order of competence and military professionalism.

I have said many times and I am proud to say it again here, that the men and women who made up the fighting force who were exposed to the public through the media acquitted

themselves extremely well. I do not know if there ever was a war, or if there will ever be another war in which almost every combatant and his family was interviewed either before, during or after the war. This war was close to that.

The point of pride that I am speaking to is the fact that these people, these individuals are not normally accustomed to dealing with the media in any way. Clearly, they were asked questions that might have caused others to stammer or otherwise be unarticulate about whatever the subject was. In almost every case that I witnessed, however, I found that the responses coming from the men and women who were doing the fighting not only understood what they were doing, but had great common sense and commitment about their missions. They understood why they were there. They were able to articulate the fundamental reason for the involvement of the United States and its allies in this effort.

I think we ought to take great pride in that, because we hear so much about the negative side of young people in this country and the younger generation. We hear a great deal about the failings of our educational system. I can only say that anybody who had the opportunity to listen and watch average Americans, and that is not a fair statement, either, or characterization, respond not only to their duty and the patriotism, but the common sense and logic about why they were there to give their lives. I think that is very commendable indeed. It is certainly a new sense, I think, that the American people look with new pride and resolve. We have an all-volunteer Army with capable leadership. Who can ever forget the briefings by the top officer, General Schwarzkopf, and others as well? We must also remember, and pay tribute to those officers who were in the field who were leading the troops.

□ 1400

I think that the interviews with those people were remarkable in their clarity, in their understanding, in their dedication, and the purpose for which they were there.

All of that came together, of course, on the battlefield. While the loss of even one soldier is a tragedy, I am thankful that U.S. casualties were remarkably low for such an extensive military operation. Even the most optimistic of Americans could never have forecast such an outcome. We must, therefore, commend both our leading generals and the troops that followed them.

Mr. Speaker, the President deserves commendation for many reasons. First, of course, is the fact that we were successful in standing up to such blatant aggression as Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. This success has revitalized our own thinking about our responsibilities

in this world in which we live, and hopefully reinvigorated the opportunity we may have to fashion a better world. This goal may remain an elusive goal but it remains one worthy of pursuit. We would find accomplishment of this goal very rewarding. Achievement of this goal would give us the building block or blocks perhaps to look at the future with a different outlook than we have had in the past, in a region such as the Middle East where the struggle has been going on since the very beginning of time, almost, certainly since Biblical time.

Maybe, just maybe, because of the unusual skill exhibited by the President, Secretary Baker, Secretary Cheney, and the others who worked with the President, we will have together not only a success in the military sense but a major success in the diplomatic sense. This success may provide us the opportunity to continue the coalition with other nations to show that we can work together even when there was brother against brother in one part of the struggle.

We can take some comfort in the fact that this was done under the President's leadership in consultation with Congress.

The President also deserves commendation, Mr. Speaker, because early and throughout this struggle he had to make some awesome decisions. In this regard, he was perfectly willing not to make any decisions without having heard not only from his own people and staff surrounding him but also from the Congress of the United States.

The President said that he was perfectly willing and said many times at meetings that both the gentleman from Michigan and I attended as part of the consultative group in the leadership of the House and the Senate, to listen and consider a variety of opinions.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to say as a participant in those meetings that while he understood his responsibility and was perfectly willing to accept that responsibility, making a decision by himself if it was necessary, he ultimately listened to the advice of the people not only around him but also the leadership in the Congress. The President listened to and considered our views when we recommended that under any condition, regardless, if there was to be armed force used in actual combat, that he come to the Congress and make the effort to seek authorization to use force. This effort was made consistent with both the Constitution and the War Powers Resolution.

The President finally decided that this was a wise course of action. He was alert to that, responsive to that. He was correct in this decision.

I think the result of it is something that all of us can not only take pride in but we can commend. Certainly the debate that occurred on the floor of this

House and in the other body was an outstanding debate in every sense of the word. The issues were clear, there was not unanimity of opinion, but the American people deserved to have this issue debated and debated in open. The country deserved that kind of debate. The country witnessed such a debate.

The strength of a democracy is that we have the right to voice our opinion without fear or favor and that we have the opportunity that we did in the Congress of the United States at that time.

The American people, because of instantaneous media, could also share in that discussion and debate. I think it had a great deal to do with solidifying American public opinion and support behind the President.

The President is to be commended also, Mr. Speaker, for the fact that he came to the Congress of the United States, engaged in a debate in a democratic fashion and laid the entire matter before the American people. It was done so that a decision could be made with the active participation of the people's representatives and the people themselves.

That is the ultimate commendation, it seems to me, for a President of the United States and especially in this case, Mr. Speaker, because the country was eminently successful in this endeavor.

So I am saying directly, that the American people really are commending themselves in this matter because we demonstrated what we can do when we resolve to work together. Even though there were differences of opinion expressed in the course of the debate—and I am sure that those differences might even continue on, I do not know—but certainly the leadership and the Members rallied behind the President once the decision was made.

I hope the American people never forget that: The country rallied behind the President on this matter, and so did the Congress.

We will have to keep doing that. The building blocks for the future are that we can, with the least amount of partisanship, build upon the foundation that he put down for us to deal with an extraordinary problem that has plagued mankind for many years in the Middle East and other places. Maybe, just maybe, under the leadership of the United States with this President and the Congress agreeing thereto, the leadership can be put together under skillful diplomatic management of the Secretary of State to keep the coalition together to do the many things that still remain to be done so that we can win the peace.

I think we can safely say we have won the war, we are now engaged in trying to win the peace. It will take the same kind of dedication, Mr. Speaker, it will take the same kind of commitment, it will take the same kind of resolve; the big difference that

I see is this: Obviously and arguably, there are differences of opinion on the best way to proceed and how the costs will be met. There is ample room for division here. It is healthy that we have this kind of debate in the Congress of the United States and among the American people. But I would hope that the same kind of skill and resolve that the President and his leadership and the members in our Government and the leaders in the Congress exhibited with respect to the actual military operation, can be kept together for the hard work that needs to be done in forging the peace. The pursuit of this ultimate end-game objective, is a direct consequence of what our brave men and women achieved in this operation. They have given us the opportunity to carry that torch forward. We should not let them down.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today we heard the charge that those of us who backed the President's tough stand in the gulf crisis are in some way playing politics because we are willing to point out that some people in this body, that actually many in this body, did not support the President's tough stand in the gulf. What we need to ask ourselves when we talk about this resolution is just who has been playing politics? Let us review the facts.

Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait on August 2. Hundreds of thousands of young Americans were deployed to the gulf. These young Americans have had their lives on the line to fight against aggression and to stop further aggression.

President Bush set us a deadline of January 15; he drew the line in the sand.

□ 1410

He was facing down a vicious dictator whose troops were committing horrendous acts of aggression on the people of Kuwait, and also other atrocities on the people of Kuwait.

President Bush took this dramatic stand against tyranny and aggression. The Democrats in this Hall voted 2 to 1 to cut his legs out from under him, to make the deadline that he drew on January 15 a joke.

Who is playing politics? Of the 183 votes to undermine the President's deadline, 179 were Democrats. Who is playing politics? These are the very same individuals who have opposed any recognition by this body of President Bush's magnificent leadership in this gulf crisis since it has turned into a successful operation.

President Bush brought us a magnificent victory and kept our casualties low. If his detractors had their way, our troops would still be in the desert facing wind storms, summer heat and a disintegration of the alliance. Who is playing politics?

Mr. Speaker, no one questions the patriotism of those who voted against the President. But we do question their judgment. One Member, who now claims we are politicizing the gulf war, said during the debate, and I quote,

Rushing to war will be a mistake of historic proportions. The result of moving too quickly to war with destructive divisions here at home and a dangerous jumbling of alliances and allegiances in the nations of the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this is 1 Congressman and 178 others of his colleagues who now seem to be unwilling to admit they are wrong. If they find it impossible to admit they are wrong, at the very least they can get out of the way so that we, the rest of the body, can congratulate the Commander in Chief for the fine job that he has done in handling the gulf crisis and in bringing America this magnificent victory over tyranny and aggression.

I would hope that my colleagues can join me in supporting the resolution of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] which will, quote, congratulate our brave young people who have won this magnificent victory and congratulate our allies for standing firm with the United States, and, yes, also to commend and congratulate the President of the United States for the historical leadership that he has provided this country in a time of crisis.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 95.

Mr. Speaker, now that the fighting has stopped in the gulf, I think it is time for the Congress to express its gratitude. Last week it seemed, amid worldwide praise for the efforts of the coalition troops and their leaders, that there were some in this body that would quibble about offering full credit to those most responsible for the success that we are all enjoying today.

It was not simply high technology or superior firepower that won the war in the gulf. It was the ability to apply it. Our United States ground forces who stormed entrenched Iraqi positions and our pilots who flew tens of thousands of missions know that this was no cakewalk. The difference was our people, superbly trained, staunchly committed, and ably led forces. No country could possibly ask for more of its armed forces than was given by each brave fighting woman and man in Oper-

ation Desert Storm. As the world moves along the road toward peace, however, rapidly or slowly that may be, and toward stability, it is the contribution of those men and women and their sacrifice that has paved the way, and, Mr. Speaker, there was sacrifice. We all know that.

I doubt there is any Member of this body who has not been touched in some way by the loss of a loved one or friends of families where there have been people killed paying the ultimate sacrifice. In my own district there was a memorial service this morning, and there will be another one, regrettably, Sunday night to honor two of our missing who had connections in our area. These are the types of sacrifice that this Nation and that this body needs to express their thanks for in a cohesive and meaningful way.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in awe of the U.S. leaders of Operation Desert Storm. History will remember President Bush, Secretaries Baker and Cheney, Chairman Colin Powell and General Schwarzkopf as orchestrators of one of our most successful diplomatic military operations. Let's not kid ourselves, we did not just wind this operation up and let it run its course—total victory was not achieved by accident. The overwhelming success of this operation is due directly to the ongoing efforts and constant fine tuning of our leadership. In the months before the fighting erupted, President Bush and Secretary Baker forged an unprecedented coalition of 28 countries, as we all know, and skillfully kept it together in the face of Saddam Hussein's many underhanded attempts to inflame and mislead the Arab world and drive a wedge in our coalition.

We owe a great deal to our coalition, and we owe a great deal to our Nation's leaders.

Six weeks ago we stood here and asked the American people to put aside political differences and support our troops. They did, and now they have a right to expect no less from us. Let every Member support this resolution. It says, "Thank you," to those involved in a very gracious and meaningful way. It conveys our deepest sympathy to the families and friends who suffered loss of loved ones, and it supports what we all want: Peace and stability in the Middle East.

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, let me start by asking:

How can I vote against a resolution which expresses its highest commendation and sincerest appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces and other members of the inter-

national coalition who have participated in Operation Desert Storm and have demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication, and professionalism?

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, and double or triple the sentiment.

Or how can I vote against a resolution which conveys its deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of United States and coalition forces who have been injured or killed during this operation and expresses its compassion for the families of noncombatants who have suffered hardships and personal losses during the Persian Gulf war? And I certainly can not vote against supporting continued efforts to promote peace and stability in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I share all those sentiments.

However, Mr. Speaker, when in the second whereas clause, the resolution says:

Whereas the House of Representatives, by means of its historic debate and courageous passage of H.J. Res. 77 (by a vote of 250-183), authorized the President to use United States Armed Forces pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 678 (1990) in order to achieve implementation of Security Council Resolutions 600, 661, 662, 664, 665, 666, 667, 669, 670, 674, and 677; * * *

What does that require?

Mr. Speaker, that requires me to say that in fact, when I chose, together with 182 of my colleagues, some of whom were Republicans, to say that sanctions were the better policy way to go, that I was wrong.

I do not believe that at all. I think that, having made his policy determinations, the President did an outstanding job of following through. I do not agree with the policy that he set forth, and so I cannot vote for this resolution which would retrospectively change my position, especially in the context of the big headline in today's issue of Roll Call, the Hill newspaper, which says, "Gingrich Plan—Run Gulf Veterans Against Democrats," and it goes on to say that at a young Republicans meeting he suggested that the Republicans find Desert Storm veterans to run against incumbent Democrats, to suggest that that is the way to highlight Democratic opposition to Bush.

□ 1410

The fact is that the day after the Kuwait invasion I and a number of our colleagues spoke, and a day or two after the Kuwait invasion by Saddam Hussein the New York Times carried a story with pictures of a number of Americans from a broad political spectrum, including me, stating in the strongest terms my opposition to the kind of brutal aggression that Saddam Hussein undertook and said that President Bush's deter-and-defend policy was expressing the fondest values of America.

The Members who voted for sanctions were not supporting Saddam Hussein, they were not opposing Bush and standing up for Saddam Hussein, they opposed rushing to war, and to try to turn that into a political ploy is not right. I must tell you I was surprised by this approach of Mr. GINGRICH. I sat through most of that historic debate and the gentleman from Georgia, who usually has no difficulty in speaking at the drop of a pin, was remarkably silent during that debate. And now he comes forward with a solution to attack the Democrats for opposing President Bush. I think that is shameful.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding time to me.

I just want to say, first of all, that I appreciate the gentleman from New York's mentioning me. I happen to think that it was a historic debate, and it took courage to pass House Joint Resolution 77. It was a historic debate on both sides.

I went up immediately after the Speaker spoke, and I said that I thought his speech, which was against the resolution, was a historic speech. It was a speech worthy of the House, and it reminded us of the process of democracy. I think Members on both sides of the aisle spoke courageously.

I was here until 4 o'clock in the morning before that vote listening to Members speak out on both sides. What I have said is that there was a grand irony in that the Democrats who are determined to shrink the military are going to lead to the voluntary unemployment of a number of Desert Storm veterans, and that those Desert Storm veterans who might prefer to stay in the military except for the Democrats' insistence on shrinking the military may decide that they want to run for public office against the party that is forcing them to be unemployed.

That happens to be a series of facts. It is a fact that the Democratic Party wants a weaker military, it is a fact that that will lead Desert Storm veterans to find out that some of them are not going to stay in the military. It is a fact that there is an opportunity in 1992 for them to seek employment in an elected office.

I have also said openly that some of them may want to run as Democrats in the primary against people with whom they disagree. But let me carry it a step further.

I am mildly astonished that there are so few Democrats on the floor today. This is a resolution which I think virtually every Member of the House in either party can identify with. This is a resolution which condemns Iraq,

something which virtually everybody agrees with. It is a resolution which says that the operation succeeded, something which I suspect every Member of the House agrees with. It praises the American and allied forces for performing their missions with great courage and distinction, something I think everyone agrees with. It also acclaims the President, and maybe that is part of the sticking point. But let us go back. It would be an amazing thing to pull out of the RECORD from August 1990 up through the first 2 weeks of February the number of Members on the Democratic side who said, "We don't know what is going to happen. This is a very grave risk. We may lose thousands and thousands of people." We can go down the list and find there were Members saying that we are going to have 30,000 to 50,000 killed.

The minimum that I think George Bush deserves is some recognition that he had remarkable courage and remarkable professionalism in holding together a worldwide alliance, in getting the United Nations to pass a series of resolutions, in being able to marshal the military forces of 28 countries, in being able to calmly and patiently develop a military campaign plan and not micromanaging General Schwarzkopf or General Powell, and in allowing the process to work. I think it is one of the greatest achievements in military history to have decisively defeated the country of Iraq with the number of casualties we had and with the speed and decision that we saw.

I am a little surprised that this is a day when Democrats frankly could be coming to the floor and expressing bipartisanship. This is not a partisan resolution. This is a resolution which is open to all Members, and I would hope that tomorrow night, when the President comes, we will certainly offer more enthusiasm and more support for these sentiments than we are getting from the Democrats today. I am just very sad that the Democrats are not coming.

Let me tell the Members why I think a part of that is. The last time we had a Democratic President, they could not get eight helicopters across the desert in what was called Desert One. They literally collapsed in the Iranian desert. This has come now after 10 years of very hard and often contentious work. I have stood in this House and I have listened to Members on the other side who said, "Oh, we don't need the military buildup, we don't need those expensive weapons, we don't need all that professionalism." Let me say to them that I think there are some lessons to be learned from this. I think the fact is that Ronald Reagan was essentially right. I think the fact is that a stronger military worked. I think the fact is that it saved American lives. That is the message I would like to drive home today, not just self-con-

gratulation. The fact is that both in Panama and Iraq having a well-trained, well-equipped, adequately large force saved the lives of young Americans.

When we talk over the next year about cutting the defense budget, let us understand what we are doing. We are taking away from America the ability to have the kind of defense that allowed us to take down Saddam Hussein and say that in the future the next time there is a Saddam we are not going to be able to do it.

Let me just close with this thought: We are going to make one of two decisions every time we weaken the military: We are either going to make a decision to take away from President Bush and take away from the United States the opportunity to do things such as what we have just done and such as we did in Panama, or we are going to make the decision that if the President does decide to do something, we are going to run the risk of much higher American casualties. I hope that every Member of Congress will read the Broomfield resolution and will think about this extraordinary success.

I must say to my friends that I did not think we would pull this off as fast as we did or with as few casualties. I frankly thought it would take longer, and I thought we would have more casualties. I am very grateful that it was as successful as it was. But I hope all of us will not just walk away from this success and not study it. I hope we will study this success, and I hope that our colleagues on the left in this House will decide that maybe they ought to be a little more prodefense, that maybe being strong on saving American lives is a good idea, and that maybe there are steps we should take that will be helpful in the future when we have a similar crisis of this kind.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 95, the Broomfield resolution, commending President Bush and our allied forces for their success in Operation Desert Storm and I would like to commend the distinguished ranking Republican member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], for his outstanding, timely leadership and work on this measure and for the consistent support of our distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

It is with great pride and appreciation that we take this opportunity to commend President Bush for the decisive leadership, and sound judgment he

has demonstrated since the inception of the Persian Gulf crisis.

We also must bestow our highest commendation and sincere appreciation to the members of our U.S. armed services and the members of the international coalition who have participated in Operation Desert Storm and who have demonstrated exceptional bravery and effectiveness on the desert battlefields of the Middle East, to protect the sovereign of nations and to enforce international law.

I join with my colleagues in expressing our profound sympathy to the families and friends of United States and coalition forces who have been wounded or killed during this operation. Their grief knows no bounds. We empathize with them, and we want them to know that we will never forget the sacrifices their loved ones made in the interest of world peace.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to firmly support this important resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

□ 1430

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. FASCELL] and the distinguished ranking member [Mr. BROOMFIELD] who have worked so closely, so often on a bipartisan basis, frankly deserve better than this debate this afternoon. Especially the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a sad day in what ought to be a happy day for America and a day of celebration that we witness this kind of response, that this Congress is becoming so partisan that we cannot even unite in a bipartisan way to congratulate and commend the troops of the United States of America and the leadership of this country within the Pentagon, all the way to the Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, if one talks to anybody in America, they will tell you that during this crisis, it did not matter whether you were a Republican or a Democrat, liberal or conservative; you were an American, and you united together because you cared. And when you make that kind of commitment and you suffer the kind of agony that these families of 513,000 troops have experienced over the last few months, the fact that this Congress cannot on a bipartisan basis gather here this afternoon and commend them, I find tragic, to say nothing of being despicable.

I want to say to Members over here, if this is so painful to stand up and say thank you to the leadership of this Government, the leadership of the military, and the participants, then I hope you do not show up tomorrow night either. Leave your seat for somebody who wants to come as an Amer-

ican and participate in saying thank you.

Finally, I have to ask, because this troubles me deeply, what message do you send to the families of the 90 Americans who were killed in action, to the 63 Americans who lost their lives in combat-related duty, to the families of the 34 missing in action, and to the families of the 9 known POW's, as well as the families of the 1,500 wounded in action? Have we as a body politic disintegrated to the degree that as Americans we cannot stand together?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Speaker, I am here to give somewhat of a unique perspective, as a freshman Member who was called here to the Chamber as one of his first votes to vote whether we should take offensive military action in the gulf. One of the first times I ever met with the President was early in January, prior to the vote. I had an opportunity, with several other freshman Members, to gather in a corner and talk with the President.

I saw at that time a President who was very alarmed at what was going on in the Persian Gulf; who cared deeply about the plight of the Kuwaiti people; who was particularly alarmed at the potential devastation that Saddam Hussein could wreak upon that area, and, in fact, upon the entire world. The President was sensitive to the American public, and to the Congress, and the fact they were not particularly bloodthirsty and willing to take on the tremendous challenge of a war, but was committed and clearly committed to establishing a new world order and following through and making that world order come into reality.

Mr. Speaker, the President understood that he was on thin ice politically. He realized that. But he also understood, and he knew what was right, not just for his country, but for the world and the future of world peace. He stood up for what was right.

When I came to the floor the day that I was to vote, I also felt that I had to do what was right, and stand up for the President. And I am very proud of the Members in this House, that they too stood up for what was right and stood up for what was right for this country, and for the world.

As we have seen, things have worked out just as we had hoped they would work out. We have, I think, established a new world order, and we can be very proud of our President and our military leaders for making that happen. We can also be very proud of our brave troops and their families for standing up and fighting for what was right and making that happen.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and the men and women who deserve this resolution, and that includes the man in the White House, President Bush. But in looking at the list of cosponsors and seeing there are no Democratic cosponsors on this resolution, I have come to the conclusion that the statements by the Speaker and a number of other Democratic leaders during the debate to the effect that this is a divided government, in fact has a very deep meaning. It is strongly divided between the executive branch and the legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, many times during the deliberations by this body we have Members on both sides of the aisle, liberals and conservatives, Democrats and Republicans, who indulge in tough high-level debates, like the debate we had before the President was authorized to use power and use force in the Persian Gulf. After the debate is over, and often after the results flow from that particular action that we took, we say to each other that that was a job well done.

Maybe we did not agree with the legislation when it came before us, maybe we did not agree with the vote, but we say to our colleagues on each side of the aisle, "My fellow Congressmen, that was a job well done."

Why can we not in the legislative branch on a bipartisan level say the same thing to our Commander in Chief, that that was a job well done? We should be very proud of this President. I know that the Democratic Members of this body, just as much as the Republicans, very much respect this President for what he did and for the leadership that he exhibited, that saved literally thousands and thousands of American lives. It was that leadership that allowed us to come out of this dangerous situation in the Persian Gulf with but a fraction of the casualties that all of the experts predicted.

For that gentleman, who has many burdens on his shoulders today and a very challenging domestic agenda before him, it might be nice if we took just a minute, which is what this resolution does, and thanked the men and women of the Armed Forces, and thank our allies, and thank our President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the ranking Republican member on this committee for sponsoring the legislation. It is a tribute to our troops, who fought so valiantly. It is a tribute to our country for standing behind our troops, and it is especially a tribute to our President. President Bush had opposition here in the Con-

gress, and the debate that raged for 3 days and late into the night showed very clearly where everyone stood. But the President did get the support from a majority of the Members of this House and the other body, and carried on in trying to do what had to be done to preserve the lives of our troops, while at the same time winning the war in the Middle East.

The President had opposition, not only here, but had opposition in the courts. Members of the Democratic Party went to court to try to stop the President in his endeavors to carry the battle to Saddam Hussein, to win in the Middle East, but they were not successful there.

In addition to that, he had opposition from leaders around the world, in particular from the Soviet Union. Mr. Gorbachev, as everyone will recall, wanted President Bush to settle for half a loaf, and in the waning days of the war, when Saddam Hussein was on the ropes and trying to find a way out, Mr. Gorbachev called for solutions which were unacceptable to President Bush. Even though the pressure mounted day after day after day, President Bush as Commander in Chief and titular head of the allied forces, stuck to his guns and said, we are not going to let this man get away. We are not going to let him take his troops out of Kuwait. We are not going to let him have an army that can wage war in the future, and thus cause problems down the road for the Middle East. The President once again stuck to his guns.

□ 1440

Had the President capitulated or settled for half a loaf at this particular time, there is no question that Saddam Hussein's army would have been much stronger than it is, and had Saddam Hussein been able to take his army and be able to claim half a victory, there is no question in my mind that the rest of the Arab world would have said here is a man who is an Arab leader who has faced down 28 nations, including the entire U.N. Security Council, and Saddam Hussein, in my view, would have grown in stature and been a much bigger threat down the road than he ended up being.

The President, in short, showed good old-fashioned American guts and intestinal fortitude at a time when we really needed them.

In addition to that, in the finest tradition of Teddy Roosevelt, he showed that America is a strong nation and a nation that will not tolerate terrorism and tyrants like Saddam Hussein, a nation that does walk softly but a nation that carries a big, big stick, and when we have to, we are willing to use it.

So Mr. President, congratulations on a job well done. The Congress of the United States supports you and congratulates you on being a great President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, due to an unfortunate little order from former Speaker Tip O'Neill some time ago, the cameras will pan the Chamber during special orders, to show that there is not much attendance at that time. It was a mean-spirited decision to pan an empty Chamber in an obvious attempt to embarrass Republican Members by making viewers think nobody is listening.

But this is misleading because the audience viewing this Chamber is now about 1 million people, Mr. Speaker. It is about the same for the other Chamber, a little less, because their rules of debate are a little slower and more low-key than over here.

But I am sorry that we are not panning the Chamber right now as we debate the Broomfield amendment. We do not pan the Chamber during 1 minute at the beginning of the day or during legislative regular business like this. But if we did, I think most Americans would be shocked, Mr. Speaker, that there are so few Members here now for this important resolution.

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us how many people he thinks may be on the floor at the present time?

Mr. DORNAN of California. On the Republican side about 10, and on the Democratic side about 3.

If this resolution, the Broomfield resolution is important, and I believe it is highly important, then more Members should be here, and I know this is an important resolution. I never have seen so many cosponsors on a resolution in my life. The first resolved clause acclaims the President for his decisive leadership and unerring judgment. These are key words, decisive leadership, unerring judgment, near flawless judgment, and sound decisions with respect to the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

The second resolved clause states that this Chamber, "expresses its highest commendation and sincerest appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces and other members of the international coalition who have participated in Operation Desert Storm and have demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication and professionalism." That was the key word I heard coming out of all of the anchor-men's mouths when they went into Kuwait City, and they could not believe the professionalism of all of our men and women in every branch of the service, from logistics, to the fighter pilots in a British Tornado going in at 200

feet over the deck in darkness on the first night, blowing up Iraqi airfields.

The third clause "conveys its deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of United States and coalition forces who have been injured or killed during this operation, and expresses its compassion for the families of noncombatants who have suffered hardships and personal losses during the Persian Gulf War," what I choose to call the battle for the liberation of Kuwait.

A total of 105 men and women, including the young lady helicopter pilot, a major, who died during the support operation at the end of the war.

The fourth clause "supports continued efforts to promote peace and stability in the Persian Gulf," not easy with fighting going on there as we speak, all up and down this nation of Iraq. That one evil man, Saddam Hussein, seems to have dragged his nation through the meat grinder, he shredded it. The fighting may go on for months until God chooses that Saddam's short dash through life is over.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this well twice last week and said that I could not feel joy or euphoria or celebrate with the rest of my country. It was not that I was any more sensitive, like the Alan Alda or Phil Donahue sensitive male of this modern time, it was just that I had spent half of my adult life working POW problems. Actually more than that. I have worked this issue going all the way back to when I was a pre-cadet waiting to go to pilot training, and I listened to an Army major, I think his name was Mayo, tell about brainwashing and how they broke our men in captivity in North Korea. And we left 389 of them behind in Korea. And we never got a single POW back from about 500 men shot down over Laos.

So I was sweating these POW's. I couldn't relax until they were all returned. But I tell you, I am happy today. That joyful spirit the President of the United States said is slowly overcoming him is gripping me because of the word today that before we even started this debate, 24 Americans POW's were added to the ones released yesterday one is a Kuwaiti. That must be Mohammed Mubarak, the A-4 pilot shot down in the first days of the war. Also 9 more British allied pilots, who together with the 3 yesterday makes a total of 12. The Brits lost six Tornados in those airfield strikes. That may mean that every man aboard successfully ejected, suffered some abuse, but they survived. We got our lady prisoner, Melissa Rathbun-Nealy, back yesterday. We did not know she was wounded. So she is not only back with us, but she has a Purple Heart. Talking to her parents on the phone yesterday was a delight to witness.

Here is a chart of the prisoners that I held up here the other day. John Pe-

ters, the severely beat-up British pilot. Where was Adrian Nichol, the backseater? He hopefully is in the group of nine Brits. And Jeffrey Zaun's pilot, Bob Wetzell, we never heard a word on him in all of these weeks. He was in that first group that came out yesterday. Maurizio Cocciolone, the Italian must be one of those released today. Also where were Clifford Acree and Guy Hunter, our oldest flyers from Camp Pendleton? I have seen their families on local TV back in California. They must be in the 24 Americans to be released today.

Here is a photo of Mohammed Mubarak who fought in an A-4 Skyhawk, the same plane in which Senator JOHN MCCAIN, our courageous colleague, was shot down over the skies of North Vietnam. John spent 6½ years as a prisoner of war.

Also Harry Roberts, our great F-16 pilot from Torrejon.

Mr. Speaker, I truthfully enjoy speaking out on this Broomfield amendment. We do not get that chance very often to have such leadership on a great amendment like this. No, it looks like the POW story is having a happy ending.

We got back our team of four CBS who tried to write their own ground rules; 26 or 29 journalists have also written their own ground rules by going up to Basra, where there is unbelievable civil unrest. We will have to sweat out these fellow Americans all this week. Hopefully, God willing, they will all come home safe. I do understand that desire to pursue the news story and ride to the sound of the cannons.

But I also have to respect the pain of their loved ones left. What about the six hostages in Iraq? What about the Israeli pilot backseater in an F-4 Phantom? His wife is sweating 6 or 7 years in captivity for him. There are a lot of unanswered histories in that part of the world, but let me return to this resolution.

□ 1450

The President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, one of our former highly respected colleagues who served 10 years in this Chamber, Dick Cheney—all of them did a job that is almost beyond description it was so good. We have a military team, all of whom were honed in combat in Vietnam, from Colin Powell and the Bear, Normal Schwarzkopf, and all the ranks in between, right down to the young captains and majors and lieutenants who want into their first combat.

What can we say about our enlisted men? The words are weak on this piece of paper. You want to reach into Churchill's writings to wax poetic with Churchillian praises to honor these men.

Where are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle sharing in this historic

debate so they can make amends for some things on this floor about our defense structure over the last 14 years?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker asked where the Democrats are who might like to speak on this momentous occasion. If I could have the attention of the gentleman from California, let me just say that we have got one Democrat right here who voted to authorize the use of force; we have the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], who was one of the leaders in crafting the legislation that passed the House of Representatives authorizing the use of force. We have our chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who helped craft the legislation authorizing the use of force, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ], a ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs who helped craft the legislation that authorized the use of force.

I think it is peculiar that none of them, nor am I, are listed as a cosponsor on this legislation. If I could ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor, I would do so at this time. I do not know if the rules of the House permit that.

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

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Let me say that the gentleman has raised a very interesting point that I wish had not been raised, but now that it has by so many speakers, I think we need to get the record clear.

The resolution we are dealing with, House Resolution 95, was introduced on February 28, 1991, and all of the people who appear on the printed copy of that were asked in advance to cosponsor it, period.

As far as the language is concerned, I just want the Members to know that this chairman had nothing to do with writing the language. I am glad to support the language in every way, and as you can tell from my remarks, I thoroughly agree with the purposes of the resolution, but that does not change the fact of what has gone on here with regard to the resolution and the debate, and, yes, the gentleman can cosponsor it. Under the rules, if the gentleman were not out of town attending to business, the gentleman could become a cosponsor up until the time of the vote, but if he is not here and he did not know about this resolution, he could not be a cosponsor no matter how badly he would like to have been a cosponsor.

I am glad the gentleman pointed out the fact that without the Democrats

the original resolution on the use of force would never have passed this House.

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

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is timely to make a correction here, because the Democrat majority was alerted, because when I drafted it, I sought bipartisan support for it. They were not interested at that time, and so we proceeded with it. So they did have the opportunity to make this bipartisan.

I just want to say this: I have been in this House now for more than 34 years. I have worked with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for all of those years. We have worked very, very closely together. I know he is a dedicated American. We work on a bipartisan basis, and I appreciate his support. I know how he supports the President of the United States.

But I did give the opportunity to the majority to make this bipartisan, and we were turned down.

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

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying that I turned him down?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. If the gentleman will yield further, no, it was his staff that turned us down.

Mr. FASCELL. If the gentleman will yield further, let me just get the record straight. I respect my distinguished colleague, and I guess this leads to a difficult problem as far as the two of us is concerned, but I hope it does not last very long.

But this bill was never considered in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was never considered in the Committee on Armed Services. I had no part in the drafting of it, although I am very happy to support it.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the resolution before us salutes the President for his leadership. The resolution before us salutes our troops, the men and women who have served, along with our allies, in the Persian Gulf. The resolution before us conveys our deepest sympathy to the families of those who have served in cases of families who have lost a loved one or seen a loved one injured. The legislation before us supports our continued efforts toward peace and stability in the Persian Gulf.

I do not think I have to tell the Members of this body that the Democrats and the Republicans support the thrust of this legislation, and whether or not we may or may not appear as a cosponsor, I think that has probably said more about those of us who were asked to cosponsor it than those of us who be-

lieve in and support the thrust of this resolution.

Having said all of that, let met just go back to January 12, when we debated in this House the legislation authorizing the use of force. It would not have been enacted without the support of both Republicans and Democrats.

I respect the views of those who voted against authorizing the use of force. They had ample reason not to vote to authorize the use of force. They had our former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Crowe, saying let us provide more time for sanctions to work. We heard from a number of other Joint Chiefs of Staff members in the past, and we heard from former Secretaries of Defense who said to give those sanctions more time to work.

I voted to authorize the use of force because I felt the best chance that we had for avoiding war was to convince Saddam Hussein that we were prepared to go to war, to force, to compel, the Iraqis out of Kuwait. I felt that our cause was just.

I do not believe that we, as the United States, or any other caring nation, can stand aside and watch as a powerful nation runs roughshod over a weak nation.

I do not believe we should award aggression. We should not encourage would-be aggressors like Saddam Hussein wherever they may appear, and I believe the strategic needs and interests of this country were at stake in this instance.

I believe that sometimes, sometimes as a last resort, but sometimes force is necessary.

The tough job, in a real sense, may lie ahead of us. I am not going to suggest that what we have gone through is easy, but in some respects, the tough job still lies ahead, and that is to build on the peace.

We have to decide how long and how many U.S. troops to leave in the region. My hope is we do not leave many, and we do not leave them for long.

To the extent that we need a peacekeeping force, my hope is that we make that a U.N. peacekeeping force or one led by Arabs.

I believe in the future we should conduct joint exercises with our allies in the region. There is reason to say that we should position equipment in the region. Clearly we need to continue our naval presence in the region as it has been for the last, I think, four decades.

As we face the future in the Congress, and for our Nation, I hope and I pray that we will mount the same intensity and enthusiasm that we have demonstrated for Desert Shield and Desert Storm. I hope that we will bring to bear the same intensity and enthusiasm in crafting, in debating, in designing, in developing and implementing an energy policy for our country, at long last an energy policy for this Nation.

Second, I hope that we will finally bring to bear the same intensity and enthusiasm for resolving once and for all the issue of Israel, peace and security for Israel within its own borders and, at the same time, develop a settlement fair to the Palestinians.

Finally, I hope that we have learned that maybe this United Nations that many in this body have derided over the years, that the United Nations can play a constructive role in keeping the peace, and then in many instances in bringing to heel an aggressor who would violate the lives and liberties of whether it is Kuwaiti people or any other nation.

My hope is we will now bring to bear postwar the same enthusiasm that we have brought to bear in the last 6 or 7 months.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I commend President Bush for his extraordinary leadership of this Nation and the coalition. I salute the courageous men and women of our Armed Forces who performed their duties with excellence and vigor. And I would like to express my appreciation for the extraordinary talents of Generals Powell and Schwarzkopf who led our men and women into the conflict with a flawless plan and a deep concern for the safety of each and every soldier on the battlefield.

Never have I been prouder of our country than when it answered a call for help in a fight for peace with freedom and justice. At no other time in recent memory has the flag of the United States flown so vibrantly as when, over the past few months, it has led our Armed Forces to victory and our Nation to unity. In case anyone doubted, which they never really should have, America is back. The overwhelming success of American forces in the dust of the Arabian desert should have vanquished any notions that the power and prestige of America were dwindling. No longer can the United States of America be derided as the world's wimp, forever looking over its shoulder at the ghosts of the past or cowering at the need and responsibility for strong action to defend freedom.

During debate on the use of force we heard all about the presumed virtues of sanctions and diplomacy. There can be no mistake now that our military forces achieved an end which diplomacy and sanctions never could have. The swift and decisive liberation of Kuwait displayed the professionalism of our forces as well as the deep concern for minimizing allied casualties. As Secretary Cheney so aptly put it, "The mother of all battles was turned into the mother of all retreats." In just 100 hours, our troops decimated a vaunted

army of more than half a million. While the loss of even one life is a tragedy, still fewer than 100 of our personnel gave their lives in the face of great odds. In contrast, more individuals have been killed in the war on the streets of Washington than in the battle in the desert.

As Americans, the coalition, and the people of Kuwait glory in the victory, let us not now be tempted to let our guard down. Due to the failings of human nature, or rather the nature of inhuman leaders, we are likely to face similar situations in the future. As long as one country would seek to dominate another, we must maintain our peaceful, yet strong, vigil and not allow the lure of selfish nonviolence to stifle justice.

The magnificence of our Armed Forces, their discipline, their commanders, our superior equipment saved lives in the long run. Yet we did not reach this pinnacle of excellence magically overnight. It has taken years to resurrect our Armed Forces from the dearth of just a decade ago. This task took resolve in the face of those who viewed support for the military as immoral and wasteful. The funds spent in providing for our military were monies well-spent. They allowed us to win the conflict in record time and, mercifully, with a miraculously low rate of casualties.

If we wish our America to remain as the vanguard of freedom, let us not now foolishly sacrifice these strides by disassembling the structure which has brought us to this great success. Let us continue our support, which so many have been eager to proclaim here today, for our brave and courageous men and women in uniform. Support for our troops must be more than a yellow ribbon deep.

I encourage my colleagues to bear these things in mind as we face critical issues in the days ahead. And I join my colleagues in rejoicing at our victory, the safety of our troops, and the leadership of the United States of America.

□ 1500

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commending my President, and the young men and women who have so valiantly served this country in the stunning success of Operation Desert Storm.

I think it is proper that we stand today, to recognize those who have stepped forward in the name of freedom.

Our President, the Commander and Chief of our Armed Forces, and the Chief Ambassador of the American principles of liberty, has demonstrated extraordinary leadership, diligence and decisiveness throughout this conflict.

Likewise, our troops responded to the call of duty. They served their Nation bravely, confidently, and in the finest tradition of our Armed Forces.

While we grieve along with them for their losses, we herald their achievement.

Mr. Speaker, while many may have doubted the wisdom of President Bush's leadership, he did not doubt himself. He understood the ruthlessness and maliciousness of the Dictator, Saddam.

A dictator who murdered, arrested, tortured, and used as human shields the innocent men, women, and children of Kuwait.

A dictator who wreaked unbridled environmental havoc upon an entire region's fragile ecology.

A dictator who systematically raped, pillaged, and devastated a nation.

Mr. Speaker, George Bush was right from the beginning. He was right about Saddam. And he was right about how to handle this conflict.

He understood that some things are worth fighting for, and that ruthless aggression must be checked.

As an institution, we owe him and our troops our highest gratitude and admiration.

Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. We thank divine providence for our President, and thank divine providence for the successful conclusion to this war.

We thank our President. What a superb example of leadership. Throw all the books and periodicals on leadership away. Here is a stellar performance, a model of all leaders. He did not imitate, but he is a model and example to others. We thank our troops for the professional way in which they conducted themselves, and for the sacrifices they made. Our troops in the gulf, I believe, had another President's words in mind when they fought in the gulf and served in the gulf: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country."

These men and women in the gulf exemplify that philosophy. The valor and the example that they exemplified are for all future generations. We thank the American people for their steadfastness, their courage, and their commitment, because here in our Republic, truly, the people do rule.

I want to thank my fellow Members in the Congress. I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for his resolution, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. I remember the superb speech the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] gave right on this floor, in this Chamber. I was sitting right here in this chair when he told the people in this House what they were voting for when they voted for the Janu-

ary resolution. He did not equivocate. He did not mince words. He backed the President 100 percent.

It is important to note at this time that, as Gen. Douglas MacArthur said "It is preparation that leads to victory." I want to thank all the Members of this House, but especially the Members of this side. When the tough decisions were made in the 1980's, and had to be made in the 1980's on the defense votes, our side stood strong. Some Members of that side stood strong, too. But when the decisions had to be made, the tough decisions had to be made, I think it is only fair to say that the Republicans were there to make those decisions. Republicans were in the trenches when the unpopular but appropriate decisions had to be made.

I was hoping that after this conflict we would again have politics stop at the water's edge. I think that is what we owe this Nation, both as Democrats and Republicans.

Again, we want to thank all those who made this victory swift and sure. We have had in history, the Hundred Year War, the Thirty Year War, and now we have had the Hundred Hour War, which will be studied in every military academy around the world.

I thank those in Congress who made it possible, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for introducing this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as 1 of the 183 Members who cast their vote against the President having authority to declare war some few weeks ago, and yes, as 1 of the 6 people who stood by that position a week later, I never thought I would live to see the day when the issue of war or peace as to what side a Member was on would become such a political issue.

Therefore, I rise today with a few very brief remarks. There are just a couple of matters that I must clearly state before I cast my vote on this resolution because my vote today may not be appropriately perceived. First, I take this time to commend the U.S. forces for their exceptional bravery, dedication, and professionalism, I also want to, with all sincerity, to convey my deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of the military forces who have been injured or killed during the Persian Gulf conflict. God knows that I regret the loss of even one life. No one has yet bothered even to estimate the number of lives that were lost, either Kuwaitis or Iraqis. They were human beings. I do not know how many American people lost their life. Maybe we will know at some point.

However, I cannot support continued efforts on the part of our President to police the world. I opposed the Persian Gulf conflict at its inception, and I

continue to oppose the reasons why we entered into this war. I oppose this country's policy in the Persian Gulf.

This resolution before Members today merely removed any accountability for the President as it concerns his actions in the Persian Gulf. I cannot support such a mandate.

□ 1510

Moreover, no one has yet to truly answer my question. What is victory?

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. The war has ended, and this is a victorious time for the United States and our allies who have stopped a brutal tyrant as he sought to wreak havoc among the countries of the Middle East and upon the world. We watched in horror as Saddam Hussein systematically destroyed the smaller, weaker country of Kuwait. We can now say that we have been successful in repelling this aggression through a united world effort. The Commander in Chief deserves our highest commendation for his foresight, insight, and superb leadership.

As President Bush has said, our cause in the Middle East was right and just and moral. I believe President Bush and his top advisers—General Schwarzkopf, Secretary Cheney, and Chairman Powell—showed absolutely superb judgment throughout this entire ordeal. United States and allied efforts in the Persian Gulf will go down as one of the most brilliantly planned and executed military performances in history. Our service men and women have been the best trained and equipped forces ever deployed in history.

These efforts and our victory in the Persian Gulf could not have been remotely possible without the courageous men and women who served their country during this war—they are the real heroes of this conflict. These men and women have suffered the perils of war, the hardships of being away from home and from their loved ones, and they have experienced financial hardships as well.

Let us welcome them home with open arms and thank them for their service and sacrifice for their Nation.

This war has caused sacrifices on the part of many. Again, I heartily commend those who served our country in the gulf and anxiously await their safe and speedy return home.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, as a co-sponsor of this important resolution, I

could not help but rise to speak on behalf of the absolutely brilliant leadership of our President in the Persian Gulf Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm.

I would respectfully disagree, however, with some of my colleagues who I think have put some partisan politics into this debate. There was, in fact, substantial support from the Democratic side as we debated this issue, and I want to pay special attention and proper recognition to those Members of the Democratic Party, some 80 in total, who did support the President during a very difficult deliberation and debate on this floor, and specifically 12 committee and subcommittee chairmen who stood up in support of the President, led by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], who I think did a fantastic job in supporting House Joint Resolution 77; however, my primary purpose is in acknowledging the absolutely brilliant leadership of President Bush. There were many nay-sayers who said in the debate that they were not sure why we were in the Middle East, why we were taking up our support of the issue of Kuwait, and as we have seen by recent polls, as much as 91 percent of the American people now are absolutely or totally convinced that President Bush did the right thing.

There were many who said the coalition would break down, that President Bush would not be able to keep the coalition together, and as we all know, he performed brilliantly and kept all our coalition partners as full players.

There were many who said that Israel would be brought into the fray and that would cause us major problems, and, once again, because of the brilliant leadership of President Bush and the tenaciousness of the Israeli leadership, they were able to keep their resolve and not enter the conflict.

There were those who said the Arabs would not fight, that they would not be up on the front lines with our troops, and, as we know, they were not only on the front lines, they led some of the fights, especially in and around Kuwait City.

There were those who said this effort would weaken our relationships with the Soviet Union, and that was also proved to be wrong. We in fact have an outstanding relationship with the Soviet Union.

There were those who said that casualties would be high, and, Mr. Speaker, that, too, thankfully was wrong.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all of us join together in saying to President Bush, "You have done us proud."

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute, simply to pay my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] who just spoke in the well, for the recognition of the efforts of the Democratic Party

and those Members who voted in support of the President in authorizing the use of force and to balance the record with more perspective than I have heard up until now about the actions in this body.

We are all very proud of the efforts of the President and the troops. This resolution expresses that.

I dare say while there are still strong differences of opinion, I think we have demonstrated to the whole world the strength of the democratic process. We still remain united.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the debate is misnamed if we call it a debate. We are simply here joined together, not to debate this resolution, for there is no disagreement about it; rather, we are here as Americans, not Democrats or Republicans, to commend the President for his superb conduct of the war, to commend the generals and officers and the troops for their courage and steadfastness in the face of the enemy and to convey our sympathies and condolences to the families of the fallen troops.

This marks the second time that the Congress has passed such a resolution. One might mistakenly believe in listening to much of the debate today this is the first time that the Congress has gathered to pass this resolution or one nearly identical to it. One might even believe from the debate today that the passage of such a resolution is partisan in nature only.

Well, those who would claim that seek to clutch the results of the war and the war itself to their own breasts for personal, petty, partisan political reasons.

On January 18 last, this body passed by the overwhelming vote of 399 to 6 a bipartisan resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. The Honorable Senator MITCHELL, the majority leader, was the sponsor of that resolution. It passed, as I said, by an overwhelming vote of 399 to 6. It is almost identical to the resolution that is today before us.

We could as far as this Member is concerned pass one resolution a day commending the President and the troops and giving our sympathy and condolences to their families, but the thing that we should be sure the American people understand is that this is not a partisan issue, that the resolution before us today has been discussed in a bipartisan manner on January 18 and passed overwhelmingly by both Democrats and Republicans.

Now, let me, Mr. Speaker, if I may, refer to the vote on January 12.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Montana.

□ 1520

That vote back on January 12, that vote is known as the "war" vote, has been mischaracterized in this Chamber today, I believe, again for petty, partisan, personal politics.

The vote on January 12 was not a vote on whether or not to go to war; the vote on January 12 was a vote to commend the President and to ask him to come to the Congress of the United States, as the vast majority of the American people wanted him to do, to ask for a declaration of war prior to committing the troops to an offensive military action.

So the vote on January 12 was not a vote, as some would have you believe, for or against the President; it was a vote about the Constitution of the United States, which says only the Congress can declare war.

Many of us voted in this Chamber, as I did, and that is to uphold the Constitution, to say to the President, "Mr. President, if we must go to war, then come to this Congress as the Constitution requires and ask for a declaration of war as other Presidents before you have done."

To characterize that vote as a vote for or against the President, for or against the war, is to do so for the lowest of partisan political purposes.

Did anyone at the Pentagon or in this Chamber believe that this war would be short and easy and that only a few dozen—as tragic as that is—a few dozen Americans would be lost? No one believed that. And in secret briefings we were told this could be anywhere between 1,000 and 15,000 men and women, Americans.

Are we delighted? Yes. Prayerful? Yes. Surprised? Absolutely. And thrilled with the successes of our troops and the political precision of our President.

Let us resolve here and now that those who would use this war and dozens of American lives that have been lost and the environmental havoc that has been wreaked across the Middle East and the political chaos that may follow, those who would use that for narrow Republican partisan gain should, themselves, be turned out of office.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker. I am a Democrat, I consider myself a real Democrat. I said the President did a great job; he deserves a pat on the back. He did a great job under fire. President Bush earned a place in history. I think more so than for his performance, that at least he came to the Congress and he asked for

that use of force, I think that will distinguish his Presidency.

General Powell, Dick Cheney, General Schwarzkopf did a great job. But I want to talk about something a little different today.

I voted against it, and I still say that America cannot be the policeman to the world. While we are policing the world, who the hell is policing America?

You had 23,000 murders in America this year alone.

Let me say this: Our troops did a great job, and I want to commend them, but we have been made to believe that Hussein was the greatest threat in the history of the World.

Let me tell you: Japan is buying up our T-bills, financing our debt, and buying our companies, and it poses a much greater security threat than Hussein ever did.

What the hell are we doing about it? They are financing our debt, foreclosing on our companies, buying our banks, they are buying jobs.

Let me say one other thing as we talk about Hussein: About 18 million people, the size of California, World War I minds; the Scud missile flies slower than a commercial jetliner from California to New York.

Our troops did a great job, but let me caution this House: For those Members who are going to try and build up a continued military-industrial complex in this country, you are wrecking our freedom with that type of policy. You are not saving America, you are not saving the world.

We did a great job, our troops did a great job, and our President did a great job. But, ladies and gentlemen, you keep socking it to that military budget, and what Dwight David Eisenhower said was the truth, that we have created a military-industrial complex that is now taking the Persian Gulf and using it as a 60-second promo for every damn weapons system around.

Where was the B-1? Where was the B-2? They pulled out the A-10s, because we were meeting no resistance.

I just say this to the Members of the House again: Thank God our troops did a great job. Our President did a great job under fire. But let me tell those who continue to say that all that great defense buildup is what was making us free. We could have beaten this man without an awful lot of the expenditures we have had. I think it is time to take a look at some of those expenditures before we weaken ourselves that much further.

In closing, out, I would like for our Nation now to take a look at international trade, and I am making a plea for one of the most popular Presidents in American history right now.

Ronald Reagan was in a position, although I disagreed with some of his policies, when Ronald Reagan said he was going to do something, he did it

and now has the respect of the world. George Bush has now moved himself into that position. I am hoping that George Bush and the Republican Party take a look at the trade issue of our Nation. In fact, I make this statement on the floor right now: If the Republican Party seizes the trade issue, they will take over both the Senate and the House, and I do not give a damn who does it, I think we have to get our trade deficit in order and we have to deal with Japan and deal with these other problems facing our country.

In closing out, my hat goes off to the President and to all our troops that are coming home and for every Member in this House that brought and had an opportunity to debate the issue brought to the floor by the President. The President will distinguish himself more for coming to the floor for that vote than he will for his great success there.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has expired.

The Chair would take a moment to advise the Members of the rules of decorum and words to be used on the floor pursuant to the Speaker's admonitions that were put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the first day of this session.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I stand here in front of you today in strong support of our U.S. troops and their allies. At a time when we have put together so many young people from this Nation and sent them so very, very far away, I think we are very grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for his commitment to what we all know in this country as our values. This entire Nation now knows what I have known for several years, and that is that the quality of the young men and women who bear the burden of our national defense today is outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I have traveled extensively to speak with our national soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, and our marines, and I am always struck by their professionalism and their dedication to service.

We cannot forget the faces of those brave young men and women who were interviewed daily as they arrived in Saudi Arabia last year. We cannot forget the faces of the young men and women out in the desert as we saw every morning on the news media. The hardships that they faced were chronicled: The extreme heat, the sand, the difficulties and, more importantly, the

uncertainty of the public support on the homefront.

That public support they questioned when they went, and it is, no doubt, any longer in doubt; that support on the homefront is evident everywhere.

When I visited the troops, I sensed a real desire to get their job done and then come home.

The complaints that I heard were not about why we were there but about making sure that we provided them with all the means necessary to do their job. I vowed to them that I would do everything in my power to see that they had all the means that were necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the President deserves a great deal of credit as does this Congress as a whole for making this commitment to the troops. And they responded accordingly.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in commending the troops if I did not indicate my special gratitude to those National Guard and Reserve personnel who have supported Desert Storm. Those that have volunteered to serve their country in the face of destruction of their civilian lives, both personally and professionally, should not be overlooked by their communities.

I look forward to the day when the last troops arrive back into this country and will receive a much deserved welcome home and congratulations by their friends and neighbors. It is something that is due and owed, but more than that it is something that will be coming from the heart of this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we stand here debating a passage of benefits for those troops, I think we have to commend the President and those individuals that made what is an outstanding victory possible, and that is the young men and women on the ground.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCMILLEN].

Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I, too, would like to commend the President and the leadership of our Armed Forces, the men and women in uniform, and particularly the American people who have supported this effort.

Mr. Speaker, one of the proudest moments for me as a Member of this body was observing and participating in this debate on January 10, 11, and 12, about what should be the appropriate strategy for our Nation in removing Iraq from Kuwait. I was proud because there in fact could be a divergence of opinion in this body, but yet, when the vote was taken, we could rally behind our Commander in Chief and support our Volunteer Army in a victory, in a

swimming victory over a ruthless dictator.

Just the other day I was reminded of the painful consequences of war. On Saturday Sergeant Randazzo of Glen Burnie, MD, was buried. He had given the ultimate sacrifice to our country, and it occurred to me that the price of freedom can indeed be very high.

I voted to support the President, but I can honestly say in my heart that I thought long and hard about the day when I would have to go in front of Sergeant Randazzo's parents and say, "I'm very sorry, but I'm proud of your son."

Mr. Speaker, those of us who thought about this vote on January 12 understood these consequences, and I think it is only right that we take the moment to commend those who made our victory possible.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for yielding this time to me and for his sponsorship of this resolution.

Let me begin by also being one of those who praises the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for his leadership, not only on this resolution, but on the resolution that allowed this country to take action that was necessary in the Persian Gulf. He indeed has been a stalwart throughout the process, and many on his side have followed his leadership, and I think that they have earned our praise for the kind of work that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I would disagree with the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] who spoke a few moments ago to say that everyone is behind this resolution. In fact, we have heard people speak on the floor thus far today who have indicated they do not support this resolution. I find that somewhat disappointing. They may have their reasons, but, when my colleagues look through the resolution, there is very little here that really anybody should oppose.

The first part of it reads that it acclaims the President for his decisive leadership, unerring judgment and sound decisions with respect to the crisis in the Persian Gulf. The President deserves at least that much from the U.S. House of Representatives. It expresses its highest commendation and sincerest appreciation to the members of the U.S. Armed Forces and other members of the international coalition who have participated in Operation Desert Storm and have demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication and professionalism. Absolutely they have, and everybody in the House ought to be willing to commend the troops for what they did and to commend the

international forces for what they did in that part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution also conveys its deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of the United States and coalition forces who have been injured or killed during this operation and expresses its compassion for the families of noncombatants who have suffered hardship and personal losses during the Persian Gulf war.

I think particularly of Dr. Mark Connolly in my district who, within the last couple of days, was killed by a land mine in that part of the world. This is something we ought to do for those families and for the friends of people who suffered losses in that conflict, and again I cannot imagine there is anything at all controversial about saying that.

Finally, the resolution says it supports the continued efforts to promote peace and stability in the Persian Gulf. Once again that is something that everybody in the House of Representatives should be for. We ought to be willing to say that, now the conflict is ended, that we ought to achieve peace and stability in that part of the world. Those people should have fought for something.

So, I am a little disappointed that there are some who felt it was necessary to oppose this resolution, but I would hope the overwhelming membership of the House of Representatives sees fit to approve it. It is a very, very good resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

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

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution commending American and allied military forces on the success of Operation Desert Storm.

I have been a true and vocal supporter of our military forces—from President Bush, the Commander in Chief, all the way through the ranks to the young soldiers, seaman, and airman, from the very beginning of Operation Desert Shield. Their mission has not been easy and has not been without cost. However, our brave men and women in the Armed Forces dutifully carried out their mission with great courage, skill, and patriotism. I salute them and their families who anxiously await their return.

The advanced technology weapons and defense systems, like the previously maligned Tomahawk cruise missile, Patriot missile, M1 tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Apache helicopter, and A-10 aircraft among others, certainly contributed to our success and kept our casualties incredibly low. These are products of the Reagan-Bush defense program I supported. I recall some in Congress and the public unjustly criticizing this responsible defense program. Clearly, they were wrong and I am glad, and I can guarantee our forces in the

gulf are glad, that we did not listen to these naysayers.

However, the most important contribution to our stunning success is the people. The men and women who fought this war only Saddam Hussein wanted. Like me, none of them wanted war. Yet, this All Volunteer Force understood exactly why they were in the gulf laying their lives on the line against Saddam Hussein's brutal aggression. Having personally visited with our troops in the Saudi desert, I know this is a fact.

Today's troops are the best educated, best equipped and best trained we have ever fielded. The realistic training our ground and air forces received at Fort Irwin in California's Mojave Desert and at Nellis Air Force Base in the Nevada desert helped make a real difference that payed off today in American lives saved and objectives swiftly and successfully achieved.

The people also include those who brilliantly planned operations and masterfully executed them, including Secretary of Defense Cheney, Joint Chiefs Chairman Gen. Colin Powell and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf. The people portion includes those in logistics and supplies who performed real miracles moving unprecedented amounts of men and material around the globe and through the desert in record time. Without adequate supplies of ammunition, parts, food and water, I know we would not have achieved the success we have. Just ask the Iraqis.

I also salute all the other brave men and women in all fields and services, active and reserve. We truly are a team. All parts of the team are important and all parts are deeply appreciated by the American public.

In commending our military forces, we cannot overlook the sacrifices and yeoman's duty performed by their families. Most are looking forward to reuniting with their loved ones presently deployed in the gulf. Sadly, some Americans have made the ultimate sacrifice and it is our duty to ensure their families are cared for.

Today's resolution also commends the Allied Military Forces that participated with us in Operation Desert Storm. Just like our forces, the steadfast resolve and participation of these allied forces were important contributions to success. Whether they be the British Desert Rats I met out in the Saudi Desert or the other British, French, Egyptian, Saudi, Kuwaiti, Italian, Canadian, Turkish forces, or those of the 21 other nations that sent military forces to the gulf, their support deserves praise. Special commendation goes to the British, who have long proven they are great friends, the French, the Saudis, the Kuwaitis, and other gulf emirate forces, the Egyptians and the Syrians for directly confronting Iraqi aggression.

I agree with President Bush that we should be proud. We should be very proud of our country and most of all our brave military forces who carried out this swift and decisive victory. Like all Americans, I hope they will all safely return home as soon as possible.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are dealing with an unbelievable tragedy here. This should be a great time for celebration for Americans and the free world, and yet we have had to rely solely on the minority and the distin-

guished ranking minority member of the committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], to offer this resolution which is clearly a Republican resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I join with others in recognizing the fact that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] led the charge. In fact, it was my first meeting when I joined the Committee on Rules that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] came before our committee to testify on behalf of this resolution which he jointly offered on January 12, and I commend him for that.

However, Mr. Speaker, tragically there are people in the House who do not seem to want to support the President on this. OK; there are some who do not want to support this guy who has a 91-percent approval rating nationwide and who has done this unprecedented thing, bringing about a 28-nation coalition, the likes of which the world has never seen before, but so, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], my friend, said, have Members in this House who are not willing to cosponsor and support a resolution which commends our troops? One of the things that we heard throughout the past several weeks is that whether people were certain about the war or not remained to be a question, but they all supported our troops.

Mr. Speaker, now here is a chance to cosponsor an issue here, supporting our troops, and I am told that people can still cosponsor this thing right now. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has informed me of that, and yet one or two Democrats have wisely come forward and cosponsored it. I cannot understand how 434 Members of this House do not cosponsor this resolution.

It also extends its deepest sympathy to those who are victims, to the families, and the first casualty in this war was a constituent of mine, Mr. Campizi, who was killed in August of last year. So, we all want to go on record in support of extending our sympathy to the families and the victims, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should recognize that the leadership on this issue has clearly come from the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add another dimension to this discussion by talking about someone very special who heretofore has not been mentioned. Her name is Barbara Bush. Some people call her George Bush's partner. Others refer to her as the President's wife. Most of us know her as the First Lady.

Mr. Speaker, while each of these titles is accurate individually, they are not nearly accurate enough in describing the full dimension of this multifaceted individual. I call her America's Best Friend.

For the past several weeks Barbara Bush has been traveling the Nation, principally to military installations, to meet with the families and loved ones of the troops deployed to Operation Desert Storm. She has, this magnificent lady, this caring and sharing humanitarian person, demonstrated not just the concern of the President of the United States, but she has shown in very personal terms that the American people have respect, and appreciation and support for all of those who represent this Nation so well.

Mr. Speaker, when Barbara Bush leaves a room, we all stand a little taller for her having been in our presence. She is indeed America's Best Friend.

□ 1540

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I just wandered into the Chamber, I rise to speak in support of this resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair will advise the gentleman that that is a matter for the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] as the prime sponsor, who may under the rule add the gentleman from Utah as a cosponsor.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the ranking minority member on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I, like all Americans, am very gratified, more than I am able to express, for the successes of the past 6½ weeks of Operation Desert Storm and for the fact that so few Americans and members of the allied forces died or were injured in the process of achieving that great victory. To the men and women who perished in the service of our Nation, we owe our enduring tribute and gratitude. Though thankfully few in number, their loss is an incalculable tragedy to our country and our future. We will long remember their valor and sacrifice.

I give great credit to our Commander in Chief, the President, and to our military command for the valiant, intelligent, and competent service which they have rendered. I express my deepest gratitude for the successes which they have brought home.

A young man from my State, Dion Stephenson, was among the first of those killed. I have visited with his parents. I have seen their devotion, their dedication, and their interest in the fact that the death of young Dion Stephenson would not be in vain, and

that their support for the war and their strong feeling that he died for a higher principle be registered.

Out of all this, I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that there will come a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, a peace which deals not alone with a cease-fire in the gulf but with a settlement of the Palestine-Israeli issues, the issues concerning Lebanon, and the issues between the Arab States and Israel. I would hope and pray that the differences in the Arab world with Israel be terminated once and for all, with Israel secured within secure bounds and borders, and that her peace be assured by a recognition in the Arab world that Israel has the right of existence.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has the right to close the debate.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be joining our colleagues in commending the President of the United States and the allied military forces on the success of Operation Desert Storm.

The President demonstrated courage, energy, vision, and fortitude in the face of incredible pressures, and without his leadership the great victory would not have been possible. I would refer initially, of course, to the action taken immediately after the August 2 invasion of Kuwait. It took a decision on the part of the President that we were going to respond, and we did. And, second, I would refer to the action to get the United Nations for once to have the United States wearing the white hat, with a coalition gathered around us. This was no small undertaking, and it was well done. I think everybody applauded the President at the time.

There was another incident, though, about the early part of November when the doubling of our forces took place. There were all kinds of Doubting Thomases, all kinds of people raising fears and concerns about the fact that the President took that kind of decisive action, thinking ahead to the fact that maybe it might have to be used and we were going to have to be prepared for that particular day. Then when it came to the January 15 deadline, he was again beseeching the Congress to join him, if they would, in combining those kinds of decisions that would possibly have to be made if we wanted to pursue this thing further.

So the President took the occasion at times to make the difficult decisions in the face of all kinds of criticism and all kinds of detractors, and they were in

this House, out of this House, and all around the country for that matter.

It is easy now to say that victory was inevitable, but it was not. Things could have gone wrong without the kind of leadership the President continued to provide throughout this thing. His performance under pressure is in my view one of the prime examples in our time of Ernest Hemingway's definition of courage: "Grace under pressure."

I visited the gulf region twice before the allied bombing of Iraq convinced me that we had put into the field an exceptionally well-equipped armed force. But even the best equipped and trained Armed Forces can falter if the morale is not there and if the spirit of dedication is lacking. For proof of that, we see what happened to the Iraqi troops who were demoralized and did not believe in what they were fighting for. How could they with guns at their back and the enemy in front?

But our All-Volunteer Force has great morale and, in the event, demonstrated that they believed in what they were fighting for. They told that to us when we visited them, and they have, of course, told the world since then.

The history of Operation Desert Shield and of Operation Desert Storm remains to be written. I think there are going to be volumes written about the high technology, the logistics, and the leadership of such great military men as General Schwarzkopf, Secretary Cheney, General Powell, and all the others.

For the moment, however, one thing should be pointed out: The victory in the desert did not take just 100 hours or a few months. It took years, because the armed force we put in the field in August 1990 was a product of debate and discussion in Congress for a number of years, of hard decisions made by American Presidents, and of sacrifices made by taxpayers for a decade or more.

It was an armed force that was able to carry out its job with conventional weapons, because during the 1980's we modernized those weapons systems. In short, it takes years to build a great armed force. Let us remember that truth as we enter the defense debates of the 1990's. And what we are hearing now that it is all over is this: "Oh, now that it is over, we need not do anything for the future."

How blind can we be? It seems to me that this is one of the things we really should have learned during this whole thing. And thank heaven there were some senior, older Members around here to carry the day. Members like the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], and, yes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], and some of the older Members of this House. Thank heaven

they were here to say that it need not be like Vietnam, that it could be different. But it required coming up front and making up our minds that it was not going to be a war fought with one or two of our hands tied behind us. And the President, being a veteran of World War II, learned also that we needed to plan it differently, execute it differently, and profit from our errors of the past.

Yes, great armies and air forces do not suddenly appear out of nowhere. They are a product of the nation that creates them over a period of years, and the success of such an armed force depends a great deal on the national spirit.

After we took a vote here in the House authorizing the President to use force, a vote that proved to be a turning point in the war, many of those who voted against the use of force at that time said they supported our troops in the field. I salute them for rallying around the troops, but let us remember, too, in conclusion, that our Armed Forces need us before the first shot is fired, before the sacrifices have to be made, and before we can even see a potential enemy on the horizon.

Mr. Speaker, our Armed Forces need us now, they need us every day, and they need our support, especially during the peace that they will help us to keep.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing gratitude to the United States military forces for their service in the recent war against Iraq. I am also grateful to President Bush for his leadership during this crisis, and to Secretary of State Baker, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, Gen. Colin Powell, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf for their successful effort in gaining and using allied support to achieve such a quick victory in this conflict.

At the same time, I think we should offer thanks to every American who supported President Bush and his military advisers, and all our military personnel who have served so bravely in the Persian Gulf. It is truly a miracle that in over a month of air and ground fighting, less than 100 Americans lost their lives. And to the families of those brave Americans who paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to their country, we share in their loss. We also are saddened that so many innocent civilian lives were lost in the Persian Gulf region.

We can be grateful, however, that thanks to the outstanding work of the men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces and the military personnel in the allied coalition, Saddam Hussein no longer poses a serious military threat to the countries in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope and prayer that this united action taken by the United States and its allies in support of the U.N. resolutions will demonstrate to all the governments around the world which are contemplating wanton aggression and blatant disregard for human rights, that they will not be welcome in the community of nations.

Again, I offer my heartfelt support and thanks to the men and women of our military

services who have served their country so well and so bravely and so professionally in the Persian Gulf. They are truly America's finest.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend U.S. troops for their performance in Operation Desert Storm.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have spent the greater part of the past decade working to provide the United States with the best military in the world. During that time I have consistently believed that people are the cornerstone of America's defense strategy. Without highly motivated, well trained, and professional soldiers, all the other elements of defense strategy would collapse. Highly technical and demanding weapon systems could not be used effectively and the complex tactical and strategic doctrine of our Armed Forces would unravel without the brave men and women of the All Volunteer Force. Consequently, much of the past investment in defense has focused on people; providing military personnel with the compensation, services, and training they need to be effective soldiers. As the astounding success of Operation Desert Storm indicates, this was money well spent.

In just over 40 days, American forces completed one of the most successful military operations in history. American troops confronted a well-fortified force of over 500,000 men, armed with some of the most sophisticated weapons available and simply overwhelmed them. In the early days of the campaign, Air Force and Navy aviators took command of the skies and carried out their missions with unparalleled skill and unprecedented success, breaking the back of the Iraqi Army.

The ground war began with a daring display of tactical maneuvers. The Army, having secretly redeployed its forces in eastern Saudi Arabia west to the Saudi-Iraqi border, stunned Iraqi forces by advancing with lightning speed to the Euphrates River and blocking their line of retreat. At the same time, the Marine Corps was breaching the much touted Iraqi defenses in southern Kuwait quicker than anyone had thought possible. General Schwarzkopf observed that the Marines' success would be studied by military commanders for generations to come. Only 100 hours after the initiation of the ground war, Kuwait was liberated and the Iraqi Army crushed.

Americans have every reason to be proud of the military's performance. The brave men and women who participated in Operation Desert Storm will, and should, return home as heroes. They selflessly answered the call to duty. They performed their missions with the highest level of dedication, skill, and professionalism demonstrating that they were the greatest fighting force this country has ever assembled, and perhaps, the best the world has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is possible to say enough about the tremendous job performed by our troops in the Persian Gulf. All Americans owe these brave men and women their unending gratitude and support.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the strongest possible support for the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] which supports the President and supports the allied armed forces

on their outstanding successes in Operation Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, America is back. For anyone who doubts this, I say, just take a look around you. Take a look at the American people. Never before have I seen our citizens so united behind a cause. American flags are proudly displayed everywhere. Rallies around the country have attracted hundreds of thousands of people. Polls show near unanimous support for our President and our troops.

For anyone who doubts this, I say, take a look at our Armed Forces. With the awesome display in this crisis, our military has once and for all buried the evil spectre of Vietnam in the deserts of Saudi Arabia. To Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Colin Powell and the other hundreds of thousands of other military men and women, I say thank you. Thank you for an outstanding job.

And thank you for vindicating those of us in this Chamber who have supported the military buildup of the last 10 years. While the loss of any life is a tragedy, and I want to offer my deepest condolences to those families and friends who have suffered losses in the gulf, the incredibly low total of casualties among our service men and women can only be attributed to the outstanding preparation and materiel that we have provided our personnel with due to the buildup.

Finally, I say for anyone who doubts that America is back, take a look at our President and the outstanding leadership he has provided us with. Under his leadership, America has proved once again that we are the world leader. And when the President comes to this Chamber tomorrow night to address Congress, he will be shown the appreciation and admiration that he deserves.

Mr. Speaker, by this resolution, we are taking the time to commend those outstanding efforts of our President, our Armed Forces and those brave men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation. Never before has this praise been so deserved. Under the leadership of President Bush, we have shown the world that, once and for all, America is back.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution expressing support for the success of Operation Desert Storm.

When American troops drove through the streets of Kuwait City to the cheers of thousands of newly freed Kuwaitis, the values America represents were vindicated once again.

The victory of freedom over tyranny in Kuwait announced to the world the basic right of individual states to self-determination.

We have now seen the great feats that can be performed when the world unites in the name of liberty and against aggression. And we know our success was based in large part on the efforts of the men and women who risked their lives for the simple ideal of freedom.

Indeed, the swift and decisive manner in which American-led allied forces prosecuted the ground offensive against Iraq is a tribute to their professionalism and the superb training of our military.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the valiant members of our Armed Forces who went in

and did the fighting. Our troops involved in Desert Storm were the best prepared force ever deployed in American history, and show the value and effectiveness of an all-volunteer force.

And we owe a special debt to those who made the ultimate sacrifice for the cause of freedom. They are American heroes of the first degree.

The families of the brave young men and women who fought, as well as the faith and unyielding support of the American people, made the soldiers' job easier and helped to keep their morale high throughout Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

Throughout this operation, we saw the defense investment we made during the past decade pay off. The high-technology weaponry that helped to make the liberation of Kuwait quicker and less costly than expected indicates that we owe a show of thanks to our military leadership and the troops that have made this operation so successful.

Many opponents of our defense modernization program in the 1980's have had their criticisms muted by the precision accuracy with which American forces executed the war to free Kuwait. As Defense Secretary Dick Cheney remarked recently, our preparedness for this conflict demonstrates to the American people that their tax dollars were well invested in high-technology military hardware.

Programs such as the Patriot missile, which was a direct spinoff of strategic defense initiative technology, are a testament to American ingenuity and military programs second to none. And the value of researching and developing our Stealth technology was proved when the aircraft bearing that visionary capability were successfully used in the air bombardment against Saddam Hussein.

The state-of-the-art weapons used by our troops in the ground offensive helped to keep allied casualties miraculously low, as Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf reported. While any casualty is one too many, we should all be grateful that the quality of our equipment and the readiness of our troops helped to minimize the loss of life.

President Bush handled the entire Persian Gulf crisis masterfully, from the days following the Iraqi invasion to the actual execution of the war. His enlistment of support from our allies, the United Nations, Congress, and the American people was unprecedented. The President was able to foster the most unity in wartime our country has seen since World War II. He truly fulfilled his constitutional responsibility as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

Now that the conflict is officially over, we must ensure that the lessons of Operation Desert Storm are taught to our children and our children's children. We know unequivocally that aggression must never be rewarded, and that when the world unites to oppose the war machine of a maniacal dictator, the forces of freedom will prevail over the forces of tyranny.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member pays tribute to, and gives thanks for, the truly outstanding performance of the men and women of our Armed Forces who have been engaged in the hostilities of the Persian Gulf area. The All-Volunteer Force is the most professional, best trained, and best equipped mili-

tary force in American history. America is proud and thankful for their superb performance. This Member is also very appreciative of the contributions on the battlefield by the Armed Forces from the other coalition countries that stood with us against Iraqi aggression.

A great many Americans provided outstanding leadership for our Armed Forces, but the truly exemplary leadership provided by Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, Gen. Colin Powell, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf surely deserves wide and enthusiastic acclaim. It would be difficult to find a top military leadership team in American history who performed more brilliantly. They led the effort that resulted in a masterpiece of planning, logistical support, and execution that, henceforth, will be studied in awe by military leaders and historians. Praise, too, should probably be given to the Nichols-Goldwater military reform legislation that permitted these wise and skilled men to avoid the interservice rivalries and related command-control-communication coordination problems that were recently all too apparent in Grenada.

As one of my younger staff members reminded this Member, for generations of younger Americans, Cheney, Powell, and Schwarzkopf quite rightly serve as the Nation's first, remarkable post-Vietnam military heroes. America needs heroes to restore our self-confidence and spur us on to greater achievement in a very wide range of domestic and international areas.

This Member would also like to extend sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of U.S. and coalition forces who have been injured or killed during this operation. These individuals are heroes in every sense of the word who have made the supreme sacrifice, and this Member joins in honoring each and every one of them.

Americans note, too, with great satisfaction and, this Member hopes, with renewed confidence and resolve, this new combat evidence of our technological and manufacturing skills. Who in the world could be unimpressed with the fearsomely superb performance of so many of our high-technology weapons systems? The Tomahawk cruise missile, the Patriot antimissile defense system, the M1A1 Abrams tank, the F-117 stealth fighter-bomber, the ungainly and relatively simple A-10 Warthog close air support aircraft, the largely unsung electronic warfare and countermeasure systems, to mention only a few of America's new-to-combat military hardware—all impressively exceeded our expectations. They greatly multiplied our force projection and cut our casualties. Despite expensive procurement and production glitches, they confounded the harping critics and worked superbly.

As a member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence this Member can perhaps better testify, necessarily in very general terms, to the critical importance of the sophisticated tactical intelligence hardware we employed. By these means we were able to provide our field commanders, right down to the small unit level, with the highly reliable, timely information that was reportedly critical in insuring the success of our forces. That intelligence, in combination with the most success-

ful air war ever waged, did great damage to the command and control capabilities and the morale of the Iraqi forces. They found themselves constantly dumbfounded or lagging in the crucial decision sequences. The results of those failures multiplied exponentially and disaster after disaster befell them. The skillful, confident use of timely and best-ever tactical intelligence by the allies caused the Iraqi Army to look much worse than they really were.

The final, but foremost, tribute, of course, is reserved for the Commander in Chief, President George Bush. Surely historians will forever praise his steadfast resolve and skill in reversing the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait. They will cite his diplomatic master strokes in both securing the necessary U.N. sanctions and in forging and sustaining the coalition whose forces and resources persisted until Kuwait was liberated.

Learning from the mistakes of Vietnam, President Bush avoided any urge to micromanage military strategy and tactics; instead he carefully delegated authority to his very capable military leaders and assured they would have the full resources necessary to do the job. We know they served their commander and Nation well.

Through our triumph on those battlefields of a just war the President patiently and sincerely sought to avoid for 5 long months, something that may be crucial to America's future was forged. America's moral leadership, conduct, and battlefield successes helped restore American self-confidence. It finally brought us out of the Vietnam era. It demonstrated the country's preeminent position as a world power ready to resist aggression and to protect its national interest.

Now the Congress must give President Bush and his administration the kind of post-war cooperation and support necessary to keep Saddam Hussein from snatching victory from the jaws of defeat. All informed and humane people of the world should devoutly hope that Saddam will not be allowed to continue leading Iraq. After the overwhelming, ignominious defeat the Iraqi military suffered—after the terrible human and financial losses his attacks on Iran and Kuwait have brought down upon the shoulders of his people—surely his support at home and respect abroad should vanish. He should stand trial as one of the world's most infamous war criminals.

Yet even today Radio Baghdad and other propaganda organs of Iraq defiantly trumpet their nonexistent victories and bald-faced lies about the rest of the world. Will he keep his promises to meet the conditions of the cease-fire and the U.N. resolutions? Will he desist in demanding worldwide terrorism against the United States and its coalition partners? Iraq is rich in resources, but will it agree to pay reasonable and just reparations from its oil export earnings? Or will it instead again squander them on military hardware and on the aggressive actions which have brought death and deprivation to its people?

While our quarrel, we repeat, is not with the Iraqi people, Americans must now clearly stand behind President Bush and the men and women of our armed services—especially in the immediate hours and days ahead. We must be willing, as warned, to again use our military forces to stop Saddam Hussein from

violating the terms of the cease-fire or U.N. resolutions or creating a new round of destabilizing action for the Middle East. If necessary, America and all of its allies must under U.N. auspices enforce the peace by resuming military action for a few hours or for whatever time is necessary. We have made war as well as it has ever been waged; now we must act with resolve and without hesitation to set the proper course for peace.

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 95 commending the valiance and the bravery of our troops in Operation Desert Storm. What a magnificent display of American know-how, will and tactical superiority we have just seen. While I was confident that we would eventually prevail, never did I imagine that it would occur in such an overwhelming manner. Although I am thankful that our casualties were minimal, we must not forget the sacrifices of those fine men and women who will not return. In my district, three brave, young Americans gave up their lives to make sure that freedom and justice were restored to the Persian Gulf region.

I must also commend and thank the troops of the 28 other nations who participated in Operation Desert Storm. This joint military operation will go down as one of those pivotal points in world history which showed how the community of nations on this good Earth will not allow tyranny, subjugation, and disregard for international law to prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I know that later this week we are scheduled to begin considering how to pay our share of the cost of this military operation—a stark reality which we will all face in the midst of our euphoria over the successful resolution of this crisis. While perhaps this may not be the proper time to begin raising these concerns, I am becoming increasingly alarmed by some of our other allies who did not commit military forces to Desert Storm who had, nonetheless, pledged financial support for its execution and who are now trying to renege on their commitments. This body will need to go on record at some point to express our intent that these nations honor their obligations or we will take steps to ensure that they do.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 95. I do so realizing that many in this body and many in this country will find this an unusual position to take on this issue and at this point in time. Mr. Speaker, I feel that a vote in support of this resolution can only be interpreted as a vote in support of the entire pattern of decisions which led this country down the path to war. I have stated many times, on and off the floor of this Chamber, that I feel this war was unnecessary and should never have been fought.

I cannot, in good conscience, change my position on whether or not we should fight a war based on the outcome of that war. My opposition to the waging of war is not based on whether we "win" or "lose" the war. It is based on the notion that we must, as a people, get beyond war and the threat of violence as a solution to the world's problems. We must hone the skills of negotiation; we must elevate the status of the international bodies of arbitration and justice; we must understand that true leadership is demonstrated by those

who illustrate the way to resolve conflict without bloodshed.

This position is not an anti-military position. On that point, I will let my 18 years of service on the Armed Services Committee speak for itself. Instead, I find myself in opposition to the ready use of the military—primarily by politicians—as a means to obtain ends which should be done through nonviolent methods. Having said that, I will take the liberty of echoing a portion of the resolution with which I do agree. I, too, express my sincere appreciation to the members of the U.S. Armed Forces who were ordered into this conflict and demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication, and professionalism.

Mr. Speaker, we must shed the mentality of war. I take the liberty of offering a recent Op-Ed I wrote on this subject to my colleagues.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 14, 1991]

SHEDDING THE MENTALITY OF WAR

(By Ronald V. Dellums)

I have opposed the application of offensive military force throughout the Persian Gulf crisis. I filed suit to protect against a unilateral decision by the President to use such force. I led the effort to continue economic sanctions in the place of a military offensive. I believe that negotiations and sanctions needed to be exhausted before we resorted to force.

When asked why I oppose the war now started, I invoke a speech that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. delivered at the height of the Vietnam War. He warned that the bombs being dropped on the jungles of Vietnam were exploding in the ghettos and barrios of America. The significance of that statement lies in both its simplicity and its complexity. Its thrust is every bit as relevant today.

Simply put, King warned us that those bombs were killing the hopes and aspirations of many, particularly the poor, in this country. The pursuit of a military solution to the situation in Vietnam was at the direct expense of those Americans whose marginal existence depended to a great extent on federal programs.

Today, Dr. King would warn that the bombs falling in the Persian Gulf are exploding all across America. The middle and working classes now join the poor in feeling the effects of the nation's misplaced spending priorities. Our crisis in health care, housing, education, environment and the "safety net" programs all will be aggravated by Gulf War expenses now ranging from \$500 million to \$1 billion a day. As a result of the misplaced spending priorities driven by the mentality and the actuality of war, the people of our nation face the greatest threat to the quality of their lives in modern times.

Dr. King also urged us to abandon the mentality of war. We are at war because an enormous gamble failed. A gamble of brinkmanship, driven by the mentality of war. During this crisis we have been taken to this brink, the next brink, and so on, with assurances that we would not have to leap any farther. Now we stare into the abyss, brought to the brink of what would, by all accounts, be an incredible slaughter of human beings—Americans, allies and Iraqis—in a ground attack combined with an unrestrained air assault on entrenched Iraqi positions in Kuwait and Iraq.

The economic sanctions continue, even though the war is having a negative effect on the resolve of the coalition enforcing them. As no strategic goods are allowed in and no oil is allowed out of Iraq, the country's econ-

omy will continue to disintegrate under the weight of the sanctions, without an escalation of the war.

Dr. King also warned against our fascination with the technology of war. In the days since the beginning of this war, we have heard discussion of a kind of national "euphoria" as we collectively consumed the descriptions of the performance of our high-technology weaponry. We now face the more sober reality that even when the weaponry exceeds our expectations, the predictions of an early Iraqi capitulation have proved false.

I submit that an even more sober reflection is in order. We are actually experiencing a unique opportunity to look through a window at the future of war. Instead of becoming enamored of this technology, we should become profoundly frightened by it. As long as we remain fixated on perfecting the art and craft of war over the art and craft, of diplomacy, we will remain caught in a spiral of violence that may escalate to the use of biological, chemical or even nuclear weapons.

The time to think beyond warfare is now. Otherwise, modern warfare may someday come to our own country, raining cruise missiles and high-technology death down on our own cities.

The harvest of a policy driven by the mentality of war finds fruit in increasingly anti-American Arab states. I agree with President Bush that America has a special role and a special responsibility in what he refers to as the "new world order." However, I believe that the United States should lead by example in searching for alternatives to war.

The decision to resort to brinkmanship is a failure of the responsibility. Respect for all of the lives that are being—and would be—extinguished should surely be great enough to drive nations to negotiate a solution to the current crisis. In the long run, peace is not just the withdrawal from hostilities, peace is the withdrawal from the mentality of war.

Dr. King's simple but profound statement lives with us today: eventually nations must peacefully coexist or violently annihilate each other. The search for peaceful coexistence is our moral obligation in the post-Cold War era.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, the Persian Gulf war has restored our national sense of patriotism and has reminded us all that the cost of freedom is eternal vigilance.

It has also had a profound effect on an entire generation of American Armed Forces who trained for combat, but who had never seen war before.

These brave young men and women deserve a hero's welcome upon their return from the gulf. They have joined the ranks of citizens who have served their country. They are now veterans.

Our pride and our celebration on this occasion should be extended to include all veterans. And, our reason for giving thanks should not be limited to military victory, but should look beyond our success on the battlefield to the peace that we hope will follow.

I would like to express my personal pride in the strength and determination shown by one particular World War II veteran, who stuck to his guns and was proven to be right in his unbending decision to fight tyranny with a steady application of force.

George Bush made the tough decisions, knowing that he was right, and he did not deviate from his stated purpose of freeing Kuwait

and implementing all of the U.N. resolutions as conditions for an end to the conflict.

As President, George Bush stood firm with the international community and then stood aside and let the military do its job, with great success.

We have reason to be proud of our troops and, in particular, of a native New Jerseyite, Gen. H. Norman Schwarzkopf, for his professionalism and his humanity as commander.

Now is also the time to heal old wounds and to remember with special pride all of our veterans who have answered the call of their Commander in Chief to defend freedom on a foreign shore.

I am thinking in particular of our Vietnam veterans and those veterans of the Korean war who feel that they have not received the proper recognition for their equally significant sacrifices.

We must make this a time of national reconciliation for all who have served with honor and who put their lives on the line in the call to duty.

As our brave men and women return from the Persian Gulf, they deserve our thanks and our recognition of their commitment to service and their professional handling of a difficult mission.

As I attended rallies for the troops held in New Jersey during the war and prior to it, my thoughts were for their safety. There is now a real sense of relief among the families as our forces begin coming home, and that, too is a reason to celebrate.

We are all impressed with the speed and effectiveness of the allied victory in the gulf war. We basically had four things going for us. We had a well developed plan of action. We had the will to use it. We had dedicated forces. And we had the equipment to back up those forces.

We must express appreciation and gratitude to the families of those brave individuals, who have made great sacrifices in terms of security at home in order to make a contribution to a larger cause—freedom for the occupied people of Kuwait.

President Bush has proven that the international community can speak with one voice. We have sent a clear message to any dictator who seeks to expand his horizons by conquering his neighbors that he had better think twice.

Having the right plan is only half the battle. You must have the people and the equipment to do the job. Our success with Operation Desert Storm has confirmed what many of us in Congress have been fighting for throughout the Reagan and Bush years.

If we had not listened to President Reagan early on about the importance of military preparedness, we would not have had the equipment in the pipeline to get this job done.

Mr. Speaker, this national celebration is a time for unity and for renewal of our basic values. There is work yet to be done, as always, to secure the peace, but we should rightly take a moment to be thankful for our accomplishments and to honor those brave individuals who have taken the initiative and have been successful.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment today to join my colleagues in commending the success of Operation Desert

Storm. The credit for our victory in the Persian Gulf belongs to many people, and it is altogether fitting to commend them here.

First, and foremost, credit must go to the brave men and women who left their homes and families to risk their lives for this just cause in the Arabian desert. The troops of Desert Storm are truly America's finest. In the past, the all-volunteer Armed Forces were maligned in some quarters. Their outstanding performance in liberating Kuwait will rightly put an emphatic end to that.

Credit must also go to American technology. From the Stealth fighter to the Patriot missile, from the M-1 tank to precision-guided "smart bombs," this newest generation of weapons passed their first major battlefield tests. The bottom line is that American technology is not only militarily effective, but it also saves lives.

We must also, of course, give an unqualified "well-done" to our military leadership. Operation Desert Storm was conducted with brilliant tactical and strategic planning and execution by General Powell, General Schwarzkopf, and their colleagues. Our former colleague, Dick Cheney, also deserves great credit for his bold leadership of the Defense Department during this time of crisis.

Last, and quite certainly not least, substantial credit must be given to President George Bush. Those of us in Congress who voted to authorize the use of force against Saddam Hussein recognized then what all Americans know today: that the policy and vision of President Bush was the guiding force behind the unprecedented response to Saddam Hussein's aggression. He showed both the skill and finesse needed to put together and hold together a worldwide coalition, and the courage and tenacity to withstand pressures to go only half way. Simply put, President Bush rose successfully to the historical moment.

All of these people who made Desert Storm such a stunning success deserve our commendation on a job well done.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, America and the world are today very proud of the military which has achieved a victory unparalleled in the course of modern history. The bravery and professionalism of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines and the brilliant leadership and planning of Generals Powell and Schwarzkopf and our other military commanders are living testimony to the greatness of America and our democratic system. American participation and leadership was the one indispensable component in this triumph.

President Bush was correct in calling for a ceasefire as the destruction of the Iraqi military machine and the elimination of the threat it poses is complete. Of equal importance, our commanders in the field believe that a ceasefire will not pose a risk to our forces. The destruction of the Iraqi armed forces has eliminated the Iraqi threat to world peace and stability. The ceasefire call has resulted in America setting the terms for peace in the region. American leadership has won the war and will now win the peace.

Let us hope Saddam does not misjudge again and resume the war. If he does it will just bring more destruction upon his nation and his regime. This is not a goal we desire as a nation but it will occur as surely as night

follows day if Saddam fails to meet all our conditions.

Finally, I want to express my personal thanks to our fighters and their families for their sacrifices. In particular, I want to express my sympathies to the families of those who have paid the ultimate price in the struggle for freedom. Their sacrifices will not be forgotten.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Mr. BROOMFIELD'S resolution to commend the U.S. and allied military forces on the success of Operation Desert Storm.

This is truly a great victory for all of us—all Americans, all allies, and particularly the people of Kuwait.

We should offer a prayer of thanks that our troops will soon be home.

We should also offer a prayer for those brave soldiers who gave their lives to secure this victory.

Throughout this entire conflict, our forces showed incredible leadership and a remarkable ability to carry out the strategic plan.

Tremendous credit goes to President Bush, to our military leaders, and especially to our troops.

Also, major credit goes to the American people for their support of Operation Desert Storm. It could not have been accomplished without that support.

As one Minnesota soldier in the gulf wrote me recently, "The support of people back in Minnesota has kept me going."

I applaud President Bush, Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, Gen. Colin Powell, the leaders of our allied partners, and all the men and women in our armed services who have served so bravely and valiantly.

Congratulations on a job well done.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in congratulating our forces in the Persian Gulf for their courage and resolve in carrying out Operation Desert Storm. This incredible victory, accounting for fewer overall casualties than a grim week of fighting during the Vietnam war, is a tribute to our Armed Forces' tireless training and planning. As President Bush stated in his radio address to the troops:

The coalition faced a moral imperative to put a stop to the atrocities in Kuwait once and for all * * * Boldly, bravely, you did just that—and when the rubber met the road—you did it in just 6 weeks—and 100 decisive hours.

Further "kudos" should be awarded to Defense Secretary Cheney, General Powell, and General Schwarzkopf. This trio put together a military strategy that, with the exceptional support of our military forces, will go down in history as one of the greatest, most successful executions of military warfare ever.

Let us reserve our ultimate appreciation for the efforts of our President. President Bush not only carried out his military duties as the Commander in Chief in heroic fashion; he also skillfully maneuvered a very diverse, 28-nation coalition through a political and diplomatic minefield. From lobbying Israel not to respond to the Scud attacks, responding to the numerous Soviet initiatives, and handling Saddam's unreasonable attempts to gain the upperhand, the President made the right decisions necessary to keep this important coalition together.

For the critics who continued to be cynical of our chances of succeeding in this war without incurring a high number of casualties, the ultimate success of this operation remains as the final proof. As it turned out, the United States military never underestimated the true danger and unpredictability of Saddam Hussein's firepower. Perhaps instead, critics underestimated the military capacity of this coalition to release Kuwait and the Middle East from the despotic chokehold of Saddam Hussein and his war machine.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, while we all rejoice in the total victory over the forces of aggression in Kuwait, we must pay our due to the one man who put together the most effective political and military coalition since the Second World War—President George Bush.

He not only held together an alliance composed of different cultures, religions, and political stripes, President Bush withstood tremendous pressure from some quarters to bend with the wind and permit those who live by the gun to be victorious over those who live by the word of law.

President George Bush has done all that and all of us in Congress should appreciate the tremendous job he has done as our Commander in Chief.

He didn't seek war, but he prepared us for it. He sought a peaceful solution, but was not hamstrung by it.

And when the moment of truth came, President Bush showed the confidence needed in our military forces to carry these goals, approved and supported in unprecedented fashion, by the international community of nations.

Mr. Speaker, with the end of hostilities in the Persian Gulf, there are many lessons which can be drawn from its successful conclusion, although our excitement and joy is tempered by the sacrifices made by those who have fallen in combat.

Dictators and aggressors, who wish to inflict death and destruction against those who wish no harm to their neighbors, now realize there are countries willing to rise to their defense.

The United Nations has proven its ability to pull together and offer sanctions against those who break accepted norms of international behavior.

The people of this country realize we can accomplish our military goals when the political objectives are clearly laid out and the investment is made in people who carry out the war and the weapons needed to do so.

Many of these weapons systems were made in Connecticut. Engines for the M1A1 tanks are made by Textron-Lycoming, while attack helicopters are built by Sikorsky.

The myth that American workers cannot build a high-quality product, and our soldiers, and airmen cannot use them, was effectively put to rest.

Clearly, aggression can be repulsed through preparation and a readiness to use force when provoked.

While many of the weapons systems proved to be more than up to the task, as evidenced by the spellbinding videotapes of laser-guided missiles, there were other human resource reasons for the total victory over Iraq.

In the early years of the last decade, the quality of our troops was not up to the task

and the overall coordination of each military branch was rife with well-intended, but counterproductive rivalries.

A reorganization of the military, which consolidated the authority of the military under the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the improved training of our men and women in uniform, were instrumental to the superb coordination seen on the land, on the sea, and in the air.

President Bush also avoided the mistake of trying to direct the war effort himself. He, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, and Gen. Colin Powell outlined the political objectives and handed the war over to the military professionals.

Now, the goal of a lasting settlement to the thousands of years of conflict, between all parties, will be no easy task and the President has struck the right chords by orchestrating the United States toward a position of offering solutions rather than dictating them as a conquering Caesar.

Although the forces of the coalition are sitting on top of half of the world's known oil reserves, we should not seek a long-term, top-heavy presence once the situation has stabilized.

But, it may take some time for Kuwait to be rebuilt and the political dynamics of this troubled region to solidify.

We must also press our allies, who did offer financial commitments, to meet those requirements in a timely fashion.

The American people owe much, if not all of these successes, to President Bush, who has shown that the will of the American people to do what is right and just is undiminished.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commend the President and our troops who acted so brilliantly during Operation Desert Storm.

Sending U.S. military forces overseas is the most definitive foreign policy statement any President can make. When President Bush first sent our troops to the Persian Gulf, there was much criticism levied at the White House, both from the American public and right here on Capitol Hill.

However, as we have now witnessed, there is little doubt that without the action initiated by President Bush in the early days of the crisis, the precarious situation that we faced would have resulted in grave consequences. Saddam Hussein, in blitzkrieg fashion, ruthlessly poured his military muscle into Kuwait, seizing hostages as well as assets. I firmly believe that without our presence in Saudi Arabia, Hussein would have moved into that country. History has proven that appeasement is no solution to stopping the expansionist intent of a dictator. The uncontested march into Czechoslovakia and the Sudetenland by the Nazis parallels Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

President Bush must be lauded for his leadership and strength over the last several months. The President showed decisive political skill in formulating the Persian Gulf alliance and competence above and beyond the call of duty as our Commander in Chief. However, as in any sport, a team is only as good as its players. In carrying out its game plan, our troops were All Pros.

Our troops in the Middle East are a cross-section of America's best and brightest young

people. Their performance during Operation Desert Storm was nothing less than spectacular. To fully commend our heroes in uniform should be a top priority of our Nation. The troops now beginning their trek back to our shores deserve a welcome home on a magnitude of nothing less than their performance in the Middle East. They are truly the role models of our time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me in voting for House Resolution 95 and show just a small portion of support that our President and our troops truly deserve.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today we have before us a resolution to commend the troops and extend our condolences to the families of those who died in the conflict.

Recognizing the courage of our troops should not be considered approval of the course of action taken by the President. Yes, the military victory was well planned, but I do not commend any decision to use force except as a last resort. I believe that we endangered too many people, American, allied, or Iraqi, and posed horrible dangers to the environment. These tolls are still yet unknown.

While I take exception to some of the language of the resolution, I convey my deepest sympathy and most devout prayers to the families of our troops.

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting for Congress to adopt a resolution commending our own forces and the forces of our allies for the job they have done in the Persian Gulf, and to convey our sympathy to the families and friends of those who lost their lives during the operation. This is one way we can express our gratitude.

We should also express our gratitude by making certain our military personnel and veterans receive the benefits they deserve. Congress has already enacted a number of measures relating to veterans and active military personnel this year. There are still issues that need to be addressed, however, including some directly linked to Operation Desert Storm. I am confident Congress will give our veterans and military personnel the legislative support they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, the successful conclusion of a military operation is always a time for celebration. It is also a time for prayer. We pray for stability in the region and for peace and justice in the world. We have already achieved the immediate goal of evicting Iraq from Kuwait. Now we need to achieve the more long term goals of peace and justice and freedom in the world.

These are the goals our troops have been fighting for, and we commend them for all their bravery and skill have accomplished.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that pride that I join in commending the men and women of our Armed Forces for their outstanding performance in the defense of freedom. The swift and decisive victory by the United States and coalition forces stunned not only Saddam Hussein but many of us here at home. There are many who share the credit for this accomplishment: President Bush, for his leadership in the world community, in the United States, and as Commander in Chief; Secretary Cheney and General Powell for overseeing the military response to Iraq's aggression; Secretary Baker

for his efforts in organizing the international response and obtaining foreign support for the United States; Brent Scowcroft and others and the National Security Council for the counsel they provided to the President during this crisis; and General Schwarzkopf and his staff for developing and executing a military strategy that accomplished our objectives so successfully.

But without question, the greatest credit goes to the men and women in uniform. It is they who made the greatest sacrifices and assumed the greatest risk. For over 7 months, our forces have been separated from their families and have served in one of the most difficult environments on Earth. Special recognition should be given to the members of the National Guard and the Reserves who were called to active duty. These citizen soldiers were uprooted from their jobs and everyday lives often at a substantial financial cost to them and their families. Despite the hardships, they demonstrated a level of professionalism and dedication that enabled the United States to once again stand as the defender of freedom and the rule of law.

Finally, though U.S. casualties were mercifully low, we are forever indebted to those who paid the ultimate price for this just operation to succeed. As General Schwarzkopf stated, peace is not without a price. We are fortunate to have volunteers who are willing to lay their lives on the line in the defense of their country and the cause of peace. Now that the war has been won, it is indeed a grateful nation that awaits the return of its sons and daughters. We turn now to completing the task they began, that of building a lasting peace.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, grateful for the chance to support House Resolution 95, sponsored by my colleague and friend, Congressman BILL BROOMFIELD. I am also honored to express the emotions of my fellow central New Yorkers and say, "Congratulations, American and allied military men and women. You have upheld the tradition of our Nation, fighting for liberation of people, not territorial gains or hegemony."

Who deserves credit for this great victory? This historic stemming of aggression. This reinstatement in the world order of the greatest Nation on Earth as a force that will make sacrifices as it sides unequivocally with good against propagators of evil. Certainly President Bush deserves our admiration. He led us well. Our former colleague, Secretary Cheney. Joint Chiefs Chairman Colin Powell. General Schwarzkopf. Yes, they have earned our praise and thanks.

But you and I know who deserve the greatest praise: the troops and their families, whose courage is a model for all of us and whose personal sacrifices have not yet been tallied.

I am particularly proud of our community's troops. We bid farewell to hundreds of our neighbors, who serve in various units: the 174th tactical fighter wing of the Air National Guard, "The Boys from Syracuse"; Bravo Company Marine Reserves in the 8th tank battalion of the 2d Marine Division; the 403d Army Civil Affairs Company; the 423d Army Reserve medical detachment; the 376th Army Reserve Medivac Hospital; and the 702d Naval Reserve detachment and medical unit.

They've done their job well. We are eager to welcome them home.

We also have casualties of war: wounded, missing, or killed. So our excitement and joy in victory is tempered by the wisdom of the veterans who remind us that war is never desirable.

There are other casualties of war: the effects on families who struggled and waited. We must not let these veterans and their families down as they return home and need our help in little ways, to make their lives whole again.

They, and we as a nation, have done well. We have shown potential aggressors there is a cost to waging unjust war. Congratulations to our allies and especially to all American forces. Hurry home and God speed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that the house suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 95.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 759

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 759.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1550

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

The Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 707 de novo; and

House Resolution 95 by the yeas and nays.

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

COMMODITY FUTURES IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of sus-

pending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 707, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 707, as amended.

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

Mr HUCKABY. 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 395, nays 27, answered "present" 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie	Costello	Guarini
Ackerman	Coughlin	Gunderson
Alexander	Cox (CA)	Hall (OH)
Allard	Cox (IL)	Hall (TX)
Anderson	Coyne	Hamilton
Andrews (ME)	Cramer	Hammerschmidt
Andrews (NJ)	Crane	Hancock
Andrews (TX)	Cunningham	Hansen
Annunzio	Dannemeyer	Harris
Anthony	Darden	Hastert
Applegate	Davis	Hatcher
Archer	de la Garza	Hayes (IL)
Army	DeFazio	Hefley
Aspin	DeLauro	Hefner
Atkins	DeLay	Henry
AuCoin	Dellums	Hergert
Bacchus	Derrick	Hertel
Baker	Dicks	Hoagland
Ballenger	Dingell	Hobson
Barnard	Dixon	Hochbrueckner
Barrett	Dooley	Holloway
Bartlett	Doolittle	Hopkins
Barton	Dorgan (ND)	Horn
Bateman	Dornan (CA)	Horton
Bennett	Downey	Houghton
Bereuter	Dreier	Hoyer
Bevill	Durbin	Hubbard
Bilbray	Dwyer	Hughes
Billirakis	Dymally	Hunter
Billey	Early	Hutto
Boehlert	Edwards (CA)	Hyde
Boehner	Edwards (OK)	Inhofe
Bonior	Edwards (TX)	Ireland
Borski	Emerson	Jacobs
Boucher	Engel	James
Boxer	English	Jefferson
Brewster	Erdreich	Jenkins
Brooks	Espy	Johnson (CT)
Broomfield	Evans	Johnson (SD)
Browder	Fascell	Johnston
Brown	Fawell	Jones (GA)
Bruce	Fazio	Jones (NC)
Bryant	Feighan	Jontz
Bunning	Fields	Kanjorski
Burton	Fish	Kaptur
Bustamante	Flake	Kasich
Byron	Foglietta	Kennedy
Callahan	Ford (MI)	Kennelly
Camp	Ford (TN)	Kildee
Campbell (CA)	Frank (MA)	Kleczka
Campbell (CO)	Franks (CT)	Klug
Cardin	Frost	Kolbe
Carper	Galleghy	Kolter
Carr	Gallo	Kopetski
Chandler	Gaydos	Kostmayer
Chapman	Gekas	Kyl
Clay	Gephardt	LaFalce
Clement	Geren	Lagomarsino
Clinger	Gibbons	Lancaster
Coble	Gilchrest	Lantos
Coleman (MO)	Gilman	LaRocco
Coleman (TX)	Gingrich	Lehman (CA)
Collins (IL)	Glickman	Lehman (FL)
Collins (MI)	Goodling	Lent
Combest	Gordon	Levin (MI)
Condit	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Conyers	Grandy	Lewis (FL)
Cooper	Gray	Lewis (GA)

Lightfoot	Panetta	Skelton
Lipinski	Parker	Slatery
Lloyd	Patterson	Slaughter (NY)
Long	Paxon	Slaughter (VA)
Lowery (CA)	Payne (NJ)	Smith (FL)
Lowey (NY)	Payne (VA)	Smith (IA)
Luken	Pelosi	Smith (NJ)
Machtley	Penny	Smith (OR)
Madigan	Perkins	Smith (TX)
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Snowe
Markey	Peterson (MN)	Solarz
Marlenee	Petri	Solomon
Martin	Pickett	Spence
Martinez	Pickle	Spratt
Matsui	Porter	Staggers
Mavroules	Poshard	Stallings
Mazzoli	Price	Stark
McCandless	Pursell	Stearns
McCloskey	Quillen	Stenholm
McCollum	Rahall	Stokes
McCurdy	Ramstad	Studds
McDade	Rangel	Stump
McDermott	Ravenel	Sundquist
McEwen	Ray	Swett
McGrath	Reed	Swift
McMillan (NC)	Regula	Synar
McMillen (MD)	Rhodes	Tallon
McNulty	Richardson	Tanner
Meyers	Ridge	Taylor (MS)
Mfume	Riggs	Taylor (NC)
Michel	Rinaldo	Thomas (CA)
Miller (CA)	Ritter	Thomas (GA)
Miller (WA)	Roberts	Thomas (WY)
Mineta	Roe	Thornton
Mink	Roemer	Torres
Moakley	Rogers	Torricelli
Mollinari	Rohrabacher	Towns
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Traficant
Montgomery	Rose	Unsoeld
Moody	Rostenkowski	Upton
Moorhead	Roth	Valentine
Morella	Roukema	Vander Jagt
Morrison	Rowland	Vento
Mrazek	Roybal	Volkmer
Murphy	Russo	Vucanovich
Murtha	Sabo	Walker
Myers	Sanders	Walsh
Nagle	Santorum	Washington
Natcher	Savage	Waters
Neal (MA)	Sawyer	Waxman
Neal (NC)	Saxton	Weber
Nichols	Schaefer	Weldon
Nowak	Schiff	Wheat
Nussle	Schroeder	Whitten
Oakar	Schulze	Williams
Oberstar	Schumer	Wise
Olin	Sharp	Wolf
Ortiz	Shaw	Wolpe
Orton	Shays	Wylie
Owens (NY)	Shuster	Yatron
Owens (UT)	Sikorski	Young (FL)
Oxley	Sisisky	Zeliff
Packard	Skaggs	Zimmer
Pallone	Skeen	

NAYS—27

Beilenson	Hayes (LA)	Scheuer
Bentley	Huckaby	Sensenbrenner
Berman	Leach	Tauzin
Duncan	Livingston	Traxler
Eckart	McCrery	Vislosky
Gejdenson	McHugh	Weiss
Gillmor	Moran	Wyden
Gradison	Obey	Yates
Green	Pease	Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—10

Dickinson	Miller (OH)	Udall
Donnelly	Sangmeister	Wilson
Laughlin	Sarpallus	
Levine (CA)	Serrano	

□ 1611

Messrs. GREEN of New York, GEJD-ENSON, LEACH, MCCRERY, and TRAXLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HALL of Texas 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to improve the regulation of futures and options traded under rules and regulations of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission; to establish registration standards for all exchange floor traders; to restrict practices which may lead to the abuse of outside customers of the marketplace; to reinforce development of exchange audit trails to better enable the detection and prevention of such practices; to establish higher standards for service on governing boards and disciplinary committees of self-regulatory organizations; to enhance the international regulation of futures trading; to regularize the process of authorizing appropriations for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission: and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT, THE UNITED STATES, AND ALLIED MILITARY FORCES ON SUCCESS OF OPERATION DESERT STORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 95.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 95, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 8, answered "present" 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Anderson	Annunzio
Ackerman	Andrews (ME)	Anthony
Alexander	Andrews (NJ)	Applegate
Allard	Andrews (TX)	Archer

Armedy	Evans	Leach
Aspin	Fasell	Lehman (CA)
Atkins	Fawell	Lehman (FL)
AuCoin	Fazio	Lent
Bacchus	Feighan	Levin (MI)
Baker	Fields	Lewis (CA)
Ballenger	Fish	Lewis (FL)
Barnard	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Barrett	Foglietta	Lightfoot
Bartlett	Ford (MI)	Lipinski
Barton	Ford (TN)	Livingston
Bateman	Frank (MA)	Lloyd
Beilenson	Franks (CT)	Long
Bennett	Frost	Lowery (CA)
Bentley	Galleghy	Lowey (NY)
Bereuter	Gallo	Luken
Berman	Gaydos	Machtley
Bevill	Gedjenson	Madigan
Bilbray	Gekas	Manton
Bilirakis	Gephardt	Markey
Billey	Geren (TX)	Marlenee
Boehlert	Gibbons	Martin
Boehner	Gilchrest	Martinez
Bonior	Gillmor	Matsui
Borski	Gilman	Mavroules
Boucher	Gingrich	Mazzoli
Boxer	Glickman	McCandless
Brewster	Goodling	McCloskey
Brooks	Gordon	McCollum
Broomfield	Goss	McCrery
Browder	Gradison	McCurdy
Brown	Grandy	McDade
Bruce	Gray	McDermott
Bryant	Green	McEwen
Bunning	Guarini	McGrath
Burton	Gunderson	McHugh
Bustamante	Hall (OH)	McMillan (NC)
Byron	Hall (TX)	McMillen (MD)
Callahan	Hamilton	McNulty
Camp	Hammerschmidt	Meyers
Campbell (CA)	Hancock	Mfume
Campbell (CO)	Hansen	Michel
Cardin	Harris	Miller (CA)
Carper	Hastert	Miller (WA)
Carr	Hatcher	Mineta
Chandler	Hayes (LA)	Mink
Chapman	Hefley	Moakley
Clay	Hefner	Molinari
Clement	Henry	Mollohan
Clinger	Hergert	Montgomery
Coble	Hertel	Moody
Coleman (MO)	Hoagland	Moorhead
Coleman (TX)	Hobson	Moran
Collins (IL)	Hochbrueckner	Morella
Collins (MI)	Holloway	Morrison
Combest	Hopkins	Mrazek
Condit	Horn	Murphy
Cooper	Horton	Murtha
Costello	Houghton	Myers
Coughlin	Hoyer	Nagle
Cox (CA)	Hubbard	Natcher
Cox (IL)	Huckaby	Neal (MA)
Coyne	Hughes	Neal (NC)
Cramer	Hunter	Nichols
Cranes	Hutto	Nowak
Cunningham	Hyde	Nussle
Dannemeyer	Inhofe	Oakar
Darden	Ireland	Oberstar
Davis	Jacobs	Obey
de la Garza	James	Olin
DeFazio	Jefferson	Ortiz
DeLauro	Jenkins	Orton
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Owens (UT)
Derrick	Johnson (SD)	Oxley
Dicks	Johnston	Packard
Dingell	Jones (GA)	Pallone
Dixon	Jones (NC)	Panetta
Dooley	Jontz	Parker
Doolittle	Kanjorski	Patterson
Dorgan (ND)	Kaptur	Paxon
Dorman (CA)	Kasich	Payne (VA)
Downey	Kennedy	Pease
Dreier	Kennelly	Pelosi
Duncan	Kildee	Penny
Durbin	Kleczka	Perkins
Dwyer	Klug	Peterson (FL)
Early	Kolbe	Peterson (MN)
Eckart	Kolter	Petri
Edwards (CA)	Kopetski	Pickett
Edwards (OK)	Kostmayer	Pickle
Edwards (TX)	Kyl	Porter
Emerson	LaFalce	Poshard
Engel	Lagomarsino	Price
English	Lancaster	Pursell
Erdreich	Lantos	Quillen
Espy	LaRocco	Rahall

Ramstad	Shaw	Taylor (NC)
Rangel	Shays	Thomas (CA)
Rangel	Shuster	Thomas (GA)
Ravenel	Sikorski	Thomas (WY)
Ray	Sisisky	Thornton
Reed	Skaggs	Torres
Regula	Skeen	Torrice
Rhodes	Skelton	Traficant
Richardson	Slatery	Traxler
Ridge	Slaughter (NY)	Unsoeld
Riggs	Slaughter (VA)	Upton
Rinaldo	Smith (FL)	Valentine
Ritter	Smith (IA)	Vander Jagt
Roberts	Smith (NJ)	Vento
Roe	Smith (OR)	Viscosky
Roemer	Smith (TX)	Volkmer
Rogers	Snowe	Vucanovich
Rohrabacher	Solarz	Walker
Ros-Lehtinen	Solomon	Walsh
Rose	Spence	Waxman
Rostenkowski	Spratt	Weber
Roth	Staggers	Weldon
Roukema	Stallings	Wheat
Rowland	Stark	Whitten
Roybal	Stearns	Williams
Russo	Stenholm	Wise
Sabo	Stokes	Wolf
Santorum	Studds	Wolpe
Sawyer	Stump	Wyden
Saxton	Schaefer	Wylie
Scheuer	Sweet	Yates
Schneider	Swift	Yatron
Schulze	Synar	Young (AK)
Schumer	Tallon	Young (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Tanner	Zeliff
Sharp	Tauzin	Zimmer
	Taylor (MS)	

cesses, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

EDUCATION DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 104) to designate March 26, 1991, as "Education Day, U.S.A." and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so simply to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] who is the chief proponent of this legislation, and to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 104 designating March 26, 1991, as "Education Day, U.S.A.", and I commend my colleagues, our distinguished minority leader, Mr. MICHEL and our distinguished majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT for introducing this measure.

Mr. Speaker, the future of our Nation, our very way of life, and our democratic system of government is dependent on a highly educated citizenry, a citizenry that must be fully equipped to compete with other nations of the world. We must nurture our desire for learning and to motivate students and teachers to assure that we maintain leadership to continue our American democracy.

The quality of education is essential to our American heritage of cultural and political freedom. Our schools are instrumental in providing our scientific and technical competence. Education holds the key to the future. By designating March 26, 1991, as "Education Day, U.S.A." we will call the attention of the American people to the necessity of improving our educational system, which promotes good moral and ethical.

House Joint Resolution 104 also calls attention to the Lubavitch movement, which promotes many of our ethical values and principles upon which the educational system of our great Nation was founded.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to say a few words about House Joint Resolution 104, requesting the President

NAYS—8

Conyers	Sanders	Washington
Dellums	Savage	Waters
Hayes (IL)	Towns	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Gonzalez	Payne (NJ)
Owens (NY)	Weiss

NOT VOTING—11

Dickinson	Levine (CA)	Serrano
Donnelly	Miller (OH)	Udall
Dymally	Sangmeister	Wilson
Laughlin	Sarpalius	

□ 1621

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow, Wednesday, March 6, 1991.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 6, 1991, for the Speaker to declare re-

to designate March 26, 1991, as "Education Day, U.S.A."

Along with the distinguished majority leader, RICHARD GEPHARDT, I am sponsoring this resolution. The majority leader and I joined forces 2 years ago, and I am happy to be a part of this worthy venture today.

As I said last year, I think it is fitting that the majority and the minority leaders cosponsor such a resolution. Education is an issue that transcends partisan consideration.

Today, we are seeing a rebirth of the time-honored ideal of progress through education. This resolution draws to the attention of the American people the importance of education to our country. Education is the cornerstone to maintaining our quality of life and national security and is the basis upon which this country will rise to meet the challenges of the future.

March 26 also happens to be the 89th birthday of the internationally renowned and respected religious leader, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson.

It is only fitting that we pay tribute to this great educator as 1991 marks the Rebbe's 90th year of his ascension to the world leadership of the Lubavitch movement. The Lubavitch movement actively promotes educational programs at more than 150 centers in the United States and many more worldwide.

The Lubavitch movement, founded in the 18th century, has as its philosophical foundation three basic elements: wisdom, understanding, and knowledge.

It is, therefore, appropriate that the movement, under the inspirational leadership of the man called the Rebbe, has been so active in promoting education.

Looking over my remarks from last year, I came upon a fact I want to share with you today.

The movement which the Rebbe heads takes its name from the Russian city, Lubavitch, which, translated into English means, city of love.

In the final analysis it is love of one's religious heritage, love of learning—that is at the heart of the Lubavitch movement and at the heart of this resolution.

I am pleased once again to honor a great man and to support such a noble idea.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 104

Whereas Congress recognizes the historical tradition of ethical values and principles which are the basis of civilized society and upon which our great Nation was founded;

Whereas these ethical values and principles have been the bedrock of society from the dawn of civilization, when they were known as the Seven Noahide Laws;

Whereas without these ethical values and principles the edifice of civilization stands in serious peril of returning to chaos;

Whereas society is profoundly concerned with the recent weakening of these principles that has resulted in crises that beleaguer and threaten the fabric of civilized society;

Whereas the justified preoccupation with these crises must not let the citizens of this Nation lose sight of their responsibility to transmit these historical ethical values from our distinguished past to the generations of the future;

Whereas the Lubavitch movement has fostered and promoted these ethical values and principles throughout the world;

Whereas Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, leader of the Lubavitch movement, is universally respected and revered and his eighty-ninth birthday falls on March 26, 1991;

Whereas in tribute to this great spiritual leader, "the rebbe," this, his ninetieth year will be seen as one of "education and giving," the year in which we turn to education and charity to return the world to the moral and ethical values contained in the Seven Noahide Laws; and

Whereas this will be reflected in an international scroll of honor signed by the President of the United States and other heads of state: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 26, 1991, the start of the ninetieth year of Rabbi Menachem Schneerson, leader of the worldwide Lubavitch movement, is designated as "Education Day, U.S.A." The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE OLDER WORKER WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 133) authorizing and requesting the President to designate the second full week in March 1991 as "National Employ the Older Worker Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the chief sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I certainly thank the gentleman from Ohio, the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the time.

National Employ the Older Worker Week does encourage this Nation's elderly to rejoin the work force, and must be a priority for the 102d Congress. For far too long our senior citizens have been penalized for trying to get back, into the work ethic.

My commemorative would designate the week of March 18, 1991, as "Na-

tional Employ the Older Worker Week." The American Legion has sponsored a "National Employ the Older Worker" during the second full week of March in every year since 1959, but the last time the Congress was able to accomplish this was way back in 1948.

Mr. Speaker, the skills, the talent, and the experience vested in our older workers are among the valued natural resources we possess in this country. In addition, older workers clearly wish to stay involved in the economic and social development of their communities. It is in the interest of America that they be supported and encouraged in every single way possible.

Mr. Speaker, "National Employ the Older Worker Week" symbolizes the strong support that this Congress has for removing the barriers that are preventing our senior citizens from joining the work force. I urge all Members in the House to support this legislation that recognizes the talents of our older Americans. They certainly deserve it. I thank the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for allowing the legislation on the floor.

□ 1630

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 133

Whereas individuals aged 55 and over are a major national resource, constitute 22 percent of the population of the United States at the present time, and are likely to constitute a larger percentage of the population in future decades;

Whereas a growing number of such individuals, being willing and able to work, are looking for employment opportunities, want to remain in the workforce, or would like to serve their communities and their Nation in voluntary roles;

Whereas such individuals, who have made continuing contributions to the national welfare, should be encouraged to remain in, or resume, career and voluntary roles that utilize their strengths, wisdom, and skills;

Whereas career opportunities reaffirm the dignity, self-worth, and independence of older individuals by encouraging them to make decisions and to act upon those decisions, by tapping their resources, experience, and knowledge, and by enabling them to contribute to society;

Whereas the operation of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 has demonstrated that older workers are extremely capable in a wide variety of job roles;

Whereas recent studies conducted by the Department of Labor and the Work in America Institute indicate that, in many cases, employers prefer to retain older workers or rehire former older employees due to the high quality of their job performance and their low rate of absenteeism; and

Whereas the American Legion has sponsored a "National Employ the Older Worker Week" during the second full week of March in every year since 1959, focusing public at-

tention on the advantages of employing older individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to designate the second full week in March 1991 as "National Employ the Older Worker Week", and to issue a proclamation calling upon—

(1) the employers and labor unions of the United States to give special consideration to older workers, with a view toward expanding career and employment opportunities for older workers who are willing and able to work and who desire to remain employed or to reenter the workforce;

(2) voluntary organizations to reexamine the many fine service programs which they sponsor with a view toward expanding both the number of older volunteers and the types of service roles open to older workers;

(3) the Department of Labor to give special assistance to older workers by means of job training programs under the Jobs Training and Partnership Act, job counseling through the United States Employment Service, and additional support through its Older Worker program, as authorized by title V of the Older Americans Act; and

(4) the citizens of the United States to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BALTIC FREEDOM DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res 167) to designate June 14, 1991, as "Baltic Freedom Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so to acknowledge the work of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL], and I yield to the gentleman as the chief sponsor of the joint resolution.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for taking up this very important resolution for Baltic Freedom Day.

Each year since I have been a Member of Congress we have celebrated the former independence of these three countries and calling for renewed independence for them since the Soviet Union took over these countries in 1940.

This year it is even more important, because we see as Lithuania earlier this year by a vast majority of over 90 percent supported independence, now we see this last week that Latvia and Estonia, those two states have also supported independence by overwhelming votes of over 70 percent. It was not

only the Latvian people and the Estonian people who supported independence, it was all the other ethnic groups.

Just last month, members of the Helsinki Commission and others from this House, 13 Members went over and met with leaders of all three countries. I and some of my colleagues met with some of the ethnic groups that were minority groups. We met with the Polish group, Russians, Ukrainians, and all those people also support independence for these states to become independent nations once again.

This Congress has a caucus on the Baltic States and the Ukraine. We have over 150 Members who belong to that caucus.

A majority of the Members of this House are for independence for these three Baltic States. We believe it should happen now. It is most important that this resolution pass, and again I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I want first to acknowledge the work of my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER], who had devoted considerable energy and time to this issue as well.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for House Joint Resolution 167, designating June 14, 1991, as "Baltic Freedom Day."

From 1918 to 1940 the Baltic States existed as independent, sovereign nations and as fully recognized members of the League of Nations. Furthermore, the Baltic peoples have traditionally cherished the principles of religious and political freedom throughout their entire history.

The year 1991 marks not only the 51st year of the invasion, seizure, and illegal incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union against the national will and desire for independence of the Baltic people, but also marks a pivotal period in which Eastern Europe continues to embrace democracy and the military organization of the Warsaw Pact is dismantled.

Unfortunately, while we marveled at the changes in Eastern Europe and the apparent liberalization of the Soviet Union, the events in the Baltics are a cause of enormous concern to the United States, and have already had repercussions for United States-Soviet relations.

For the last 50 years, Soviet occupying forces engaged in a forced deportation of native Baltic peoples from their homelands to concentration camps in Siberia. Even today, Soviet troops have surrounded and occupied government buildings and other public facilities in the Baltic States in an attempt to intimidate the Baltic peoples and govern-

ments to reassert Soviet control over the Baltics.

These events indicate a serious reversal of the progress toward democracy in the Soviet Union. We can only hope and pray that the candle of democracy in the Baltic States will not flicker and die under Soviet repression.

However, the essence of freedom and democracy burns strong in the hearts of the peoples of the Baltic States and I call upon President Gorbachev to allow the aspirations of the Baltic peoples to become reality.

In the spirit of democratization and progress, I request our colleagues to join in calling upon the Soviet Union to uphold basic principles of international law, to uphold principles and rights which are guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL] for his outstanding work on this measure, and I urge its unanimous adoption by this body.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 167, to designate June 14, 1991, as "Baltic Freedom Day."

Over half a century ago, the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany conceived the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact which was carried out at the expense of the sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. The United States has never recognized this forced annexation. Even the passage of more than 50 years has not quelled the desire of the Baltic nations for freedom and self-determination.

When this oppressive political system was imposed on the Baltic people, the Soviet Union began deporting them from their native homelands to labor and concentration camps in Siberia and elsewhere. These actions have virtually destroyed all traces of democracy, civil liberty, and religious freedom in the Baltic Republics.

Just this past weekend, the people of Latvia and Estonia voted overwhelmingly for independence from Moscow. In doing so, they have joined with Lithuania in voting for self-determination. We hope that this process is a peaceful one and that the desires of the Baltic peoples, which has been made very clear through the power of the ballot box, will be respected by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is a meritorious resolution and should be passed. I also would like to commend Congressman HERTEL for all of his efforts in bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 167

Whereas on June 14, 1941, the Soviet Union began mass deportation to Siberia of peoples from the Baltic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania;

Whereas the United States has for the past 50 years refused to recognize the forced in-

corporation of the Baltic Republics into the Soviet Union;

Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently refused to follow the request of the United States that it begin negotiating a peaceful end to the occupation of the Baltic Republics;

Whereas the Baltic Republics, which in 1990 reaffirmed independence from the Soviet Union, have not been allowed to pursue policies which would realize the intent of these declarations;

Whereas the armed forces and secret police of the Soviet Union continue to maintain an extensive presence in the Baltic Republics;

Whereas, although the Soviet Union has stated its intention to pursue policies of glasnost and perestroika, recent events in the Baltic Republics indicate that the Soviet Union is not fully committed to those policies;

Whereas the Soviet Union has consistently pursued measures which are contrary to its stated goal of sovereignty for Soviet Republics; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has not acted in accord with the Helsinki agreements, which it signed 15 years ago, because it has not allowed the Baltic Republics to exercise their respective rights to self-determination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That June 14, 1991, is designated as "Baltic Freedom Day", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: In the material following the resolving clause, strike "is designated as" and insert "and June 14, 1992, are each designated as", and strike "such day" and insert "such days".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the title offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution designating June 14, 1991, and June 14, 1992, each as "Baltic Freedom Day"."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on the several joint resolutions just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE BYRON DESERT SHIELD-STORM PERSONNEL BILL

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

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, each month when I hold office hours in my office in Columbus, GA, Fort Benning, GA, my office is crowded with veterans who are very unhappy.

I would like to share an incident just recently. A retired Army recruiter came to see me. He said:

Mr. Congressman, for 30 years I recruited people into the U.S. Army, and I promised them that the Government was going to give them complete health benefits if they would spend their life as a career in the Army; free prescriptions and so forth.

He said:

You know, Mr. Congressman, I am here today because I cannot even get my own health benefits. I need help and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, in that respect, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] of the Personnel Defense Subcommittee is going to introduce 19 items of provisions of the Byron Desert Shield-Storm personnel bill, items which she is going to bring before the Congress in just a few days.

I think they are well worth considering, and I hope people will consider them and vote for them.

Among them is imminent-danger pay in the amount of \$149 million. I recommend that we take a very good look at these provisions.

PROVISIONS OF BYRON DESERT SHIELD-STORM PERSONNEL BILL

Imminent Danger Pay:

Increases imminent danger pay from \$110 a month to \$150 a month.

FY91 Cost: \$149 million.

Family Separation Pay:

Increases family separation pay from \$60 a month to \$75 a month.

FY91 Cost: \$49 million.

Family Separation Pay—Dual Military Couples:

Authorizes family separation pay to dual military couples without dependents.

FY91 Cost: \$4 million.

Basic Allowance for Quarters (BAQ)—Activated Reservists:

Authorizes basic allowance for quarters for unmarried reservists called to active duty in connection with Desert Shield/Storm who maintain private residences.

FY91 Cost: \$44 million.

Death Gratuity Payment:

Increases the death gratuity payment from the \$3,000 ceiling currently authorized to a flat amount of \$6,000 for all grades.

FY91 Cost: \$6 million.

Transition Medical Coverage for Separated Reservists:

Authorizes two months of medical coverage for reservists and families after serving on active duty for more than 30 days in support of Operation Desert Shield/Storm

when employer sponsored coverage is not available.

FY91 Cost: \$36 million; FY92 Cost: \$18 million.

Transition Medical Coverage for Stopped Active Duty Personnel:

Authorizes two months of medical coverage for active duty personnel and families involuntarily retained on active duty due to Operation Desert Shield/Storm requirements when employer sponsored coverage is not available.

FY91 Cost: \$23 million.

Health Care Provider Special Pays—Reservists/Involuntarily Retained Members/Recalled Retirees:

Authorizes pro-rated active duty special pays for reserve health care providers other than physicians and dentists (already authorized).

Authorizes pro-rated special pays for physicians, dentists, and other health care providers involuntarily retained on active duty as a result of stop loss policies implemented by the services.

Authorizes pro-rated special pays for recalled retiree physicians, dentists, and other health care providers.

Corrects perceived inequity between groups of providers serving on active duty in support of Desert Shield.

FY Cost: \$17 million.

Qualification for Board Certification Pay:

Authorizes continued payment of board certification pay to physicians who completed residency and were scheduled for board certification, or recertification, but were unable to complete certification due to deployment in support of Operation Desert Shield/Storm.

FY91 Cost: Less than \$500,000.

Foreign Language Proficiency Pay:

Authorizes foreign language proficiency pay to military language school graduates sent to Desert Shield/Storm prior to certification by the service.

FY91 Cost: Less than \$500,000.

Variable Housing Allowance (VHA)—Activated Reservists:

Authorizes VHA to be paid to reservists called to active duty in connection with Desert Shield/Storm at the rate applicable to the member's home of record as opposed to duty station to which activated.

FY91 Cost: Budget neutral.

Recall of Retired Officers in the Highest Grade Held:

Authorizes retired officers to be recalled in the highest grade held on active duty, even though retired in a lower grade due to failure to meet time in grade requirements.

FY91 Cost: Negligible.

Savings Program Limit for POWs/MIAs:

Extends the limit for savings program deposits for POWs and MIAs.

FY91 Cost: Would vary with the number and duration of MIA/POW cases.

Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Pay:

Removes the legislative prohibition against paying imminent danger pay and family separation pay during declared war.

Has no cost implications.

Restriction on Separating Mothers from Newborns:

Precludes the activation of a reservist, or the temporary or permanent reassignment of an active duty member, who is the natural or adoptive mother, or father with sole custody, of a child under the age of six months.

Study of DOD policies relating to deployment of parents:

Directs the Secretary of Defense to study current service assignment policies for con-

sistency and provide a report not later than March 31, 1992.

Fiscal Year Restrictions on Desert Shield/Storm Personnel Issues:

Removes the limitation to fiscal years 1990 and 1991 on the personnel pay issues outlined in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1991 (P.L. 101-510).

Medical Care for Dependents in Germany:
Sense of Congress that the German government should be approached to provide medical care to military dependents to replace the medical resources dispatched to the Persian Gulf to treat Desert Storm casualties.

Morale Telephone Calls:
Sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should seek contractual arrangements with private telephone companies or establish alternative telephone arrangements to provide a free monthly opportunity for service personnel assigned to the Operation Desert Storm to telephone loved ones.

"HEAL"—HEALTH CARE EMPOWERMENT AND ACCESS LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, this session of the 102d Congress will be a pivotal one in framing the debate for Federal legislation addressing the health care access and cost problems facing our Nation. Presently, 31 million to 60 million people are underinsured or lack health care coverage in the United States. To a growing number of my constituents, it is becoming strikingly clear that healthcare reform is necessary to lower the cost of health care for those with coverages and widen access to those who have no coverage.

Today, my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY], the gentlemen from Florida [Mr. IRELAND], and [Mr. GOSS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and I are introducing a legislative framework to help "HEAL" these pressing problems. Today we offer health care access and empowerment legislation which I call the HEAL bill. This approach provides incentives to make health care more affordable and accessible, without heavyhanded government controls.

HEAL offers a carrot and stick approach that provides a window of opportunity for the private sector. Through a phased in approach, HEAL provides incentives for private and public-private partnership arrangements. The key to this approach is flexibility. Local government is given an opportunity to build on current successes. Ideas come from bottom up and a national health care strategy is created through a confederation of States approach.

As we renew our efforts to form a national health care strategy, I ask each

member of this body to give H.R. 1230 their strong consideration.

Mr. Speaker, with the 21st century fast approaching, it is clear that a workable blueprint for health care reform is necessary, if in the near future our Nation is to adequately address the interrelated problems of health care access, costs, and quality.

The problems have been well-documented in numerous studies and congressional hearings—the rising number of Americans who lack basic health care coverage, now estimated at between 31 and 37 million individuals; the escalating costs of such coverage, especially for small businesses; the increasing structural barriers to obtaining basic coverage, for example, because of the lack of affordability, of job mobility, of uninsurability, of pre-existing conditions, of occupational denial, and otherwise; the inability to properly evaluate the relationship of health care quality and costs; and other related concerns involving cost shifting, and so forth.

It is the consensus among all interested parties—employers, employee organizations and other consumers; providers of health care services and group plan coverage; policy-makers from all ranks; and so forth—that these are problems deserving of being afforded a place among other national priorities. It is in this spirit that my colleagues, Representative WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Representative PAUL HENRY, Representative ANDY IRELAND, Representative PORTER GOSS, Representative RANDY CUNNINGHAM, and Representative JIM BUNNING, and I have introduced a legislative framework to help HEAL these pressing problems.

In shorthand, my bill (H.R. 1230) can be described as health care empowerment and access legislation, or HEAL. The bill provides incentives for private and/or public-private partnership arrangements to be established to simultaneously address the issues of access to health care coverage and the affordability of such coverage, with an emphasis on improving health care quality.

To avoid the initial demand-push inflation inherent under other proposals, the bill first puts into effect various affordability and health care cost control measures.

The HEAL blueprint utilizes a carrot and stick approach to induce the development and implementation of private sector mechanisms to provide for the universal availability of health care coverage—that is, for all citizens who do not have access to basic group health coverage and who are uninsurable or underinsured. To the extent the private sector carrot under section 4 of the bill is not implemented within a fixed period of elapsed-time, a State-based fall-back mechanism would be triggered.

The affordability of coverage will be enhanced under the bill in several ways. First, the required universal availability of group health coverage would spread risk and help lower expenses—because employees must be offered access to employer based group health coverage; because basic group health coverage must be available to other uninsured and COBRA eligible, that is State systems may provide COBRA coverage; and because barriers would be removed and 501(c)(9) tax incentives provided to encourage soundly fi-

nanced multiple employer basic group health plans.

Second, the ERISA preemption of State health benefit mandates under the bill will encourage insurers to offer more affordable group plans to uninsured employers.

Third, the ERISA preemption of state barriers to managed care options under the bill will encourage competition, innovation of cost control approaches, and quality review.

Fourth, the provisions under this bill for treatment practice guidelines and outcomes research will aid in reducing unnecessary services and in increasing quality while offering a possible means for reducing malpractice costs.

Fifth, the phased-in deduction under the bill of 100 percent of contributions for the self-employed and their employees provide coverage incentives for 25% of the workers and their families who are currently uninsured.

After a fixed period of time, HEAL requires that all mechanisms providing universal access to coverage be implemented. First, under ERISA employers would be obligated to offer employees access to basic group health coverage. Employers are encouraged but not required to contribute to such plans. A State-based nonprofit corporation would serve as a backup only in the event group coverage for the employer's employees is rejected by a group health coverage provider. Second, individuals who would be denied access to group health coverage because of uninsurability, material preexisting conditions, or otherwise must be eligible for coverage either under an employer based plan, a State-based system or an alternative system equivalent to the fall-back system.

HEAL also provides for a transition period to universal access to basic group health coverage. Before the effective date occurs for the fall-back State system, the Secretary of HHS may make a determination that an alternative arrangement provides substantially equivalent elements of health care coverage, thus obviating the need for the State system. Such determinations may be made separately or in combination with respect to—first, uninsurable risk coverage, second, coverage for substantial material preexisting conditions, and third, COBRA continuation coverage for individuals ineligible for other basic group health coverage. The alternative arrangements may be voluntary or adopted pursuant to State or Federal law and administered by insurers, other providers, or various other private or public partnerships.

In summary, the health care empowerment and access legislation provides a workable Federal framework which will include the formation of the private and public partnership necessary to assure that all Americans have access to more affordable health care coverage. The following is a section-by-section analysis of the legislation.

Under section 1, the short title, reads that this act may be cited as the Universal Health Benefits Empowerment and Partnership Act of 1991.

Under the section 2 finding and declaration of policy, the Congress finds that—

First, the health care delivery system of the United States provides most Americans with a

level of access and quality of care that is unsurpassed;

Second, for a significant minority of Americans, the systems works less well because they cannot obtain or otherwise do not have basic health care coverage under either public or private programs;

Third, these individuals represent a diversity of situations for which there is no single solution;

Fourth, assuring access to basic health care coverage and quality of care for these individuals is a compelling national priority that will require commitments from both the private and public sectors;

Fifth, the most practical and effective solutions for these access problems are ones that preserve the pluralistic base of the health care delivery system of the United States; emphasize incentives, innovation, and the removal of current barriers to access; and recognize that both the complexity of the problem and the existence of fiscal constraints means that responsibility must be shared among employers, employees, insurers, providers, and patients, as well as Federal, State, and local governments;

Sixth, Federal efforts need to be closely coordinated with others who share in the responsibility for improving access to basic health care services;

Seventh, Federal efforts need to reflect not only the diversity of interested parties but also the diversity of areas where action is resolution of the best means of targeting the uninsured population, of delivering health care services and of structuring premiums and financing to maximize program participation; it avoids rigid, detailed Federal requirements which would stifle innovation, competition, and efficiency in the delivery, quality, and financing of care.

This section means ERISA part 6 to read "Part 6—Universal Coverage Under Group Health Plans and State Health Benefits Systems."

New subpart A provides definitions and special rules under section 601.

A basic group health plan, hereinafter referred to as a BGHP, means an ERISA health plan, or any combination of two or more plans, which includes at least a basic health benefits provision. As explained later in more detail, each covered employer must offer coverage to certain employees—and dependents—under either one or more BGHP's or group health payroll deduction plans—hereinafter referred to as a GHPDP. Although the bill does not prevent an individual who is offered coverage from rejecting such coverage—that is, plan provisions and related contracts can continue to govern rejection of coverage—coverage must be made available to any individuals that the plan may treat, but is not required to treat, as being an uninsurable risk—hereinafter referred to as UR—or having a material preexisting condition—hereinafter referred to as a MPC—leading to a substantial restriction of coverage under the plan.

The bill does not change existing law with respect to any requirement that an employer contribute to a BGHP for employees or others.

Therefore, a plan meets the requirements of a BGHP by either offering coverage regardless of a UR or MPC condition—as do many

larger plans—or, if the concept of UR or MPC is continued under a plan, then coverage for such UR or MPC conditions must be made available to the affected individual under a State health benefits system—hereinafter referred to as a SHBS—or a similar private or public/private alternative arrangement determined by the Secretary of HHS under section 4 to meet specified requirements—for example, a statewide or nationwide reinsurance mechanism established by health care providers to assure coverage availability for UR's and MPC's. Employers would contribute to such UR and MPC arrangements for affected employees—or dependents—in the same manner and extent as if such individuals were not subject to a UR or MPC condition.

This requirement that ERISA plans offer coverage, even in the case of UR and MPC, is the jurisdictional means under the bill for encouraging employers and employees to demand the establishment of SHBS' or alternative systems providing coverage for such conditions. This mechanism will assure the universal availability of basic group health coverage for all Americans under BGHP's, SHBS', or alternative systems.

Section 3(b) of HEAL and ERISA section 601(3) establishes a mechanism for defining basic health benefits provision. Not later than July 1, 1992, the Secretary of HHS would publish proposed regulations taking into account the recommendations made by the Federal Advisory Council on Health Care Coverage and Cost—see section 9. Such regulations could not be finalized before July 1, 1993, and would be subject to review by the Congress in the interim. The definition of basic health benefits, consists of two parts—services consisting of basic health care services—including physician's inpatient hospital, and outpatient hospital services which are prevalent under group health plans and other services which may be necessary for basic health care; and the reimbursement formulation defining the minimum extent to which such services are to be covered at a percentage of cost determined by the Secretary under regulations—by means of deductibles, coinsurance, and other limits on covered services—to be not less than a percentage which is, taking into account the population covered and the extent of cost currently covered under group health plans, adequate to meet basic health care needs. Under this mechanism statutory rigidity would be avoided. Section 3(b)(3) provides an administrative mechanism for periodically updating the content of basic health benefits and takes into account recommendations submitted to the Secretary by the Federal Advisory Council on Health Care Coverage and Costs.

New ERISA subpart B of part 6 defines required basic health care coverage options for employees and their dependents, appropriate, including public health, basic group health coverage, State initiatives, medical malpractice laws, Medicaid, and tax incentives; and

Eighth, improving access requires dealing with many of the most difficult problems in the health system, including the escalating costs, State mandated health benefits, and other factors that have made health care coverage less affordable for many employers and individuals, especially the near poor who need more creative workplace and public options to be able

to obtain basic health care coverage; and the inability of many individuals to protect themselves against catastrophic health care expenses because preexisting conditions make them uninsurable.

Under subsection (b), purposes, it is stated:

Therefore the Congress declares that the purposes of this Act to be to provide a sound, flexible, and workable Federal framework to simultaneously address the issues of access to basic health care coverage and the affordability of such coverage, with an emphasis on improving health care quality by:

First, empowering employers, employees, and other individuals to obtain more affordable basic health care coverage, and

Second, providing incentives for private and public-private partnership arrangements to be established for such purposes.

Under subsection (c), declaration of policy, it states that:

In carrying out such purposes, it is the policy of this Act to:

First, provide universal access to basic group health coverage for all Americans under plans offered by employers or, in the case in which such coverage is unavailable to employees and other individuals from private sources or existing public programs, under a State health benefits system; and

Second, make such basic health coverage more affordable by:

Removing barriers and encouraging "group" plans and arrangements to spread risk and lower expenses;

Preempting State health benefits mandates, thereby encouraging group health coverage providers to offer lower cost basic coverage to the uninsured;

Preempting State barriers to the providing of managed care, thereby encouraging competition, innovation of cost-control approaches, and quality review;

Encouraging the development of treatment practice guidelines and outcomes research to aid in reducing unnecessary services, increasing quality care, and reducing malpractice costs;

Eliminating tax inequities and barriers—

(1) to the full deductibility of contributions to health plans covering the self-employed, and

(2) to the establishment of soundly financed multiple employer basic group health plans.

Under section 3, it reads "universal coverage under group health plans and state health benefit systems."

In general, the key concepts under this section are: Universal access—the bill provides a framework for access for basic health care coverage for all Americans; partnership and empowerment—the bill induces Federal and State governments, employers, insurers and providers to participate in constructing a workable system for providing access to basic health care coverage at more affordable costs; and flexibility—the bill provides a framework which allows States and local governments to build on current successes; encourages local

ERISA section 611 provides that each covered employer shall maintain with respect to each eligible individual a basic group health plan or a group health payroll deduction plan under which coverage of such individual may be elected. Therefore, subject to certain permitted exclusions, employees—and dependents—must be offered coverage under an employer's existing BGHP or the employer must

establish one or more GHPDP's for those employees not made eligible under such existing plans. A State health benefit system could provide coverage to an employer plan, but only if a provider of group health plan coverage with respect to the plan rejects an individual otherwise eligible for coverage under such plan because of a requirement that a certain number or percentage of individuals otherwise eligible for coverage under the plan are not covered. Of course health care coverage providers could change current underwriting practices so as to obviate the need for the backup State system.

All private and governmental employers are obligated to make basic group health coverage available, although newly formed and very small employers are exempted. In addition, plans may exclude certain temporary employees. Any employee—or dependent—excluded under these exceptions is still eligible to obtain basic group health coverage under a State health benefits system.

New ERISA subpart C defines the backup role of State health benefits systems [SHBS] in providing individuals with access to basic group health coverage who are not otherwise eligible for coverage under an employer BGHP or GHPDP.

Under ERISA section 621 a SHBS would be established as a nonprofit corporation under State law and would be required to meet certain reporting, participation, benefits, contribution, and UR/MPC coverage requirements.

Under the section 623 participation requirements eligible individuals include employees—or dependents—not otherwise eligible for coverage under GHPDP's or BGHP's; individuals no longer eligible for coverage under BGHP's or GHPDP's who are eligible for so-called COBRA continuation coverage; individuals whose benefits are limited under BGHP's and GHPDP's because of UR and MPC conditions; and other individuals not otherwise eligible for coverage under a BGHP or public program.

A number of States have a head start in the offering of health care coverage to the uninsured. The State-based mechanism under HEAL is designed to accommodate such programs and improve on the progress already made. For example the Washington State basic health plan and the proposed Hawaii State health insurance plan [SHIP] are innovative State-based programs offering coverage to the uninsured in those States on a basis consistent with the intent of the provisions of this bill.

Under section 624 State systems would be encouraged to offer a range of health care coverage options in order to induce individuals to choose coverage at a cost which best meets their needs and ability to pay.

State system options would include at least State-employee equivalent benefits, a basic and catastrophic option and a catastrophic only option. A Medicaid-benefits package may, but is not required, to be made available. Therefore a Medicaid buy in may be administered either under this system or outside the system.

Once eligible, early retirees and other COBRA individuals must continue to be eligible for State system coverage—until Medicare eligibility—although State system coverage is

secondary to any ERISA employee benefit plan coverage.

The section 625 contribution provisions permits program flexibility to vary premium rate structures by income level, geography, family composition, and so forth, so as to be able to maximize the number of individuals covered. The State system must provide children-only coverage and is permitted, but not required, to include a Medicaid buy-in type program.

Under section 626, State systems are enabled to reciprocate with other States to achieve benefit portability to accommodate residency changes and to achieve multistate or even a national mechanism of insurance or reinsurance for uninsurables and material preexisting conditions.

New ERISA subpart D of part 6 reads "State coverage for uninsurable risks and material preexisting conditions."

Under ERISA section 631, a State UR and MPC coverage system must meet certain participation and benefit requirements and, to the extent practicable and actuarially sound, provide for separate cost and premium structures for the experience of MPC's and UR's who are employees restricted under BGHP's—that is, nonworker UR's could be treated separately. It should be noted that the UR and MPC elements of a State system need never be established if under section 4 another mechanism is implemented to provide UR and MPC coverage—subpart D serves only as a fall-back mechanism.

Under ERISA section 632, separate experience accounts may be provided for UR's and for MPC's. State system coverage under section 624 could also provide for UR and MPC conditions so that individuals eligible for State system coverage under subpart C could also fall into the subpart D UR and MPC risk-spreading coverage mechanisms.

Under ERISA section 633, individuals eligible for UR coverage must be provided the range of benefit options described in section 624; therefore a person could obtain a high-cost or low-cost benefit option, thus making at least some coverage more affordable.

Section 4 of HEAL provides for alternatives to State health benefit systems.

Before the effective date for the fall-back State system occurs, the Secretary of HHS may make a determination that an alternative arrangement provides substantially equivalent elements of health care coverage, thus obviating the need for the State system. Such determinations may be made separately or in combination with respect to uninsurable risk coverage, coverage for material preexisting conditions, and so-called COBRA continuation coverage.

An example of an alternative system that HEAL would encourage and which is currently being discussed among providers of group health plan coverage might have the following elements.

First, guarantee that small employers who seek to purchase group health coverage for their employees will not be denied such coverage even if one or more employees might otherwise be either uninsurable or a high health risk.

Second, provide that once covered, neither the group nor an individual in the group may

be denied continued coverage because the group's or the individual's health deteriorates.

Third, limit the rate of year-to-year premium increases relative to other groups insured by the same group coverage provider.

Fourth, not deny coverage or apply new preexisting condition restrictions to an insured individual in a group changing either employers or coverage providers; and

Finally, establish a privately funded and administered reinsurance mechanism through which coverage providers could reinsure high risk persons.

Under section 5 of the act, COBRA continuation coverage requirements can be met by employer plans by facilitating coverage of COBRA eligibles under a State system—thus relieving employers of one of the biggest disincentives to set up a plan or provide liberal eligibility rules. Existing covered plans may, but are not required, to permit COBRA eligibles to elect State system COBRA coverage. As is the case for UR and MPC, an alternative private system may be established pursuant to section 4 to extend COBRA coverage under the terms of this section.

Section 6 of HEAL relates to ERISA preemption of State mandated health benefits and restrictive managed care laws.

To allow group health plan providers to offer more affordable coverage and better target uninsured employers with prototype plans, the bill restores the ERISA preemption of State insurance laws which require that one or more specific benefits must be provided or made available by a contract or policy of health insurance issued to an ERISA employee benefit plan or which require that services rendered by one or more particular classes of health care providers must be covered under such a contract or policy.

In addition, State laws restricting managed care—such as in negotiating rates or restricting provider options, utilization review, and so forth—would be deemed insurance laws preempted by ERISA.

Section 7 of HEAL provides encouragement of multiple employer arrangements providing basic health benefits.

To encourage the Cleveland-based COSE-like affordable insurance for small businesses a tax carrot is offered to multiple employer welfare arrangements providing basic health benefits coverage. The restrictions on the business commonality and geographic tests under section 501(C)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code—allowing tax-exempt VEBA trusts to be established) are removed for MEWA's if, first they provide group basic health benefits, second, they provide participating employers with SPD's and other information to meet ERISA reporting requirements, and third, they are fully insured or, if not, they meet State law requirements as to funding and solvency standards. In addition, to restore accountability to all health care MEWA's under ERISA, such arrangements would be required to file annual reports to the Federal Government and the States in which they do substantial business.

Section 8 of HEAL expands on the treatment practice guidelines and outcomes research recently enacted under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 to make such provisions applicable for all Americans living in both rural and urban areas. The pur-

pose of the recodified Agency for Health Care Policy and Research is to enhance the quality, appropriateness, and effectiveness of health care services for all Americans, and access to such services, through the promotion of improvements in clinical practice and in the organization, financing, and delivery of health care services.

For the purpose of promoting the quality, appropriateness, and effectiveness of health care, the agency is to arrange for the development of clinically relevant guidelines that may be used by physicians, educators, and health care practitioners to assist in determining how diseases, disorders, and other health conditions can most effectively and appropriately be prevented, diagnosed, treated, and managed clinically; and standards of quality, performance measures, and medical review criteria through which health care providers and other appropriate entities may assess or review the provision of health care and assure the quality of such care.

The bill requires the newly established Federal Advisory Council on Health Care Coverage and Costs to undertake a study of the manner in which these practice guidelines may be used in reducing medical malpractice costs. The council is to submit the results of such study together with any recommendations to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Section 9 of HEAL establishes a Federal Advisory Council on Health Care Coverage and Costs for the purposes of reviewing, overseeing, and making recommendations relating to the implementation of the provisions of this act and studying the causes of changes in the costs of health care coverage and delivery.

Section 10 of HEAL provides for the deduction of 100 percent for self-employed basic group health plans. While the recently enacted budget reconciliation bill extended the 25 percent tax deduction for one more fiscal year, the bill would provide for a phased in deduction of 100 percent and make it permanent for plans established by the self-employed for themselves and their employees.

Section 11 of HEAL provides for effective dates.

The amendments made by section 3 shall take effect January 1, 1994, and those found in section 5 shall apply with respect to plan years beginning on or after such date.

The provisions of section 4 shall take effect on the date of enactment.

The amendments made by section 6(b) shall take effect January 1, 1992. The amendments made by section 6(a) shall take effect January 1, 1992, except that with respect to plans in effect on the date of the enactment of HEAL, such amendments shall take effect on the effective date of section 3.

The amendments made by section 7(a) shall apply with respect to determinations made on or after January 1, 1992. The amendment made by section 7(b) shall apply to plan years beginning on or after January 1, 1991.

The amendments made by section 8 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of HEAL.

The provisions of section 9 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of HEAL.

The amendments made by section 10 shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1992.

NATIONAL HOME CARE WEEK

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 introduce a resolution to designate each of the weeks beginning December 1, 1991, and November 29, 1992, as National Home Care Week. I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague, Mr. RINALDO, ranking member of the Select Committee on Aging, in sponsoring this resolution. Congress has approved similar resolutions for the past 9 years to recognize the valuable services of home care programs and personnel, and I look forward to congressional passage once again.

As you all know, thousands of home care agencies around the Nation have responded to the need for effective alternatives to our health care delivery system. By providing skilled medical assistance and supportive services to those who can be properly treated outside the hospital or nursing home setting, these agencies respond to the demand for new health care options and conserve tax dollars currently expended on needless placement in these institutions. This valuable concept of care provides a serviceable answer to the needs of our health care system, and offers a comforting, dignified environment for patients.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of the most critical issues to face our Nation today is the state of our health care system. While the growing elderly population, expected to total well over 30 million by the year 2000, places greater demand on our current system, home care agencies have helped many of the elderly remain at home and in their communities. In addition, home care has proven to be a very suitable setting for many others with chronic impairing diseases, including the large and growing number of persons suffering from AIDS and related illnesses. Home care creates an atmosphere of greater independence and dignity, and promotes maintenance of health as well as recovery. For this valuable service, home care agencies and persons employed in the home care industry should be properly recognized as well as commended.

As we reevaluate and reform our Nation's health care programs, especially in the vital area of long-term care, it is essential for us to take full notice of the benefits of home care and act to encourage its use. I thank my colleagues for their past support in cosponsoring this important resolution, and look forward to the opportunity to again recognize this effective and humane health care alternative during the

weeks of December 1, 1991, and November 29, 1992. For the convenience of my colleagues, the text of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. —

Whereas organized home care services to the elderly and disabled have existed in the United States since the last quarter of the 18th century;

Whereas home care is an effective and economical alternative to unnecessary institutionalization;

Whereas caring for the ill and disabled in their homes places emphasis on the dignity and independence of the individual receiving these services;

Whereas since the enactment of the medicare home care program, which provides coverage for skilled nursing services, physical therapy, speech therapy, social services, occupational therapy, and home health aide services, the number of home care agencies in the United States providing these services has increased from fewer than 1,275 to more than 12,000; and

Whereas many private and charitable organizations provide these and similar services to millions of individuals each year preventing, postponing, and limiting the need for them to become institutionalized to receive these services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the weeks beginning December 1, 1991, and November 29, 1992, are each designated as "National Home Care Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such weeks with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

KEEP COMPACT-DISC PACKAGES CLEAN AND SIMPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, a chorus has risen, regarding the issue of compact disc packaging. The compact disc, or CD, is stored inside a small plastic box, called the jewel box. When sold, the jewel box is packaged inside of a larger container, called a long box, which can either be made of plastic or cardboard. Now, depending on your taste in art, the long box doesn't look too bad. Unfortunately, we have a growing solid waste problem in this country and, these long boxes don't help the situation.

According to the Recording Industry Association of America, over 200 million compact discs were sold domestically in 1989, at a cost of \$2.6 billion. CD's account for 40 percent of the total worldwide sales of all recorded material, which exceeded \$20 billion last year. Although the final figures for 1990 sales aren't yet in, the number of CD's sold will be considerably higher than the 1989 figures. That's a lot of CD's sold, and unfortunately, means a huge amount of wasteful packaging.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a crisis in the area of solid waste management in

this country. In 1988, the total stream was 180 million tons, a 20-percent increase from the beginning of the decade. For those who like analogies, 180 million tons is roughly equivalent to the total maximum amount of cargo delivered after 1,250 flights by C-5 transport planes. For reference, each C-5 can easily carry two M-60 tanks in its cargo hold.

Of the total amount of municipal waste, 72 million tons is from paper and paperboard, and this 40-percent share of the total has been increasing steadily. The Sierra Club in Baltimore estimates that 23 of Maryland's 39 landfills face permit expirations over the next several years. With so many of our landfills reaching saturation levels, eliminating just some of the paper waste seems like a good idea.

I am pleased that a number of recording artists already have joined hands with environmental groups in calling for a reduction in this unnecessary CD packaging, but I think additional steps should be taken. Therefore, I plan to send letters to the chairmen of Sony and Matsushita—the new owners of CBS Records and MCA Records—asking them to demonstrate good corporate citizenship by eliminating the extra packaging.

These two companies are a logical choice because their combined share of the compact disc market is huge, with CBS ranking No. 1 in sales. If the new owners of CBS and MCA records decide to eliminate the excess CD packaging, these two industry leaders will be delivering a very powerful environmental message that will be music to the ears of millions of concerned citizens.

Many may ask why go after the CD industry when so many other products are packaged in equally wasteful ways? Two simple reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, because we must start somewhere, and second, because we are the only Nation in the world which still sells CD's in long boxes.

As for arguments that the long box helps to prevent thefts in stores * * *. Well, tapes like this have been sold—as is—for years, with no apparent problem.

Surely, if companies are selling their compact discs in Canada, Europe and the United Kingdom, without the wasteful packaging then it can be done in the United States as well. That's why I am calling on the two CD giants to lead the way on this issue. I hope they will be willing to step forward.

□ 1640

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the strongest deposit insurance fund in the country is by far the national credit union share insurance fund [NCUSIF]. While other funds have experi-

enced record failures, the credit union fund has experienced consistent growth and stability.

One of the reasons for NCUSIF's successful track record is the fund's structure. Federally insured credit unions are required to have on deposit at NCUSIF an amount equal to 1 percent of their total insured deposits. Each year, credit unions are required to adjust this deposit to reflect an increase in insured deposits, resulting in an insurance fund which grows at the same pace as the deposits it insures.

In addition, this structure guarantees that the insurance fund's reserve ratio will never drop below 1 percent, over twice as high as the 0.47 percent at which the bank insurance fund stands currently.

Yet, 2 years ago during congressional debate on the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act, the administration sought to scrap the structure of America's most successful deposit insurance fund. Now we find that this effort, which was rejected then, has found new life in the Treasury Department's deposit insurance study.

The basis of this attack on the NCUSIF was then and is now an accounting argument. To require a uniquely successful insurance fund model to adopt the structure of its unsuccessful counterparts is obviously a questionable proposition, but to do so merely on the grounds of an accounting argument is bold folly.

To make matters worse yet, the accounting argument upon which the administration relies is flat wrong.

In a letter recently sent to the Treasury Department's Undersecretary for Finance, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants [AICPA] states unequivocally that the accounting method used by the credit unions is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles [GAAP] and is supported by both the AICPA and the Financial Accounting Standards Board [FASB], the two governing bodies of the accounting profession.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a copy of the AICPA letter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my statement.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CERTIFIED
PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS,

Washington, DC, February 26, 1991.

Mr. ROBERT R. GLAUBER,
U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington,
DC.

Re: Credit Union Accounting Proposals in Treasury's February 1991 Report—Modernizing the Financial System (the "Treasury Report").

DEAR MR. GLAUBER: The American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) Credit Unions Committee (Committee) has reviewed the proposal in the subject report and offers the following comments for your consideration. Specifically, the Committee has focused on Part One—VIII which contains recommendations to change the way credit unions account for payments into the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund (NCUSIF). Those payments are made to meet the insurance requirement that a credit union maintain on deposit with NCUSIF (the "deposit") an amount equal to one percent of the credit union's total insured shares and savings accounts (the "insured savings").

The Treasury Report recommends that the NCUSIF deposit be expensed by credit unions; a twelve-year transition period is suggested. We understand the Administration's legislative proposal will incorporate such a provision. We are concerned about the accounting and auditing ramifications of such a legislative mandate.

We draw your attention to letters we wrote to Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur dated April 3, 1989 and to the Department of the Treasury dated May 4, 1990 (attached). Those letters set forth our position that the deposit is properly accounted for as an asset by credit unions. Indeed, the Treasury Report acknowledges that "the accounting method [by credit unions] is consistent with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and is supported by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) and the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants."

The NCUSIF deposit is accounted for as an asset in the financial statements of credit unions because it represents a probable future economic benefit to the credit union. This deposit allows the credit union to have its shares federally insured and is refundable to the credit union upon withdrawal from the system or liquidation. This benefit derives from the underlying capitalization of NCUSIF which currently exceeds one percent of total credit union deposits. In the event of a "crisis" that causes the NCUSIF reserve funds to be inadequate to provide for the risk of loss, the asset would be impaired because it would no longer be recoverable in cash from the NCUSIF and would no longer represent any future economic benefit to the credit union. GAAP would then require an estimated loss to be accrued in the period in which it becomes probable that the asset is impaired and the amount can be reasonably estimated.

The Treasury Report does not recommend any change to the facts and circumstances underlying the deposit mechanism; the rights and privileges of credit unions with respect to the deposit would remain the same. If our understanding is correct and the asset has not been impaired, we do not understand why it should be expensed over a twelve-year period. If the asset has been impaired, then that should be clearly stated, and the asset should be written off in the year it has been impaired. We foresee the following problems if the recommendation is enacted:

1. It will create a difference between GAAP and regulatory accounting principles (RAP) that may be inconsistent with the intent of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA) to reduce GAAP/RAP differences.

2. It may result in credit unions receiving qualified audits from their auditors.

3. It will result in immediate income statement recognition of required increases or decreases in the NCUSIF deposit, causing earnings fluctuations.

These matters are discussed further in the following paragraphs. In addition, we offer alternative approaches for your consideration.

GAAP VS. RAP DIFFERENCE

If implemented, NCUA will require credit unions to expense the deposit for regulatory reporting purposes. Thus, a GAAP/RAP difference in accounting for the deposit will be created. Such differences are inconsistent with the current effort of the Office of the comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Thrift Supervision, and the Federal Reserve Board to narrow GAAP/RAP differences as prescribed by FIRREA. Such differences con-

fuse the public and undermine the credibility of financial reporting.

AUDITOR'S OPINION

If a credit union does not deviate from NCUA prescribed accounting for the deposit in its externally published financial statements, a credit union's assets and equity will be understated under GAAP, and the credit union's auditor may qualify his or her opinion. Such a qualification sends a negative signal—which would not be justified—to readers of the credit union's financial statements as to the financial condition of the credit union.

INCOME FLUCTUATION

Implementation of such a requirement will affect the credit union's income based on subsequent increases or decreases in the deposit. The Treasury proposal could have a significant impact on the reported income of a credit union in that future payments to NCUSIF would be required to be treated as expense (and refunds treated as income). Thus, a credit union that receives a significant increase in deposits during a year, even if received on the last day of the year, would be required to expense one percent of the increase in that year. Conversely, a significant decrease in deposits would give rise to income.

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

The Treasury Report states that the counting of insurance fund assets as credit union assets should be eliminated and that this would create an additional layer of protection for the taxpayer. It is our understanding that this "protection" is accomplished by more conservatively stating credit union capital. We offer the following two alternative approaches for your consideration:

1. We recommend that credit unions prepare their financial statements in conformity with GAAP. If regulators wish to determine the adequacy of a credit union's capital, such a calculation can be made—outside the financial statements—using GAAP equity as a starting point.

2. Credit unions are currently required by the Federal Credit Union Act to annually transfer a certain percentage of gross income to a statutory reserve. This reserve is not available for dividend distribution. We understand that NCUA could change the methodology for calculating statutory reserves for credit unions so as to ultimately include an extra one percent for all insured shares. This would be reflected by credit unions as an allocation of undivided earnings that would not be available for member distribution.

Thank you for this opportunity to address our concerns on this matter. Representatives of the AICPA are available to meet with you or your staff at your convenience to discuss this matter further.

With sincere regards,

JOSEPH F. MORAGLIO,
Vice President,
Federal Government Division.

Instead of making the credit union fund adopt the structure of the bank insurance fund, as the administration suggests, I believe it would be more prudent to have the failing bank fund adopt the structure of its far more successful counterpart, the NCUSIF.

To this end, I have introduced the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act—H.R. 31. This legislation would result in an immediate inflow of \$25 billion into the bank fund, which many expect to be insolvent by year's end, before it needs a taxpayer bailout. My legisla-

tion would also produce a fail proof bank fund, since its new structure would guarantee that its reserve ratio could never drop below 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot permit another taxpayer bailout of a Federal deposit insurance fund. H.R. 31 is the only bank insurance fund recapitalization plant that provides adequate funding to do the job, and meets the Treasury Department's four criteria for the recapitalization. I ask my colleagues to support the Bank Account Safety and Soundness Act.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FORMER SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a colleague from Kentucky, in fact the most influential, the most popular, the most respected Kentuckian, certainly in his lifetime, Senator John Sherman Cooper, who passed away at his home on February 21 and was interred at Arlington Cemetery on the 27th alongside his beloved wife, Lorraine.

Senator Cooper was from my hometown in Somerset, KY, and that is the reason that I have been the one from the Kentucky delegation to seek this special order. The other members of the delegation will be with us today, and I hope there may be others from other parts of the Nation who would, as well, like to say something about Senator Cooper.

Mr. Speaker, he was a great statesman from Kentucky. And I think he ranks with the greatest from our State in its history. He had the humility of one of our native sons, Abraham Lincoln; he had the tenacity and the integrity and the forthrightness of Henry Clay, and I certainly rank Senator Cooper in that league.

A U.S. Senator for 20 years, a diplomat in different roles in our Nation's life, a local official, a great Republican leader, and a certainly a great loved man in his lifetime in our State, particularly in his home county of Pulaski County, in Somerset, and of course the entire State.

His life, one editorial writer once observed, was marked by "an integrity and decency that won the trust and admiration of every President since World War II." President Harry S. Truman made him a delegate to the United Nations. He was a roving ambassador for Secretary of State Dean Acheson. He was Ambassador to India under Dwight Eisenhower. He was a friend and confidant of John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, who appointed him to the Warren Commission, in fact, for the investigation of Kennedy's assassination. Gerald Ford appointed him Ambassador to East Germany, in fact our country's first Ambassador to East Germany.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that one could say about the life of John Sherman Cooper. Mere words are going to be difficult to describe the eloquence of this man, the eloquence of his life and the service that he gave to our Nation. Mr. Speaker, I will have other comments about Senator Cooper as we go through the special order, but other members of the delegation have pressing obligations that we are going to try to fit together.

For that reason I am going to yield at this time to our colleague from Louisville, who represents the Third District, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. RON MAZZOLI.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from the Fifth District, HAL ROGERS, for yielding this time and for also accommodating all of us to the peculiarities of our schedules. Certainly we all rise in memory of one of the greatest Kentuckians of all time and one of its greatest political figures, John Sherman Cooper.

Just a moment ago my friend from the Fifth District said it is hard to find the words because there are so many different words that could be used to describe Senator Cooper. Let me try these few on for size: the gentleman from Kentucky.

If there were even a human being who was more a gentleman in every connotation of that word, it was John Sherman Cooper.

He was tall, he was elegant, he was quiet, he was well spoken, he was very thoughtful, and he was very decent as a human being.

He always cared about the other people. It was not his own welfare but everyone else's that motivated him, really.

And as I told my friend from Kentucky at other times, the particular vignette that I would like to leave—and I hope to come back to the later part of this special order—but in 1971, when I first was sworn in as a Member of this body over at room 2237 in the Rayburn Building, where we had our swearing-in reception, my friends were there, my family was there, my mother-in-law was there, among other people. Through this doorway walked this distinguished, dignified figure, John Sherman Cooper. Not of the same party, a person for whom the world was a stage. I was, you know, a person just from a very small area of our commonwealth. He was a person who had been Ambassador, had been Senator, had been delegate to various conventions on behalf of this Nation.

Into this reception came John Sherman Cooper. And I to this day—and it has been over 20 years ago—have never been able to forget that, and I never want to forget it because it reflected in one capsule the kind of human being that John Sherman Cooper was.

He was thoughtful, decent, he cared about all members of the delegation re-

ardless of our political affiliation. But his love of Kentucky and his gentleness, which meant that in fact he was able to represent Kentucky whether he represented Kentucky in Pulaski County, which was his own county, or whether he was representing Kentucky in Berlin when he was Ambassador or whether he represented Kentucky in New Delhi when he was Ambassador to India or whether he represented, right here on Capitol Hill, John Sherman Cooper was the quintessential "gentleman from Kentucky."

So I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky, my friend HAL ROGERS, who represented the other gentleman from Kentucky for so many years; he was his representative for years as well as his friend and confidant.

In that setting, he probably more than any member of our delegation has been closest to him. All of us share the grief and the sorrow that Kentucky and the country experience in the loss of this great human being.

I want to thank my friend for having this special order. I hope to be able to return to perhaps engage in more reminiscences, but suffice it to say, sorrowfully enough, we have to say there has been in history and there will be in history but one John Sherman Cooper.

"The gentleman from Kentucky"—is the terminology we use here in the Chamber when we debate among ourselves. But, it is an appellation most appropriately attached to the late Senator from Kentucky, John Sherman Cooper.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in celebrating the life and career of a man whose more than 40 years in public service to his State and country were exemplary and a shining example of public service at its finest.

Citizen, soldier, Senator, Ambassador, statesman—John Sherman Cooper was all of these and more. He was also a kind, gentle, thoughtful and decent man.

His way was never to draw attention and accolades to himself despite his many accomplishments in many roles. His way was simplicity, self-effacement, understatement and humility. He was a rare and gracious man.

John Sherman Cooper began his career in public service in the Kentucky House of Representatives representing his hometown of Somerset in Pulaski County. He then served two terms as county judge of Pulaski County. He enlisted as a private in the Army during World War II, and was discharged a captain. His first experience in international diplomacy was as a legal adviser restructuring postwar Germany's judicial system.

Senator Cooper's service in the U.S. Senate may be unique. He was twice elected to complete unexpired Senate terms, only to be defeated in reelection bids. While out of the Senate and before he began his two consecutive full terms there—1960 to 1972—Senator Cooper was a delegate to the United Nations and United States Ambassador to India.

Two years after his retirement from the Senate in 1972, Senator Cooper became our Nation's first Ambassador to the German Demo-

cratic Republic—the former East Germany. Our Nation's prestige could not have been more ably served nor protected than in the diplomatic service of John Sherman Cooper, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Senator Cooper was a highly principled, independent thinker. He often took positions that were at odds with the majority of his party. He was one of the first to openly criticize Senator Joseph McCarthy's anti-Communist crusade. And, during the late 1960's, with the Vietnam war tearing at the very fabric of this Nation, Senator Cooper was an architect of legislation to limit combat activities of the U.S. military in Southeast Asia.

I remember, too, how gracious and courteous Senator Cooper was to me when I arrived here in the House of Representatives in 1971. He honored me by attending my reception in 2237 Rayburn Building on the day of my swearing in. My family and I were all thunderstruck—pleasantly so, of course—when through the door walked that tall, distinguished figure so well-known back home and around the world.

He talked to me, my family and my friends with the same genuineness and attention that, no doubt, characterized his contacts with the high and mighty of the Nation and the world. I could never—and will never—forget this great favor to my family and me.

John Sherman Cooper lived a full life—full of achievements and full of its inevitable disappointments. He remained to the very end of his life vitally engaged in efforts to help the less fortunate and to build a better world.

Senator Cooper would often admit that his oratorical skills were not outstanding. But, his clarity of thought, the depth of his conviction, and the absolute sincerity of the man were, indeed, outstanding. These attributes and these characteristics earned John Sherman Cooper the great respect and admiration he enjoyed in the Commonwealth and all over the world.

John Sherman Cooper's life and career in Government service, are models for all in public office to emulate.

In honoring Senator Cooper at the time of his retirement one of his fellow legislators said:

John Sherman Cooper is the only man I have known who has traveled the spectrum of social and political life and left only dignity, honor and respect wherever he walked.

All Kentuckians feel a special sadness over the loss of this great man and great servant of the people. I join my colleagues in expressing deepest condolences and sympathies to Senator Cooper's brother, Richard, and to the Cooper family.

□ 1650

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI], my friend, for his nice remarks, wonderful remarks, and we hope that after his obligation is over that he will come back and add anything he would like.

Here was a gentleman who served in the Senate so ably and in fact has been called the conscience of the Senate. He has been called Mr. Kentucky. He has been called a great statesman, a friend

of kings, and yet never lost the common touch.

Mr. Speaker, we saw him in all of those roles as a delegate to the United Nations, as a Member of the Senate, as an ambassador to East Germany, India, and Nepal, and also a member of the Kentucky Legislature, the Pulaski County executive, at the time called the Pulaski County judge, the circuit judge, which is the judicial officer, the trial officer, in that circuit, among other offices. He was an elegant and eloquent man.

Mr. Speaker, he and Lorraine Cooper for a good portion of their tenure in Washington, DC, were considered—an invitation to their home was considered the most important social invitation that one could receive in this city, and yet I have been with Senator Cooper on those occasions when we would go to the countryside, from whence he came, and see him as he related to the everyday citizens. And I have been with him as he shed those tears visiting very, very poor people in our community and our country, and many of these people were his political supporters from way back, and it was a wonderful time to visit those old home folks as they communed together. Senator Cooper was never happier than when he was with the folks at home, and the farther out away from civilization or the city, the better, because that is from whence he came.

So, here was a man who traveled both highways and made both groups of people feel equally at home, and both equally looked up to him during all of those times.

Kentucky, of course predominantly a Democratic State, sent him to the U.S. Senate five times. He established himself in the Senate as a credible and a very influential leader in his party.

A Kentucky journalist one time wrote of him that he talks like a Democrat, votes like an independent, and runs on the Republican ticket; end of quote, and in truth many of his party members back home disagreed with him on his votes because he was of a more moderate stripe than most of the voters in his Republican Party back home, and yet they forgave him for voting many times differently than they wished because they trusted his intellect, his integrity, and his judgment, and he did not lead us wrong ever in the votes that he cast.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote liberally from an article by Richard Harwood, the Washington Post, during my comments, and I hope that Mr. Harwood will understand. He says that in truth, speaking of Cooper, he was as nonpartisan as is possible to be in the American political system. He looked after local interests; the tobacco farmers, for example, but his principal interest was foreign affairs. He took progressive positions on civil rights, was one of the first to repudiate the tactics

of Senator Joseph McCarthy in the fifties, and by the sixties had compiled such a record that he was selected by Washington journalists as the outstanding Republican in the U.S. Senate. During the late sixties and until his retirement in 1972, he spent much of his time speaking against the deepening American involvement in Vietnam and in devising legislation to curb the war-making powers of the President and to secure the withdrawal of American forces from Indochina.

Senator Cooper's father was a wealthy landowner and entrepreneur in Somerset, KY. He graduated from Yale University. He attended Harvard University Law School. While at Yale he was a varsity athlete and a member of the aristocratic Skull and Bones Society. In the early 1920's Senator Cooper's father died as a reasonably young man, by then virtually bankrupt and deeply in debt. The future Senator at the time was going to Harvard University and had to drop out of school, and he returned home to work in order to try to pay his father's debts and to send his six brothers and sisters to college. It took him nearly 25 years to get out of that debt. He said it did not look like there was any end to it.

He was admitted to the Kentucky bar in 1928. He took the test that one could take at that time to be admitted. He served in the State house of representatives from 1928 to 1930. He was county executive for the next 8 years, during which he ran for Governor unsuccessfully in 1941.

But in 1942, with the United States engaged in World War II, he joined the Army, signed up as a private at the age of 41. He won a commission, went to Europe and was with the 3d Army of Gen. George Patton, Jr. After the war he was a military Government officer, was instrumental in rebuilding the judicial system of Bavaria and, by the way, his decorations from that war included the Bronze Star.

In 1955 Senator Cooper married Lorraine Rowan Chevlon, a very prominent Georgetown, DC, hostess. Political opponents back in Kentucky tried to make an issue of the marriage to a woman, as they said, with airs, but she took part in all of his campaigns at home, dressed in very fine frocks, which was her style, carried a parasol throughout the State and proved to be a very great political asset to Senator Cooper. Unfortunately, she died in 1985.

Senator Cooper first won election to the Senate in November 1946, and that was to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of former Gov. Albert B. Chandler who resigned the seat to become the commissioner of baseball. Senator Cooper was defeated then for election for the full term in 1948. Then for the next 4 years he was a delegate to the United Nations. In November 1952, he again won election to the Senate, this time to fill the remaining

years in the term of Senator Chapman, who had died in office. In 1954, he was again defeated for reelection, and then from March 1955 to August 1956, Senator Cooper was Ambassador to India, the world's largest democracy and a leader in the Third World. One measure of the importance and complexity of that position is a distinction of not only Senator Cooper, but of some who have succeeded him, including John Kenneth Galbraith, Chester Bowles, former Senator Kenneth Keating of New York, DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, the current senior Senator from New York.

Then, after India, he returned to Kentucky, and in 1956 he won election to the Senate a third time, and that was to fill the 4 years remaining in the term of Senator Alben W. Barkley who, as my colleagues know, had been President Truman's Vice President who died in office, and then Senator Cooper was reelected in 1960 and 1966, growing in stature both in Kentucky and in the Nation, serving on the Foreign Relations Committee, among others.

In 1973, after retiring from the Senate, he joined a Washington law firm, but then he left the firm in September 1974 to become our first Ambassador to East Germany, and he stayed in that post until December 1976, at which time he returned back to his law practice here in Washington.

As his Senate retirement neared in 1972, Senator Cooper was honored in his home State with many speeches, many resolutions, letters of commendation, and many words were said about him at the time about his great service to the Nation. In fact, it was Harold Demarcos, a State legislator who has since left us, who said this about Senator Cooper: "John Sherman Cooper is the only man I have known who has traveled the spectrum of social and political life and left only dignity, honor, and respect wherever he walked."

And then Senator Cooper at the time responded with the words of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "Thanks to all, to the great Republic, for the principles that it lives by and keeps alive for man's vast future. Thanks to all."

□ 1700

This was Senator John Sherman Cooper. One brother, Richard, of Somerset, survives. He is a personal friend of ours as well. The rest of the family have by now passed on.

This Sunday at 2 o'clock in the First Baptist Church at Somerset, the community will be conducting a memorial service for the public in memory of Senator Cooper, and everyone would be welcomed there, I am sure, in the church to which he belonged. That will be at 2 o'clock on Sunday, on North Main in Somerset, KY.

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD], who represents

the first district in western Kentucky, for any comments he would care to make.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for yielding to me, and I congratulate him for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, Kentucky and our country lost one of our most respected leaders February 21, when Senator John Sherman Cooper died here in Washington at age 89.

John Sherman Cooper's life was the epitome of integrity and decency that won him the trust and admiration of the tens of thousands who knew him worldwide.

He graduated from Yale University and attended Harvard University Law School.

John Sherman Cooper was active in local Somerset, KY, politics and was first elected to the Kentucky House of Representatives in 1928, the same year he was admitted to the Kentucky bar. He served one term as Pulaski County's State representative and then was elected Pulaski County judge for the next 8 years.

Senator Cooper first won election to the Senate in November 1946, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Albert B. "Happy" Chandler, who resigned to become commissioner of baseball. Senator Cooper was defeated for election for a full term in 1948.

For the next 4 years Senator Cooper was a delegate to the United Nations. In November 1952, he again won election to the Senate, this time to fill the 2 years remaining in the term of Senator Virgil M. Chapman, who had died in office.

Kentucky, where most elected officials through the years have been Democrats, elected this outstanding Republican to the U.S. Senate five times.

In the years before television advertising became the most valuable campaign asset, Senator Cooper usually campaigned alone, visiting the cities and towns across Kentucky and seeking support person to person.

President Harry S. Truman made him a delegate to the United Nations. He was a roving ambassador for Secretary of State Dean Acheson, an ambassador to India under Dwight D. Eisenhower, and a friend and confidante of John F. Kennedy. Lyndon B. Johnson appointed him to the Warren Commission for the investigation of Kennedy's assassination. Gerald Ford appointed him Ambassador to East Germany.

My wife Carol and I have been very fond of Senator Cooper for many years. I'm very proud of the large, autographed photo of him that hangs in my office in the Rayburn Building. I was always so pleased that in recent years Senator Cooper would ask me to assist him in his annual trips to the Fancy

Farm political picnic in my home county in western Kentucky.

Actually, my wife Carol met Senator Cooper and his lovely, talented wife, Lorraine, long before I did. After Carol was selected Miss Kentucky in 1959, Senator and Mrs. Cooper contributed \$300 toward her expenses related to the 1959 Miss America pageant in Atlantic City.

During the many times Carol and I had the privilege of visiting with Senator Cooper, he and Carol always enjoyed discussing mutual friends and current events in Somerset, where Carol lived and was an elementary school teacher for 14 years.

Truly, Senator Cooper was a man loved, appreciated, and admired by those of us fortunate to have known him.

My wife, Carol, and I extend to Senator Cooper's brother, Richard Cooper of Somerset, and other members of his family our sympathy.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky's First District, for his very nice and wonderful remarks.

I know that Senator Cooper, being a Republican from our area, when he went down to western Kentucky, which is solidly Democratic, went there first with fear and trepidation, but as they learned in the gentleman's district how warm this man was and how humble he was and what integrity he had, and that he deeply cared about everyone regardless of party, it was not long before they warmed up to Senator Cooper, and there he was considered one of them. I know that he loved the gentleman's section of the State very, very much.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield one more time?

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, Senator Cooper taught many of us who are Democrats in western Kentucky a real campaign secret. He usually campaigned by himself. So many times those of us who run for office like to go around with somebody like the local mayor or the judge, but Senator Cooper campaigned by himself. Then you always wanted to help him out because he was by himself, and you would help him out; you would vote for him on election day.

□ 1710

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague from the central Kentucky area, whose home is in Lexington, one of the special places for Senator Cooper. I know he loved that area. I yield to the gentleman from central Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS].

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me first of all thank my colleague, the gentleman from the Fifth Congressional District, HAL ROGERS, for his thoughtfulness today in inviting all of

us down here from Kentucky and other places that want to honor John Sherman Cooper.

Mr. Speaker, when John Sherman Cooper walked into a room, the room just tilted his way. He was loved by everyone that I know.

We remember John Sherman Cooper today, as the Senator from Kentucky, a diplomat and a friend.

He was an uncommon man with a common touch.

For over 40 years here in Washington, "gentleman from Kentucky" was synonymous with John Sherman Cooper. He was honest, had a good sense of humor, and was always fair.

He was a true gentleman, and a truly gentle man.

Anyone who would seek to represent our State will, for years to come, stand in the long shadow he cast.

There is a saying that "no man is so tall as when he stoops to help a child." I am reminded of these words when seeing my favorite photograph of Mr. Cooper on the Capitol steps, leaning over to talk with a Boy Scout.

He was a man of great passion; he cared deeply about people and about the events that impacted their lives—whether it was war, black lung, or floods, he spoke with sincere emotion, always on behalf of the helpless, those in need.

Cooper had credibility—in both parties, he was known for his fairness.

We remember him as a meticulous architect of compassionate public policy and unshakable public trust. He joins Abraham Lincoln and like Lincoln, he was tall in stature, articulate, intelligent, a keen observer of human nature. In a career of public service, spanning some 60 years, no one ever accused John Sherman Cooper of uttering a careless or unkind word.

And like Lincoln, he tasted political defeat often, but he was never defeated.

He knew the art and science of the legislative process. He knew instinctively how to enlist others in a cause, and like Henry Clay knew how to "make others follow where he wanted to lead." He was able to compromise and resolve obstacles in the path of the larger goals that drove him to public service.

His example of public commitment and personal integrity will always be an inspiration—not only to those of us who were honored by his counsel and friendship, but to the generations who will meet John Sherman Cooper in the defining pages of history. May they know him as an heroic figure, a treasured statesman, and as the gentleman from Kentucky. His shadow will last forever.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleagues for those very eloquent words and description of our common friend. I really think all politicians in Kentucky who knew of or knew Senator Cooper, or those who will read

about him, and perhaps in other States as well, whether they realize it or not, in some way model themselves after his example, the humility, even the shyness of this man, but the humility and the integrity and forthrightness and honesty with which he dealt with his colleagues and his constituents on issues. Even with Presidents, for that matter, because here is a man that stood up to Presidents, as well as advising them all of his material political life.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to our colleague from the Fourth District who represents the northern Kentucky area and the suburbs of Louisville, a favorite hunting ground, or haunting ground, I guess you would say, of Senator Cooper, JIM BUNNING.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Somerset for yielding to me. I would like to join all of my colleagues from Kentucky in thanking him for holding this special order about our friend and colleague, John Sherman Cooper.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody who ever ran for a public office in Kentucky failed to consult with Senator Cooper before they made their final decision to run or not to run. I can tell you of my experience with John Sherman Cooper, because they are recent, as recent as 1982.

I had a decision to make, and before I ever determined to run for any political office, other than the State senate, which I was already in, I came to Washington, DC, in 1982, to visit with John Sherman Cooper, seeking his counsel on what I should do, whether I should run for Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

I was fortunate enough to bring my wife with me, and we got to visit Senator Cooper and his wife at his home in Georgetown. I think that anyone who has ever been to his home in Georgetown realized the presence when you walked into that home, how you felt, the history you were experiencing in just meeting Senator Cooper.

Senator Cooper had had a bad fall prior to our visiting and was kind of bandaged up. His wife came and opened the door. We went in and visited with Senator Cooper and his wife. We sat down, had coffee and tea, and he knew what was going on in Kentucky without me bringing him up to date. Just by being there, he knew what was happening. He never ever lost touch with the common, everyday person in Kentucky.

I think that was the secret of his success in every aspect of his life, whether it were political, as an Ambassador to the United Nations, as Ambassador to India, or whatever public service that he was engaged in.

I happen to think that Senator Cooper was probably Kentucky's most honored spokesman of this century, the person who could bring both sides of an

issue together better than anyone else I had ever met.

I can recall a day in 1983 in Maysville, KY, and a very, very cold day it was, Senator Cooper sitting on a flatbed truck. I was cold, and I was pretty young, and he was in his eighties, right about 80 years old, and he was almost frozen, shaking. But the moment he got up to speak, the crowd went silent. If you ever heard John Sherman Cooper speak, you always were trying to help him, because he always seemed like he was struggling to say something. But by the third moment of his speech, he had that crowd right in the palm of his hand.

One of the things he did better than anyone I know, he could cry at the drop of a hat. Five minutes into the speech he was telling stories about his service in the Senate, about how he felt about this race that I was involved in.

I personally sat there and wondered, some day, maybe, you can have some of this rub off on you, and you can go do something and serve the country in just a small proportion to what John Sherman Cooper did.

At Fancy Farm in 1983, Senator Cooper spoke on my behalf. I will never forget that, because at Fancy Farm in Kentucky, there are very few Republicans that speak. So the more you can get to Fancy Farm, the more confident you might feel. John Sherman Cooper was one that when he believed in someone, he stood up and said so.

□ 1720

No matter what he said, the people listened. He had a way with the people.

My colleague from the First District mentioned, and I think maybe, HAL, you did, about Governor Chandler or Senator Chandler and John Sherman Cooper's friendship. In visiting with Governor Chandler over a period of time, I found out why they were such good friends. Early in their career they met and decided never to run against each other for any office in Kentucky, whether it be for the U.S. Senate or for Governor or whatever, and that friendship kept on and on until now Governor Chandler is obviously 92 and we just lost Senator Cooper at almost age 90.

Anyone who has ever visited for a cocktail party or a function at Senator Cooper's home in the evening would find the biggest, broadest spectrum of Washington, DC., was always present. You would walk into the room and BOB DOLE and ALAN SIMPSON on the right and TED KENNEDY or PAT MOYNIHAN or anybody else from the left, and there was a broad section of all of the people in Washington, DC, because he identified with not just one section of any party, he identified with all sections of the parties on both sides of the aisle.

Kentucky has lost a great spokesman. The United States of America has lost a great spokesman, someone who put not only the Commonwealth of

Kentucky's interests and the interests of the United States first, but the people that he represented over a period of time, he always kept the people first. We are deeply going to miss John Sherman Cooper. I am personally and my wife is going to miss him, and I just want to tell you that I am here to pay homage and honor to him because he is the greatest Kentuckian that I have ever met, and I am honored to have known him.

I yield back to my good friend from Somerset.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman very much. I do not think that I have heard more eloquent words anywhere at any time. That was well put and we all appreciate it very much, representing the northern Kentucky region and the suburban Louisville area.

We are pleased to have with us also on this occasion a Member of Congress from New York State who represents the 30th District in upstate New York, but we know her as really a colleague from Kentucky. LOUISE SLAUGHTER was born in Harlem, in my district in the mountains of Kentucky and lived in various towns, and very close to Somerset, in fact, at one point in her life, and knew Senator Cooper.

I yield to her for any remarks that she may have.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank my colleague for yielding and I appreciate very much him giving me this opportunity to come over and to participate in this special order for a man that I consider to be a moral and intellectual giant.

I actually was a graduate of Somerset High School, and all of us in Somerset knew that the perfect standard for a public servant was John Sherman Cooper. We knew about his life, sacrifices that he made, the honor that he had won in Washington from his colleagues because of the kind of man that he was.

I knew him first as someone that I was already in awe of, but as a neighbor. When the Senate was out of session and Senator Cooper was home, we could go by and sit on the porch with him a little while, upper North Main Street, and talk about what concerned us in Somerset and in Kentucky. He was as gracious and warm as you can imagine. Although his mind may very well have been on the Warren Commission, or on his job as Ambassador to India, or as one of America's greatest statesmen, we talked about home.

The great movie classic that everyone loves to see during Christmas, "It's a Wonderful Life," tells a story that all Americans love, but to me that was the story of John Sherman Cooper. We all knew how John's father had suffered a reversal of fortune, and he had given up what he was doing to come back home to Somerset to take up the family business and paid off every one of his fa-

ther's debts. And he had suspended his own career and his ambition and his hopes until he had taken care of all of his siblings and their education.

He was the American dream. I do not honestly believe that I could name three people who have served in Congress that could approach anything like the honesty and integrity that John Cooper brought to that job. Everyone respected him. There was never any sense about Senator Cooper that he was doing anything for himself or any narrow interest at all, but he loved his country and he had the capacity to do things to help it, and he took the lead.

In the little town square in Somerset, there is a little monument to John Cooper. He and his wife, after he had retired from the Senate, came back home and they made that little haven in the middle of town, a place where people could come by and sit, as people often had on the porch with John, and everybody who goes by there every day will always remember who that benefactor was.

There was a book written about him. It was out of print before I ever got a chance to see it, and after I was elected and came down, one of the first things that I was able to enjoy was lunch with Senator Cooper over in the Senate dining room. We talked about the book, and I told him how much I had wanted to read it, and he kept promising me one, but he forgot. So I suppose I shall never be able to read that book. But I have a pretty good idea of what it says. It says that every schoolboy and girl in the Commonwealth of Kentucky knew that they had been represented by a man of extraordinary quality, that he was a man all of us should look up to, and that all of us here would do well to emulate.

At the end of that lunch that day, he leaned over to me and patted me on the hand and he said to me, "I'm very proud of you." And I literally was speechless because it was the thing that I had wanted to say to him all of my life and had never been able to articulate in any way at all that was even adequate to what I really felt about that good man. When I read his obituary the other day in the New York Times, it did not do him half justice. But one had only to realize that a statesman had gone from the Earth.

And while we appreciated him and loved him in Kentucky, John Cooper was far beyond that. He went way beyond our boundaries, Hal. John Cooper was a statesman for the United States. He left a record that all of us can be proud of and say that we knew an extraordinary and a wonderful human being.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you very much, LOUISE, for those very eloquent remarks, LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER. She still has a brother who lives in Somerset, KY, a personal friend of

ours, and we are delighted that you came, LOUISE. Thank you very much.

Senator Cooper, as JIM BUNNING had said, and Lorraine were very big entertainers in Washington, and an invitation from the Coopers was the most valued invitation that one could receive in Washington, DC. One would meet members of the Supreme Court, Members of the Senate, members of various commissions, legislators, Senators, Congressmen, diplomats from around the world and the like. And then I would contrast that with an occasion that I recollect happening several years back, long before I was in Congress. I had picked Senator Cooper up at the Lexington Airport to drive him back to Somerset, an hour and a half drive.

□ 1730

I noticed as he got in my car that one of the lenses from his horn-rimmed glasses was missing, and I was in such awe of the man anyway that it took me awhile before I could finally muster the courage to remind him that he had lost a lens. When I did, he said, "Well, of course," and he stuck his finger through the horn-rim opening, and he said, "Well, I lost it last week," or something like that. We got closer to Somerset, and I volunteered to take him to the optometrist to have his glasses fixed. He said, "No. Just take me to the five-and-dime store here on the square." We went to the dime store, and he went in and picked out by trying on the glasses that he needed, and that says a lot about the simplicity of the man, the humility, and the unassuming nature of this very big giant, quite a contrast with the entertaining at his Georgetown home in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, we have saved the best for last. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has been in the Committee on Appropriations doing his work and was delayed in getting here, but we have saved him for the finale. I am very pleased to yield to the senior member of our delegation, the dean of our delegation, a personal friend of Senator Cooper's for many, many years, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, John Sherman Cooper died on Thursday, February 21, at his home in Washington, DC. He was my friend and he served with distinction and honor in the U.S. Senate for a period of 20 years and 6 months.

He was born in Somerset, Pulaski County, KY, on August 23, 1901, and after attending the public schools at Somerset and Centre College in Danville, graduated from Yale College in the year 1923. After attending Harvard Law School from 1923 to 1925, he was admitted to the bar in 1928 and began the practice of law in Somerset, KY. He served in the Kentucky State

House of Representatives from 1928 to 1930 and then he was elected as county judge of Pulaski County and served from 1930 to 1938. From time to time, he served on the board of trustees of the University of Kentucky and this was during the period from 1935 to 1946. During World War II, he served in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1946.

Following the war, John Sherman Cooper was elected circuit judge of the 28th Judicial District of Kentucky in 1945 and served until his resignation in 1946 since he has been elected to the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy brought about as a result of the resignation of A.B. Chandler. Senator Chandler was selected to be the baseball commissioner and resigned his seat in the U.S. Senate. John Sherman Cooper served in the Senate from November 6, 1946, to January 3, 1949. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1948 and at that time resumed the practice of law. Next, he served as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1949, and was an alternate delegate in 1950 and 1951. He served as an adviser to the Secretary of State at the London and Brussels meetings of the Council of Ministers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1950.

He then was elected again to the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Virgil M. Chapman, and served from November 5, 1952, to January 3, 1955. He was an unsuccessful candidate for reelection in 1954, and then served as Ambassador to India and Nepal from 1955 to 1956. Next, he was elected again to the U.S. Senate in 1956 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of former Vice President Alben W. Barkley and was reelected in 1960 and again in 1966. He served from November 7, 1966, to January 3, 1973, and was not a candidate for reelection in 1972.

John Sherman Cooper was good for the United States of America and for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. His service to our country and the Commonwealth of Kentucky are hallmarks of great distinction. The scope of his long political career was very broad and he was recognized not only in this country, but around the world for his great achievements. John Sherman Cooper was a loyal friend and he, while serving in the U.S. Senate, had friends on both sides of the aisle. He soon learned that not only in Kentucky, but in the U.S. Senate, it was imperative that you have friends on both sides of the political spectrum. He was a giant at the center of national power, but at all times he remained a modest man.

He was a good man who served his country well, and he always kept the common touch. His name will be known in all time to come at home and in the far corners of the Earth for his monumental works in behalf of representative government which is the source and the protector of all human rights in all nations where freedom

prevails. He was a man of the soil. Throughout all of his mature years, regardless of all of his other achievements, and they were many, he was considered as the friend of the American farmer. He labored with dedicated devotion and with a passion on the ramparts of individual freedom, honesty and constitutional government. His service in all of his achievements was marked by a high sense of conscience and duty. His character, his achievements and his faithful service will be an inspiration to generations yet to come.

John Sherman Cooper was an advocate of the need for the Rural Electrification Administration in this country. In a great many battles that he and I joined in down through the years, he always said that there is a place for both REA and the private power companies. He further said that we will reach the day when not only will we have the need for both, but for additional power to serve our people in this country. I recall in a great many of the early REA appropriations bills for funding and in certain authorization bills, he always was in the forefront in the U.S. Senate and this was a record he maintained all throughout his career in the Senate. He believed that our water resources should be developed throughout the country and especially in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Starting in the year 1953, and all during his career in the Senate, he, as a member of the Public Works Committee, joined with us in the construction of river, harbor, and navigation projects that have produced many benefits for our people in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. We started this program with the reconstruction of locks and dams one and two on Green River designated as the Spottsville and Rumsey Locks and Dams and this was followed by the channelization of Green River for 102 miles. This was the start of our program which produced many flood control reservoirs, lakes and flood walls.

John Sherman Cooper believed that the American farmer should receive an adequate portion of the national income and that this, the largest industry in our country, must be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I have lost a true friend and the United States of America has lost a great statesman.

He was buried at Arlington National Cemetery on Wednesday, February 27, 1991.

To the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman so much for those wonderful remarks. You knew him for all of those many years and served with him in great distinction, you in this body and Senator Cooper in the other body, always cooperating across the building and across party lines and across these

Chambers, always working for the betterment of our State, as certainly the gentleman does.

Senator Cooper was a friend and adviser to Presidents. He was never afraid to stand up to Presidents, however, and even to his own party. He explained it this way, "I vote as I believe, not according to any index. I believe a man who asserts his Christianity ought to show it in his faith in our country, in its people and in God and not act as if only he is wise and good."

Former Gov. Louie Nunn said these words about Senator Cooper: "If one blossom is brought for each kindness he has shown, he would forever sleep beneath a mountain of flowers." And certainly that is our belief today. We are all diminished.

Here was a world statesman who dealt with kings but kept the common touch. Here was the most beloved of Kentucky politicians, yet humble, sweet, and kind. Here was the model politician after whom all of us would pattern our own efforts, yet who continually tried to improve himself. He was the picture, the very picture, of the honest, conscientious, caring statesman who not only advised Presidents but occasionally stood up to them, and above all, he was a very proud Kentuckian, lean and bony frame, always carried that optimistic spirit, born out of a struggle from modest beginnings.

The memory of Senator Cooper will remain with all us as long as we remain. I think his record of service in the United States Congress and in the halls of the diplomats will remain for many centuries.

It is with a great deal of sadness that we bid farewell in this Capitol Building to one of its greatest tenants, to one of its most sincere and caring servants, to a Kentuckian who rose from very modest beginnings to the very seat of power.

As Rev. Robert Browning, the pastor of the First Baptist Church, said at his funeral service just the other day, "He made power a good word," and so we bid farewell to our leader, our mentor, our adviser, and this great American.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise here today to honor and pay special tribute to a fellow Kentuckian who led a distinguished life marked by a genuine dedication to civil service in all its shapes and forms.

That individual is John Sherman Cooper, who passed away February 21, at his home in Washington, DC. My heartfelt condolences go out to all family, relatives, and friends of this fine gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, John Sherman Cooper will be missed dearly by all of us here in Congress because we all admired, and now seek to emulate, his career as a public servant dedicated to carrying out the duties presented to him. Indeed, John Sherman Cooper completely personified what it means to be a public servant. He was a Member of the U.S. Senate for little over 20 years; he served in

the Kentucky State House of Representatives; he was a county and a circuit judge; and he served his country and the people as a delegate to the United Nations and as an Ambassador.

That, my friends, is an impressive list of credentials. But matters like credentials or status never affected John Sherman Cooper. He never got caught up in any of that. He never forgot his roots in Pulaski County in southeastern Kentucky. John Sherman Cooper always remembered he was a Kentuckian first, and then let the other titles and accolades follow suit.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what side of the aisle we claim to represent, John Sherman Cooper served as an inspiration to all of us that our duty in Congress is to serve all Americans, no matter how big or small, poor or rich, or party affiliation. That's what defines a public servant, my friends, and that's exactly how John Sherman Cooper would like to be remembered today and in all succeeding days.

God bless him.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in remembering a man who many have described as the greatest Senator in Kentucky's history, John Sherman Cooper, who, at the age of 89, passed away on February 21.

After earning an undergraduate degree from Yale and a law degree from Harvard, Senator Cooper embarked upon a long and magnificently successful lifetime of public service. His career began with a term in the Kentucky House of Representatives and two terms as Pulaski County judge. While serving as Pulaski County judge, Senator Cooper's steadfast support for humanitarian principles evolved. This belief evinced itself when he took the then unpopular position of insisting that black citizens serve on juries.

Senator Cooper placed his political career on hold for several years and enlisted in the Army in 1942. Following the Allied victory, he remained in Germany to help reorganize Bavaria's courts and repatriate thousands of displaced persons. After 4 years of loyal and courageous service, Senator Cooper was discharged as a captain in 1946.

Following his military service, Senator Cooper returned home to his native Kentucky, where later that year, he successfully won a special election to serve out the term of A.B. "Happy" Chandler, who had resigned to become the commissioner of major league baseball. This was the first of a rare feat of winning three nonconsecutive terms in the U.S. Senate. After an unsuccessful reelection bid in 1948, Senator Cooper returned to the Senate to serve another partial term in 1952. Once again, however, he lost his reelection bid, only to be returned to the Senate in 1956 to finish a third partial term. Finally, in 1960, Senator Cooper won his first full Senate term. It was a seat he would hold until 1972, when he chose not to seek reelection.

In all, John Sherman Cooper served as a U.S. Senator from Kentucky for 20 years. During that time he represented the people of the Bluegrass State with honor, distinction, and integrity. As a Senator, John Sherman Cooper established himself as one of the foremost experts on foreign affairs. He was a leading advocate and one of the first Members of Con-

gress to recognize the need to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Senator Cooper's interest in foreign affairs was further evidenced by his distinguished service in our Nation's diplomatic corps. He served as a Delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948 and 1969; and as Ambassador to India and Nepal from 1955 to 1956; and finally, President Ford appointed him to serve as our first Ambassador to East Germany from 1974 to 1976.

But while Senator Cooper was well known for his interest in international relations, he never forgot his Kentucky roots. Throughout his career, Senator Cooper supported programs to provide Federal aid to education as well as Medicaid and Medicare. In addition, he was one of the chief advocates for the establishment of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

I would like to express my sympathy to Senator Cooper's family and friends. My heartfelt prayers are with you. The death of a statesman such as Senator John Sherman Cooper, who combined a zest for foreign affairs with strong sense of dedication and commitment to his "Old Kentucky Home" is a loss to the people of Kentucky as well as the United States. It is rare to find a statesman who advised Presidents and weighed in on foreign policy matters of the highest importance while maintaining his down-home style and concern for his home State. He will be greatly missed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that because I missed my 5-minute special order by a couple of seconds, that I be allowed to take my 5-minute special order out of sequence.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1740

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 106

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] was a cosponsor of my House Joint Resolution 106, and he has requested that his name be removed, as I misunderstood him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Is there ob-

jection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A JOYOUS DAY

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, if my father, Harry Joseph Dornan, had not been called to his eternal reward in his 84th year, he would have been 99 years of age today. He was a combat artillery captain from World War I, and won several wound Chevrons, which is what Purple Hearts were then called. He won three Wound Chevrons: One for shrapnel, under his left eye; and twice for horrible poison gas attacks that the Germans unleashed. His war was originally called the Great World War or the World War. No person knew we were going to have a second one, let alone, God forbid, a third one, ever.

It was in Northern France, Southern Belgium, Flanders, that the Germans, in May of 1916, first used poison gas. By the time the American troops got there in large numbers in late 1917 and late winter of 1918, poison gas was a regular feature of the battlefield, as were machine guns, aircraft, and tanks. The red and blue slacks of the French cavalry uniforms had given way to khaki and olive drab. All these aspects of the next World War, number II, were all introduced with the sole exception of nuclear weapons, in World War I.

When Saddam Hussein began the systematic destruction of his country on September 22, 1980, by attacking a country over 3 times the size of his Iraq, the nation of Iran, the world described it as eight years of World War I conflict. What a nightmare. After a million casualties in the Iraq-Iranian War, he then swallows a small country that has now just been liberated at tremendous cost of life, most all of that loss of life on the Iraqi side. Again, tens of thousands of casualties. Because of Saddam's ignominious defeat, his Guard, his elite forces, are now, as we speak, in combat against the regular forces returning from a terrible and crushing defeat at the hands of 28 nations in what we call the allied coalition, or the coalition forces.

I wanted to say on the anniversary of my dad's 99th birthday what a pleasure it is to hear that 35 more coalition prisoners are released, to add to the 10 released yesterday. That is a total of 45, and it looks as though our worst fears have been relieved. The split crews that were evidenced when we saw only one-half of those crews paraded on television, against Geneva Convention rules. However, the other half of those crews apparently did eject safely from about five or six different aircraft, including 2-seat British and Italian Tornados, GR-1's, and in the case of the United States, 2-seat F15-E's, and Naval A-6 Grumman Intruders.

I want to put in the RECORD, the list of all of the American prisoners whose families have been notified. This is not the easiest process, although the Defense Department tries to do it with the speed of lightning. These men, and women, I hope, will at some point, after the wounds of war are healed and they have been nurtured by their loving family and friends and home towns, and hopefully after parades of thanksgiving, parades of peace, they will come and visit with their Congressmen and Congresswoman here on Capitol Hill, and give Members a firsthand accounting of what it is like to bail out over an enemy-held territory, over a very target they are working over, and tell how they are treated. Also, I would like to find out if there is any truth to the story that two British airmen were taken to an air base and tortured to death.

When I say the word air base my blood runs cold because even in North Vietnam it was the NVA military that protected our bailed-out air crews. It was the civilian population, which is understandable in rage, maybe killed a hundred or more of our air crews in North Vietnam. I remember one of our leading aces, a Mustang pilot of World War II who bailed out on Christmas Day of 1945 and was cut to death with pitchforks by angry German farmers when he bailed out in a rural area on one of his last combat missions. He is a very famous ace. I will withhold his name out of respect for any relatives because of the horrible death he suffered.

Military people, particularly German pilots, would rescue any of our downed air crews, take them to their air bases, and oven dry clean their clothes. Sometimes, as with one of the Eagle Squadron pilots, George Sperry, who I had the pleasure of taking to Great Britain for the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Britain, the German air crews took allied prisoners to the train station. They even kept one other man in the hospital until he was well, before he was sent off to a stalag. They did not torture them to death on the air base, which is breaking every code of decency and military code.

Therefore, it is a joyous day that I put in the RECORD the name of 15 American prisoners, Mr. Speaker, to add to the 10 that were released yesterday.

The names of the POW's follow:

On the list was another woman, Army Maj. Rhonda L. Cornum, 36, of Freeville, N.Y. On Monday, Army Spec. Melissa Rathbun-Nealy, 20, of Grand Rapids, Mich., was released by the Iraqis and transported to a U.S. hospital ship in Bahrain.

The other Americans released yesterday were listed by the Pentagon as Army Spec. Troy L. Dunlap, 20, of Massac, Ill., and Army Staff Sgt. Daniel J. Stamaris Jr., 31, of Boise, Idaho.

Lt. Col. Clifford M. Acree, 39, of Seattle; Capt. Michael C. Berryman, 28, of Cleveland, Okla.; Chief Warrant Officer Guy L. Hunter Jr., 46, of Moultrie, Ga.; Capt. Russell A.C. Sanborn, 27, of DeLand Fla.; and Maj. Joseph J. Small III, 39, of Racine, Wis.

Col. David W. Eberly, 43, of Brazil, Ind.; Maj. Jeffrey S. Tice, 35, of Sellersville, Pa.; Capt. William F. Andrews, 32, of Syracuse, N.Y.; Lt. Col. Jeffrey D. Fox, 39, of Fall River, Mass.; Capt. Harry M. Roberts, 30, of Savannah, Ga.; Capt. Richard D. Storr, 29, of Spokane, Wash.; and 1st Lt. Robert J. Sweet, 24, of Philadelphia.

THE DOMESTIC AGENDA

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk tonight about the domestic agenda. There has been some fascinating discussion recently about having a domestic agenda. I want to quote from the New York Times today:

Democrats Try to Shift Focus to Issues at Home. After months as bystanders while President Bush led the country to war, the Senate and House Democratic leaders struggled today to shift some attention back to Congress, domestic affairs, and partisan politics.

It went on to say in the article that the Democrats intend to make the case that Mr. Bush does not have a domestic agenda; that Mr. Bush and the Presidency, do not have anything here at home. I want to rise to make a couple of points because I think it is fascinating that the very people who did not understand President Bush's strategy in the Middle East, do not understand President Bush's strategy at home. The very people who did not understand the potential of the Stealth technology and the modern weapons, and the capacity to win the war against Iraq, also do not understand the potential of President Bush's advice here at home.

I want to divide this into several cases. I think, first of all, there is the question of whether or not the President has an agenda. I think we will prove he does. Second, there is a question of whether or not that agenda deserves to be brought to the floor of the House and the floor of the other body, and given a chance to be voted on. The third is, what does this whole debate on shifting focus to issues at home mean?

Now, I want to assert, first of all, that President Bush has quite an agenda, and that the fascinating reality is that while President Bush has been asking the Democratic leadership to bring things to the floor, the fact is, the Democrats want Members to believe there is no agenda because they have no intention of acting on it. For example, the President sent up an Ex-

cellency in Education Act on April 5, 1989, almost 2 years ago. He sent up a request for habeas corpus reform. That is, a reform which would help in terms of the death penalty and other provisions involving convicted criminals on June 15, 1989. He sent up a request for enterprise zones, to have a tax incentive to create jobs, on February 26, 1991. This is, by the way, the 12th year that enterprise zones have been recommended to the Congress.

Step by step, again and again, the question we have to look at is, what is going on? In the case of enterprise zones, for example, on March 29, 1990, legislative language was sent to the Congress in favor of enterprise zones to help create jobs in four areas, both in urban and rural America. So, again and again we have a long track record of things the President wants. We have a clear case that the President is, in fact, trying to recommend real change.

Now, the White House released on February 27, a fact sheet entitled "Expanding Choice and Opportunities for Individuals, Families and Communities." They quoted the President, in his State of the Union Address. The President said:

The strength of democracy is not in bureaucracy. It is in the people and their communities. We must return to families, communities, counties, cities, States, and institutions of every kind, the power to chart their own destiny, and the freedom and the opportunity provided by strong growth.

□ 1750

Now, this is an agenda radically different from that of liberal Democrats.

The factsheet goes on to say:

The Administration is committed to strengthening the power and opportunity of individuals and families, to breaking down barriers to independence and self-reliance wherever they exist and to providing hope to distressed communities.

Now, notice this agenda. It is not a bureaucratic agenda. It is not a welfare state agenda. It is not a tax increase agenda. It is not an agenda which increases power in Washington, DC, and therefore if you are a liberal Democrat there is no agenda because they cannot see any of the things that the President is asking for.

Let me continue from the factsheet:

This means giving people access to jobs and the ability to make choices that will better their lives and the lives of their families. People with access to housing, jobs and quality education have a stake in their community and a greater incentive to lead productive lives. More important, people with economic opportunity have hope for the future, an important and powerful weapon against poverty and despair. The Administration seeks to use numerous administrative, regulatory and budgetary means to expand economic opportunity for low income individuals. In addition to these continuing efforts, the President today announced that he will seek congressional action to promote choice and opportunity on several fronts.

They go on to list eight fronts. Listen to the eight fronts.

- One. Educational choice.
- Two. Educational flexibility.
- Three. Home ownership for low-income persons.
- Four. Enterprise zones.
- Five. Antidiscrimination laws.
- Six. Community opportunity areas.
- Seven. The Social Security earnings test.
- Eight. Anticrime references.

Now, here are eight areas where this is a clear agenda at home, where President Bush has a domestic agenda and it is an agenda that ought to be acted upon, and yet what is the reaction of liberal Democrats? Well, educational choice cannot count. That is not part of their Bureaucracy.

Educational flexibility cannot count. That is not part of their bureaucracy.

Home ownership for low income persons, the Democrats on the Appropriations Subcommittee last week zeroed out Secretary Jack Kemp's proposal, refused to spend a penny to increase reforms for home ownership for low income persons.

Enterprise zones, the effort to create an incentive to create jobs in the inner cities, to create jobs in rural America, to help poor people to have a chance to have private sector jobs, that is bottled up in the Ways and Means Committee. The Democrats have no intention of bringing that kind of projob creation, pro-private-enterprise bill to the floor of the House.

Antidiscrimination laws, well, the Democratic leadership seems committed to a quota bill, but does not seem to be willing to bring to the floor an antidiscrimination bill that does not have quotas.

So you go down the list. Finally, the anticrime effort. It was the Democratic leadership last year which established in the conference between the House and the Senate, that they would drop all of the key reforms President Bush has asked for, the key reform on the death penalty, the key reform on habeas corpus reform, and the key reform on the exclusionary rule.

Now, what did that mean? It meant that it was harder to use the death penalty. It meant that it was easier for convicted criminals to tie up State attorney generals and U.S. attorneys in repetitive appeals on habeas corpus and it meant that the local police further had their hands tied under the exclusionary rule.

The net result, we have continuing crime and a continuing drug problem, and despite the fact that it has been over a year and a half since the President asked for these reforms in crime, they have not been passed and the Democratic leadership currently has been bottled up in the Judiciary Committee.

But this is not an untypical activity. The fact is the Democratic leadership has a hard time getting Congress to do even the simplest things. Let me quote

from a letter from Secretary of the Treasury Nicholas Brady on the issue of the Resolution Trust Corporation. This is a letter to Congressman BOB MICHEL, Republican leader:

As chairman of the Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, I am writing to emphasize that unless Congress promptly provides adequate funding to the RTC, the RTC will be forced to further curtail its efforts to close bankrupt savings and loans. Already the delay in authorizing additional funds has slowed down case activity and cost the American taxpayer at least \$250 million to \$300 million. The Oversight Board has testified that full funding to permit the RTC to complete the thrift cleanup would be preferable to interim funding; however, \$30 billion of loss funds will permit the RTC to continue operating through the remainder of the fiscal year. I am afraid that if any less than \$30 billion is provided, the result will be a start and stop cleanup process that produces further delays, substantial additional costs to taxpayers and confusion in the minds of depositors. Delays if allowed to continue for a calendar quarter will cost an additional \$750 million to \$850 million, or an average of \$8 million a day. Accordingly, I repeat the Administration's urgent request that the House provide adequate funds to the RTC without controversial amendments that would delay the provision of funds and add to the taxpayers' costs.

Sincerely, Nicholas Brady, Chairman.

Now, this letter is dated March 1. This is the 5th.

The Democratic leadership by its failure to schedule and pass continued funding to protect the depositors has wasted \$40 million in the first 5 days of March. Tomorrow that number will be \$48 million. The next day it will be \$56 million, and yet we see no activity to pass something which everyone agrees is necessary, everyone agrees is unavoidable, everyone agrees will in fact be passed, and the result is a Congress which is simply not able to get the job done.

Let me quote from the Washington Post, hardly a conservative publication, Monday, March 4:

PANIC, CHAOS AND THE S&LS

Amid much panic and chaos, the House Banking Committee has voted down the bill to provide more money for the savings and loan cleanup. Everybody knows that the bill is going to have to be passed, and soon. The money is used to shut down failed S&Ls, those whose assets no longer suffice to pay off their depositors. Delays in providing the money merely mean that the failed S&Ls continue in business with steady growth of their losses.

The bill is understandably unpopular, since it spends vast amounts only to cover the past losses of private operators. Many congressmen are anxiously looking for ways to distance themselves from it and demonstrate their eagle-eyed vigilance, prudence, concern, etc. When it came up in the Banking Committee last Tuesday, a lot of members (mostly Democrats) went to work attaching endless amendments of that character to it. Another lot of members (mostly Republicans) complained that the proliferation of amendments was getting out of hand and began voting against the whole bill. With that, the Democrats realized that this detested bill was going to be attributed to

them. Some of them swung against it, and the bill collapsed.

Some of the amendments are useful attempts at serious reform. In the S&Ls cleanup, an obscure federal agency called the Resolution Trust Corp. is now spending money faster than any but four of the executive departments. Its procedures could stand improvement.

But most of the amendments were merely posturing. Although the process needs to be speeded up, one amendment would have slowed it down for environmental reviews. Another would have slowed it further by requiring the RTC to duplicate the present examiners in enforcing the civil rights laws.

A few of these amendments were cuckoo or vengeful, or both. An example was the one that would have tried to make the states with the largest numbers of failed S&Ls—Texas, for example—pay part of the cost of shutting them down. Why should they? It's federal deposit insurance and a federal responsibility. This mean-spirited bit of legislative mischief was an indication of the distance that the committee had run beyond the control of its chairman or any coherent majority—let alone common sense.

The Banking Committee is going to try again this week. The costs of procrastination run high, and the RTC is nowhere near the end of its job. There are currently 190 failed S&Ls already in federal conservatorship waiting to be closed, and the examiners report that another 200 or so are likely to join them in the months ahead.

Now, the references here about cuckoo and vengeful, the whole notion that this is going to be a disaster, is not from a Republican. It is not from a conservative. It is from the Washington Post, and the Washington Post is simply saying that the Democratic leadership, the longer it is unable to get its act together, the more expensive it is going to be for the American people, and as I said, at the rate of \$8 million a day, that adds up.

It sort of makes you think that if the Democratic leadership had been in charge of Desert Storm, an act which they were opposed to, that in fact Desert Storm would have taken 5 or 10 years and would have been unbelievably confused and unbelievably disoriented.

Now, again on Monday, the Wall Street Journal, a more conservative publication, had an editorial entitled "More Fun With S&L's," and I would like to read from it.

Since the origin of the savings and loan scandal is often so ludicrously distorted ("the ultimate Reaganite deregulation"), we wonder if it's possible that many people will recognize the direction that the end game of this awful mess is taking. For that, you'd have had to focus on what happened in the House Banking Committee last week.

Understandably, attention was drawn to the windup of the Gulf War. But the Nation has been struggling with a sour economy whose woebegone financial institutions are at the heart of the trouble. The thrift debacle, tying up potentially hundreds of billions of dollars, is the aorta.

□ 1800

Before getting to House Banking's hijinks, let's set them against the context of the problem. Most of the S&L money is gone, but

the bleeding hasn't entirely stopped. Some insolvent thrifts remain in business, losing more taxpayer-guaranteed money, and of course the Resolution Trust Corp., the assigned liquidator, moves molasses-like in disposing of assets whose value generally shrinks. Meantime, this slow drain debilitates commercial banks, insurance companies and other institutions whose infirmities compound the economic worry.

So there is an urgency here. However, it's also important to realize that what's lost is lost. The S&L bailout is about recouping money owed to depositors. The depositors are going to be paid because the federal government assured them they would be. The crooks got away with their take, and the inflated prices for real estate were paid and the bum loans were made. That money is not coming back. All that's left to do, really, is square Washington's books.

But the politicians just won't have it. At the House Banking Committee, they aren't still fighting the lost war, they're trying to rewrite its history. They've attempted to freight the cleanup bill with all kinds of punishments for the Reagan Rich and spoils for Those Not Invited to the Party. Simultaneous with an amendment to the RTC funding bill directing the agency to sell assets more quickly, the banking committee's various members offered other strictures to: preserve rent control, force more contract awards to women and minorities, cut non-profit entities in on housing deals, and make states with the worst S&Ls pay a larger share, though many of their deposits were brokered from people everywhere. From Rep. Joe Kennedy we get a demand that the bailout be paid with higher taxes or cuts elsewhere in the budget (one guess which option he'll fight for).

He was a Democrat. In the end most Republicans on the panel said that if such micromanagement was the price to be paid for more RTC funding, forget it, and enough Democrats joined them in voting to scuttle the bill. Most observers, however, expect the junk amendments to creep back into the process. Also, bailout legislation may yet be revived using a less onerous Senate version, if Howard Metzenbaum doesn't filibuster to get some RTC records he's chasing, the better hound somebody on one of his many lists.

If the funds dry up, there's nothing left to pay the already-incurred losses and no more thrifts can be liquidated after this week. The mop-up operation in U.S. finance will turn into a stalemate and the casualties will mount. America may have resolved to have no more Vietnams, but on the evidence of House Banking's behavior, we can't say the same about more S&Ls.

Now, what is the message? The message is that while the Democratic leadership is playing politics and while they are failing to get the job done, every American taxpayer is getting hit with a slightly harder hit for the bailout of the depositors. That is where the money has gone, to take care of the depositors whom we have guaranteed.

Now, when you recognize that the Democratic leadership cannot do something as simple as pass a simple continuing permission for the Resolution Trust Corporation to save \$8 million a day, you can imagine how much harder it is to talk about real reform.

Let me turn, in terms of real reform, to the President's State of the Union. This is an address which was given

when virtually every Member of the Congress was here.

This is an address given on January 29. The President spent most of the State of the Union talking about Iraq, talking about the Middle East, but he also talked about very specific reforms here at home.

He said, and I quote, "My budget again includes tax-free family savings accounts, penalty-free withdrawal from IRA's for first-time home buyers and, to increase jobs and growth, a reduced tax for long-term capital gains." He also went on to say that he wants "a budget that promotes investment in America's future—in children, education, infrastructure, space and high technology; legislation to achieve excellence in education, building on the partnership forged with the 50 Governors at the education summit; enabling parents to choose their children's schools—and helping to make America No. 1 in math and science; a blueprint for a new national highway system—a critical investment in our transportation infrastructure; a research and development agenda that includes record levels of Federal investment and a permanent tax credit to strengthen private R&D and to create jobs; a comprehensive national energy strategy that calls for energy conservation and efficiency, increased development and greater use of alternative fuels; a banking reform plan to bring America's financial system into the 21st century so that our banks remain safe and secure and continue to make job-creating loans for our factories, businesses, home buyers."

He goes on to suggest "a Mexican free trade agreement, and our enterprise for the Americas initiative." He talks about civil rights: "Civil rights are also crucial to protecting equal opportunity. Every one of us has the responsibility to speak out against racism, bigotry, and hate. We will continue our vigorous enforcement of existing statutes, and I will once again press the Congress to strengthen the laws against employment discrimination without resorting to the use of unfair preferences."

He goes on to say, "As we fight crime, we will fully implement our national strategy for combating drug abuse. Recent data show we are making progress, but much remains to be done. We will not rest until the day of the dealer is over, forever."

As I said, he has already asked for reforms involving the habeas corpus process, involving the exclusionary rule, and in restoring the death penalty.

Now my suggestion is that if you are to read the President's State of the Union, if you are to read the 20-page introduction to the budget, if you are to look at the list of bills sent up over the last 2 years, sent up by President Bush and his administration, you would see

again and again and again that President Bush has a domestic agenda but it is not Washington's agenda.

It is not an agenda of more power for the Washington bureaucrats. It is not an agenda of higher taxes to send money to Washington. It is not an agenda that would create for the Democratic Party more allies and a bigger machine.

So the bureaucratic welfare state feels that it is not being taken care of. And yet any reasonable person, looking at the scale of the President's agenda, I think would come to the conclusion that there is a lot here to be looked at. Let me give you some examples, quoting from the fact sheet released on February 27 by the White House.

I quote:

CHOICE programs provides parents with the opportunity to select the most appropriate school for their children, based on informed judgments about which school offers the best education. CHOICE leads to healthy competition among schools by focusing on improving educational quality as the way to attract students. Clearly, parents should have the opportunity to send their children to schools of their choice. CHOICE can lift the performance and quality of all schools. The President will propose a new Education Excellence Act, which contains strategic initiatives to improve the learning achievement of all Americans and to restructure the Nation's educational system. Initiatives in the Education in Excellence Act will stimulate fundamental reform and restructure our educational system through promoting educational choice and alternative certification for teachers and principals, assist educators in their mission to improve student performance by rewarding schools that demonstrate improved achievement among students, rewarding excellent teachers, and promoting innovation in training school administrators; provide incentives to school districts to design and implement innovative approaches to mathematics and science education, enhance the endowment of historically black colleges and universities, and contribute to improving literacy.

Notice the President is not insisting that any school system adopt CHOICE or is not insisting that parents adopt CHOICE; the President is suggesting that the Congress pass some legislation to allow a series of experiments, allow local communities, local parents, local educators to try to improve education with more flexibility and with less Washington bureaucracy.

Surely that is a direction that Congress ought to be bringing to the floor and trying to pass, and I would ask the Democratic leadership to quit smothering the initiatives in CHOICE and, instead, to allow them to come to the floor.

There is a second zone, and I want to quote again:

Providing educational flexibility in return for accountability. Federal departments and agencies administer hundreds of separate programs that provide or support education services. Each has its own statutory and regulatory requirement. Program requirements can impede the ability of local schools and districts to provide the best possible edu-

cation. Flexibility in administering Federal education programs will allow Governors, school administrators, teachers, service providers, parents, and others in the community to work together to develop effective education programs that meet the needs of all students, particularly those students who are educationally disadvantaged. The Educational Excellence Act of 1991 will promote local control and innovation in education by providing increased flexibility in the use of Federal funding in exchange for enhanced accountability for results.

The administration's bill will be guided by the following principles: Flexibility should be linked to accountability for improvements in educational outcomes; flexibility should result in delivering services to current target populations in a more effective manner; flexibility should retain key protections in current law, for example, protection of the disabled.

Now notice that there are some key words here that may explain why the Democratic leadership is not very excited about President Bush's agenda. The administration talks about providing increased flexibility in the use of Federal funding. The administration talks about promoting local control and innovation.

□ 1810

Mr. Speaker, I say, "If you're the party of the bureaucratic welfare state, as the Democrats are, if your major allies are people who believe in big bureaucracy and one centralized government, the Educational Excellence Act of 1991 might be a little threatening because it returns more power back home, but the fact is the President has a domestic initiative and domestic agenda that he wants to push to reform education, and it is the Democrats who are afraid to bring it to the floor."

Let us turn to home ownership, and let me quote again.

Low-income Americans have a greater stake in their communities when they have the opportunity to own their own homes. The HOPE initiative, Home Ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere, is a new grant program to increase home ownership opportunities. By offering residents greater control and access to property, the HOPE program will instill pride of ownership and enhance incentives for maintenance and improvement.

While HOPE was enacted into law last year, Congress provided no funding for the program in fiscal year 1991. The President has requested \$500 million in fiscal year 1991 supplemental funding to start the HOPE program immediately. The President's budget also requests a billion dollars in 1992 for the new home program, the housing block grant program providing States and localities greater flexibility in meeting the housing needs of their low-income residents with incentives for using housing vouchers. HOPE grants will be made on a competitive basis to resident management corporations, resident councils, cooperative associations, nonprofit organizations, cities and States and public and Indian housing authorities. Funding will help participants design and execute their plans for resident management and buyouts of public and assisted housing.

The HOPE initiative also targets \$258 million in 1992 for a new shelter plus care pro-

gram to help the homeless. The shelter plus care program will link housing with the full range of services needed by the homeless. The program will combine shelter with the support services, job training, health care and drug treatment that helps people achieve dignified and independent lives.

Now what are they saying? President Bush has a proposal for home ownership and opportunity for people everywhere, but it is a tremendous threat to the liberal Democrats. It suggests, first of all, greater flexibility. I say, "Greater flexibility is bad if you believe in the Washington system, if you believe in the bureaucratic welfare state, if you want power centralized in Washington."

The HOPE Program allows resident councils, cooperative associations, non-profit organizations to all be involved, and I say, "That's bad if you believe in the bureaucratic welfare state because it moves power away from the bureaucrats back to normal, everyday people."

This system allows participants to design and execute plans for resident management and for buyouts. This actually stands for poor people being able to buy a home someday and to have their own private property, and, if my colleagues believe in the bureaucratic welfare state, if they believe in old-time liberalism, that is bad because it means that the poor would rapidly become nonpoor, and they would have a chance to own property, and yet I would say to the Democratic leadership, "You owe it to the President to cooperate."

For example, President Bush asked for \$500 million in supplemental funding. Do my colleagues know what happened in the Committee on Appropriations? The Democrats zeroed it out. They refused to give the \$500 million to Home Ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere, and I would hope that the floor of the House, when that comes to the floor, will put that \$500 million back in in order to help, in order to give President Bush a chance to have his program work here at home. But the very people who voted against giving the President a chance in the Persian Gulf are consistently voting against giving the President a chance here at home, and the same negative attitudes that tried to cripple President Bush in the Persian Gulf are crippling President Bush in his program here at home.

It goes on. Let me continue, and I quote:

Enterprise zones will attract property by promoting investment in economically distressed neighborhoods. Enterprise zones will attract new seed capital for small business startups, create new incentives for entrepreneurial risk taking and reduce high effective tax rates on those moving to work from welfare. The Enterprise Zone and Jobs Creation Act of 1991 will target tax incentives and regulatory relief to some of our Nation's most economically depressed areas. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

would designate up to 50 urban, rural and Indian enterprise zones over a 4-year period. Designations will be based on the level of distress, as well as on the nature and extent of State and local efforts to improve living conditions and to eliminate government burdens to economic activity. Designation will be for a maximum of 24 years. The legislation will provide tax incentives to attract seed capital, stimulate employment and increase the economic return from work for the working poor. Workers will be eligible for a 5-percent refundable tax credit for the first \$10,000, \$10,500, of wages earned in enterprise zone business. This will put up to \$525 more income in the pockets of low income workers. The credit phases out between 20 and \$25,000 of total annual wages. To spur investment, capital gains taxes will be eliminated for gains and investment in tangible property; for example, buildings and equipment used in business located in an enterprise zone for at least 2 years. To encourage entrepreneurial risk taking, individuals will be permitted to expense investments in the capital of corporations engaged in enterprise zone business. This essentially provides an immediate writeoff for investments in enterprise zone businesses. Corporations must have less than \$5 million of total assets. Expensing will be permitted up to \$50,000 annually per investor with a \$250,000 lifetime limit.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation would also give enterprise zone communities priority for a free-trade-area status. Such status would, for example, allow a business in an enterprise zone to import materials duty-free, if the materials are used to manufacture products for export to other countries. Enterprise zones would reduce Federal tax revenues by \$1.8 billion over 5 years.

Now notice what we are saying. President Bush is prepared to invest \$1,800 million, and I might say that is on a static model; that is, without any kind of reflow from additional jobs, additional income, additional productivity. He is willing to invest that money in the poorest parts of America, in the poorest parts of the inner city, in the poorest parts of the Indian reservations, in the poorest parts of rural America. He is willing to set up 50 enterprise zones around America as an experiment to see if we can create jobs, to create jobs in New York City, in Philadelphia, in Chicago, in Atlanta, to have an opportunity for the very poorest citizens to go to work, to get off of welfare, and what is the answer from the Democratic leadership? It is to smother the bill.

Notice the Democratic tactic. First the Democrats say that President Bush does not have an agenda. They then kill the agenda in a subcommittee or committee. Then, since he never had the agenda, we are not supposed to notice that they killed it. Then, since they killed it, it cannot come to the floor, which further proves he does not have an agenda. Then they will bring their bill for a bigger welfare state, and more bureaucracy and higher taxes to the floor, and they will say, "Since the President doesn't have an agenda, this is the only thing we can do. So, you

have to vote for our agenda, if you want something."

Now it is nonsense. It assumes the American people are too dumb to look at what the President is doing. It assumes the President is not able to communicate what he is doing. It assumes that we Republicans are standing by idly and are allowing a series of rules to come to the floor and to allow a series of scheduling decisions which kill the reform program, and kill the new initiatives, and kill the opportunity society, and then we are going to stand by passively and allow the very people who are so totally wrong about the Persian Gulf to be equally wrong about America and not say anything. That is not the way it is going to happen. I believe my colleagues are going to see us fight to bring an enterprise zone legislation to the floor, and we are going to fight in the name of the poor.

I ask, "Why shouldn't a working American in the poorest neighborhood be allowed to take \$525 more in take-home pay home, which is what President Bush wants, and why should the liberal Democrats take that \$525 out of the pocket of the poorest low-income workers in the poorest neighborhoods in America? Why shouldn't a small business that has the courage to open up in a poor neighborhood be given a chance to expense its investment in 1 year, to be able to have a tremendous incentive?"

We are in the middle of a session, and we are going to hear all sorts of liberal Democrats talk about jobs programs and more bureaucratic welfare state ideas, but why do we not instead encourage small businesses, many of them owned by women, many of them owned by minorities, to go out and create new jobs and have an opportunity in our very poorest areas to create the kind of permanent job, not a temporary welfare state job, not a temporary bureaucratic job, but a permanent job in the private sector creating new goods and services?

□ 1820

So I hope the Democratic leadership will decide to allow us to bring to the floor and will help us pass an enterprise zones bill. But instead of pretending that the President does not have a domestic agenda, why not next week schedule an enterprise zones bill? The fact is that enterprise zones have been around here before. Jack Kemp, I believe, introduced the very first bill in about 1977. These are enterprise zones that then Congressman Kemp, now Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has been fighting for, and that President Bush has been fighting for. This is an idea whose time has come.

"Why don't you go ahead," I say to the Democratic leadership, "and bring that bill to the floor?"

Let me continue. President Bush has an agenda that reaches beyond just traditional areas. And I quote:

A vital element in the effort to protect the civil rights of all Americans is the vigorous enforcement of existing antidiscrimination laws. Over the past two years, the Bush Administration has moved aggressively to fight hate crimes and combat discrimination in housing, voting, employment, and education. A few examples.

Enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act in July 1990 was one of the most important expansions of civil rights protections in a quarter of a century. The Administration is now pursuing swift implementation of the landmark law.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] is aggressively enforcing the 1988 Fair Housing Amendments which prohibit housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, or disability. The Bush Administration has resolved nearly 12,000 of the almost 16,000 fair housing cases.

In 1989, the Justice Department prosecuted more than twice as many hate crimes cases as in any previous year. In 1990, the Justice Department had a 100 percent success rate in prosecuting hate crimes.

In 1990, the Department of Education received and resolved more civil rights complaints than in any previous year of its history—and in record time.

The largest settlements in the history of the Department of Labor's Federal Contract Compliance cases have been achieved during the Bush Administration. A single case involving employment discrimination against women and minorities resulted in a payment of \$14 million. In another case, a back pay settlement of \$3.5 million will benefit approximately 1,000 women who were discriminated against in hiring.

The Administration is committed to strengthening the strong employment discrimination laws that now exist. These improvements will remove consideration of factors such as sex, race, religion, or national origin from employment decisions. This can be done without encouraging the use of quotas or preferential treatment, without departing from the fundamental principles of fairness that apply throughout our legal system, and without creating a litigation bonanza that brings more benefits to lawyers than to victims.

A major objective of the Administration is to ensure that Federal law provides strong new remedies for harassment based on sex, race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Administration will propose to codify a cause of action for "disparate impact," involving employment practices that unintentionally exclude disproportionate numbers of certain groups from some jobs. The burden of proof will be shifted to the employer on the issue of "business necessity."

The time has come for Congress to bring itself under the same anti-discrimination requirements it prescribes for others.

Other improvements, including changes in certain provisions affecting statutes of limitations and encouragement for the use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, will also enhance the administration of our comprehensive civil rights laws.

Now, let us notice what the administration is saying. It is saying that we want a civil rights bill. The President is prepared to sign a civil rights bill, but what he will not accept is a quota bill. I think it would be very easy for

the Democratic leadership to pass everything they know the President will sign. Let us strengthen the civil rights laws right now, and let us go ahead and get into law the kind of things President Bush is committed to and that he has clearly indicated he will sign. And let us make sure that we have further strengthened the law against discrimination, but at the same time let us not get involved in a long, drawn-out fight over quotas.

The President is going to veto a quota bill. The veto will be sustained in the House, and I believe it can be sustained in the Senate. It is not going to pass. So I think it is foolish for the Democratic leadership to be so committed to a quota bill that it blocks the passage of a good antidiscrimination, pro-civil-rights act in an effort to get quotas through, and I would encourage the Democratic leadership to recognize that once again the President does have a domestic agenda, that he is asking for real reforms, that there is a bill he would sign, and that they should bring a civil rights bill to the floor that does not have quotas in it but is signable by President Bush.

Let me go further. I quote:

EXPANDING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER AMERICANS BY LIBERALIZING THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST

If social security recipients aged 65 to 69 wish to supplement their benefits with earnings, they may earn only up to \$9,720 this year before their social security benefits are reduced. Beyond \$9,720, each three dollars of earnings reduces their social security benefits by one dollar.

For retirees with sources of income other than earnings, such as private pensions and investment income, this limitation on allowable earnings may have little effect on their lives. Presently, the earnings test falls most heavily on elderly persons who do not have significant savings or income from pension plans, and can seriously constrain their choices of employment.

The President's fiscal year 1992 budget proposes an increase in the amount of allowable earnings for social security recipients aged 65 to 69.

For 1992, allowable earnings would be increased \$800, or 8 percent, from \$10,200 to \$11,000.

For 1993, the increase would be \$200, from \$10,800 to \$11,000.

For 1994, allowable earnings would continue to rise to the level projected under current law, \$11,400.

So the President is proposing a \$1,200 increase in the amount people can earn if they are retired without having to have anything taken away. We must realize that our senior citizens pay the highest marginal tax rate on additional income. If you are poor and you are earning just barely \$10,200 and you go to work and you are in a situation where you want to be able to earn a little bit extra, the minute you reach the current threshold, which for this year will be \$10,200, you will have a third of your money taken away because the Social Security Administration will reduce your Social Security check by \$1

for every \$3 you are earning. So you are going to pay that kind of a tax on what you are earning. Let us say you are in the 15 percent bracket; you are going to pay 15 percent on the money you earn, plus you are going to lose one-third of it because it is going to reduce your social security benefit. So your effective marginal rate is 48 percent, the highest rate paid by anybody, and that is being paid by our senior citizens.

The President, given the budget constraints, thinks we can find the money to raise that ceiling by \$1,200. He has a proposal to reform the limitation. I personally would like to go even further. I would like to eliminate the penalty. I would like to encourage senior citizens to stay active. But he is at least taking a step in the right direction, and I would say to the Democratic leadership, instead of ignoring the President's reform agenda, here is a place where we could schedule a bill next week, and I think it would sail through the House with a unanimous vote. I think every Member would vote to do precisely what President Bush has asked to raise the earnings limitation. It is allowed by the President's budget, it fits within the budget agreement, and we would help senior citizens by a substantial amount. This would be \$1,200 more they could earn in the next fiscal year without being penalized.

I think that is important. I think helping our senior citizens have an additional \$1,200 is good. I do not understand why the Democratic leadership, instead of fighting President Bush, does not agree to bring that reform to the floor.

But there is yet another area where the President is working hard and where he needs the help of the Congress. Let me quote:

As President Bush has stated in the past, the right to be free from fear in our homes, streets, and neighborhoods is the first civil right of every American. Where streets are not safe and property is not secure, economic opportunity is impossible.

The President announced in his State of the Union Address that the Attorney General will soon convene a Crime Summit of our nation's law enforcement officials. A major objective of the Crime Summit is to strengthen the working relationship between the Administration and State and local law enforcement officials.

The Administration will again propose comprehensive violent crime control legislation to give law enforcement authorities the tools they need to apprehend, prosecute, and incarcerate violent criminals. The legislation will include:

A meaningful Federal death penalty for the most heinous crimes with procedures to ensure its fair and colorblind application.

Habeas corpus reform to reduce unnecessarily repetitive appeals that clog the courts and delay justice.

Exclusionary rule reform to ensure that the evidence gathered by law enforcement officials in a good faith belief that they are

acting lawfully can be used to help courts establish the truth.

Provisions to strengthen Federal laws concerning the safety of women by modifying rules on the admissibility of evidence in cases of sex crimes, enhancing penalties for the distribution of illegal drugs to pregnant women, increasing penalties for recidivist sex offenders, and offering greater protection for victims below the age of sixteen.

□ 1830

Now, you would think with that kind of overwhelming popular reform in the area of violent crime, that we would be able to get the Democratic leadership to bring this bill to the floor. You would think we would be able to pass these things.

Yet, I have to report to my colleagues and to the country that the President initially proposed most of his crime reform in June 1989. It has been sitting there, and the Democratic leadership refuses to pass it. Why? Because, from a liberal value standpoint, reforming the exclusionary rule to allow police to collect evidence, that might put too much power in the hands of police. Reforming the habeas corpus procedures so that criminals cannot tie up the courts and cannot tie up the law enforcement authorities, why, that might put too much power in the hands of the courts and the law enforcement authorities.

The death penalty is something that many of our liberal friends simply are opposed to. So I would say when you add in the provisions to increase safety for women, when you add in the provisions to offer greater protection for victims below the age of 16, when you add in greater provisions to enhance the penalties for the distribution of illegal drugs to pregnant women, again and again, President Bush does have a reform agenda, he does want a safer America, he does want to do something about violent crime and drugs. And, for some reason, the Democratic leadership will not bring it to the floor, will not let us pass it.

We had an example of this action the very first day we were in session. The very first day we were in session, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], the Republican leader, offered an amendment which would have changed the rule to bring a balanced budget constitutional amendment to the floor.

Now, a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget is one of the most popular political provisions that we have. Something like 78 percent of the American people favor a balanced budget amendment. They look at the Congress spend and spend and spend, they look at the Congress raising taxes, and they say to themselves, "We are never going to be in a position to bring the budget under control until we have a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget."

On the very opening day, every Democrat in the House voted against bring-

ing up a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. Yet the Democratic leadership could schedule this week or next week a balanced budget amendment, and we could have a vote on it.

I want to wrap up by making this point: President Bush was given the authority to use his power as Commander in Chief, and we won an extraordinary success in the Persian Gulf. We were able to win, frankly, faster, with less loss of life, than many of us thought possible. We were able to be decisive. We were able to organize intelligently. We were able to get the job done.

President Bush has for 2½ years been sending reform ideas up to the Congress. President Bush has been asking for excellence in education, for reform of the criminal procedures, for enterprise zones to create jobs in the inner city, for better opportunity for homeownership, for a range of changes which would begin to shift from the bureaucratic welfare state toward an opportunity society.

Again and again and again, the liberal Democratic leadership of the Congress has refused to pass that kind of legislation. They have refused to bring it out of committee.

As I reported earlier, as recently as last week the Democrats on the Committee on Appropriations rejected President Bush's request to reprogram \$500 million to allow the new program for home ownership and opportunity for people everywhere to get off the ground, to get started.

I think the strategy is very clear. The Democratic leadership hopes to say in the press over and over again,

The President has no domestic program. We are glad he is strong in foreign policy. We are glad he knows what he is doing with military force. Gee, it is a pity he is not doing anything here at home.

They intend apparently, the Democratic leadership, to simply take everything which is new and different and say it does not exist.

It is a little bit like the way the Iraqis looked at the American military. Since the Iraqis had never seen an F-117, they did not know what it could do. Since the Iraqis had never seen a Patriot missile, they did not know what it could do. Since the Iraqis did not understand what our technology could do with a Tomahawk cruise missile, they did not know what it could do. So they simply ignored it.

Similarly, the Democratic leadership does not seem to understand that these are new ideas, new reforms, new initiatives, new approaches. Then they hope, having ignored everything that the President is asking for, to convince the news media and to convince the country not to pay attention down in the subcommittees and down in the committees, where the Democrats have stacked the game, where they have

more power than they have in the House as a whole, and far more power than they have in the country as a whole.

They hope to kill these programs, to kill the death penalty in the Committee on the Judiciary, to kill the constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget, to wipe out the new home ownership program of Secretary Kemp, and never let it come to the floor, to wipe out educational choice and never let it come to the floor.

Then they hope to come to the floor and say, "You see, we told you the President doesn't have a program, and we can prove it, because it is not out here on the House floor."

Now, I just want to sort of set the record straight, and I want to serve notice: We are going to fight every rule which bottles up President Bush's reform program. We are going to force votes on the floor on the initiatives the President wants.

Now, I do not always agree with the President. At least once last year I actively, strongly worked against him. I do not believe we ought to pass, *carte blanche*, everything the President asks. I think under our constitutional system, we ought to look at it, we ought to criticize it, we ought to take it apart, we ought to put it back together, we ought to improve it.

But I do think that the President of the United States deserves to have his program get to the floor. The parts that are bad, we will beat. But then we will be on record. People back home who want to see new idea and new approaches to replace the welfare state can see how we vote. They can listen to the debate. They can look at what is going on.

But there is something fundamentally wrong when a President is at 91 percent approval, when he and his party have held the White House for over 10 years, and when the Democratic leadership, instead of trying to cooperate, trying to understand, and trying to implement, decides that they are going to smother our programs and kill our programs in subcommittees and committees, and never let them see the light of day.

I think that is bad for America, I think it is bad for the poor, I think it is bad for the big cities, and I think it is just the wrong way to do business.

Again, just to take that one example of enterprise zone legislation, when the President of the United States sends up to the Congress a proposal that will put \$525 in the pocket of low-income workers up to \$10,500, now, think about that; \$525. The very poorest workers in New York City could next month take \$525 home more on an annualized basis. The poorest workers in Philadelphia, the poorest workers in St. Louis.

Now, I do not know why the Democrats do not allow workers who are poor to take that money home. Or to

say to the very smallest businesses, if you have the courage to go in and open up your business in these enterprise zones in the heart of the inner city, to go into West Virginia, to go into rural Montana, why are we not going to pass this?

I would say that the Democrats who claim that they want to help the poor have a number of offers from the President of bills he will sign that they could pass in the next 2 weeks. People in this Congress who claim they are worried about the recession, the President has sent up legislation which will help us with a recession.

But the fact is, as the Wall Street Journal pointed out, every day that the Democratic leadership fails to bring up the Resolution Trust Corporation funding, it not only costs an additional \$8 million a day, but it just further weakens the economy in terms of the recession. It makes it so a few more people are unemployed, it is a little harder to get out of the recession.

So I would say to the Democratic leadership, I hope you will drop this strategy of pretending that President Bush does not have a domestic reform agenda. I hope you will instead decide to cooperate. I hope that you will decide to work with the President.

I think you will find on our side of the aisle, if you want to produce a bipartisan series of rules and you want to bring to the floor liberal legislation for the bureaucratic welfare state and the President's reform proposals, let us vote them up or down. You are going to find the Republicans cooperating.

If you want to work out some procedures where we can look at the President's new ideas, and we can also look at new ideas by liberal Democrats, we are going to cooperate.

What we are not going to accept is the idea that you are going to smother the President's reform proposals, kill the House Republican reform proposals, wipe them out in subcommittee, wipe them out in committee, strangle them in the Committee on Rules, never let them get to the floor, and then come down here and bring only your ideas.

I think the average American who has watched President Bush be effective over the last couple of months will agree, that while not everything the administration sends up is right, at least it deserves a fair shot. I think every American will agree that the bureaucratic welfare state is an idea whose time is past.

The truth is, we just saw a 21st-century American military defeat a 20th-century opponent. We have a chance over the next few years to help the rest of America get into the 21st century. We have a chance to improve our health care, to improve our education, to improve our housing.

President Bush wants to be able to work to create the kind of domestic re-

forms that will let us get to that kind of 21st-century America. I want to work with him. I am very willing to work with the Democratic leadership, if they will bring to the floor genuinely bipartisan legislation, and a genuine opportunity to work together.

□ 1840

I commend them today for the decision to bring the Broomfield resolution to the floor commending the President and commending our troops. That was the right thing to do. It was a bipartisan thing to do. It passed with an overwhelming vote, and I am grateful that the Democratic leadership brought it to the floor.

But I would beg them to look carefully at the situation we are in. Back off from this strategy of trying to pretend there is not a domestic agenda and instead reach out a helping hand, and you are going to find on our side of the aisle a very great willingness to work with you. We would much rather pass legislation together and enact these reforms, and we can improve them together. I am not asking you to adopt what the President has sent up. I am asking you to consider and bring to the floor and let the House improve what the President is sending up. But I am asking you to give the President's program a fair chance, and if you decide to do that, I promise you, we will do all we can on the Republican side to pass those fair rules, to get things to the floor in an expeditious way, to have a positive, issue-oriented debate, and then to be able to go back home saying yes, we really did pass reforms that created jobs, that created homes, that strengthened education, that strengthened our opportunities for good health care. That ought to be the tone.

We have a chance to come out of Desert Storm with a country that is not only confident but unified, and I am very saddened to see this new Democratic strategy of pretending President Bush does not have any kind of domestic reform agenda. I do not think it will work, and I do think that we have an obligation to try to work together.

So I extend my hand. I am very willing to work with the Democratic leadership, but it has to be on fair terms, and it has to be in a framework where the President's reform ideas get a fair shot.

THE TAX FAIRNESS FOR FAMILIES ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Tax Fairness for Families Act of 1991, with the support of more than 15 of our colleagues.

Today we are very fortunate, that with our success in the gulf war, we will very soon be seeing our troops coming back home. We are justifiably proud of their accomplishments. As President Bush said last month, in the land of the free, we must sometimes also be the home of the brave.

It is fitting that we take an opportunity to learn a lesson from this chapter in history on how we can take decisive action against evil and prevail. While editorial writers may ask, "Can the nation that saved Kuwait rescue its own children?" we must appreciate going into this battle that family problems are, in many respects, more intractable.

However, we can still turn our renewed energy and efforts to restoring a new community order for children and families at home. With an emerging shared vision of a "can do" America we can be hopeful that once again it will be "Morning in America" for families.

Families today face the twin deficits of time and money. A recent article entitled "The Parent Trap" set out the dilemma that many parents face: "So many bills, so little time." Unfortunately in this equation, children are often shortchanged. Today, many American families are nearly running on empty. When they pull up for refueling, they are too often met by a government that siphons off what little fuel they have left. Since we know that families are the most cost-efficient vehicle for children to travel in, we need to at least allow them to keep the little resources they have.

The Tax Fairness for Families Act of 1991 is the first step in what I hope is a larger effort to truly focus on the family in the 102d Congress. Although the Tax Fairness for Families Act will only restore the exemption for children to approximately half of what it should be if it has kept pace with inflation, per capita income, and increasing family costs; it is my goal to reach the appropriate level, estimated to be approximately \$6,000 to \$7,800 in 1990 dollars, by the year 2000.

However, as we begin this focus on the family it is important to know where we are going—to have a vision for families. We have learned from experience that if we don't know where we are going, any road can get us nowhere. In fact, from the dramatically poor statistics on family indicators of well-being, it appears that the family express has apparently been on the road to nowhere for sometime now.

It is also important to know who should be leading us down this road. In doing so, I would like to note that in assessing the success of the military operations in the gulf, Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf applauded President Bush for allowing the military to "fight this war exactly as it should have been fought." The emphasis here is that those who knew best how to fight a war—the military themselves—were given the autonomy and resources and were not hampered in their efforts by arm chair experts and those removed from the everyday realities.

Similarly, in the battle to save the family we should provide broader latitude to those who are most directly knowledgeable and proficient in family matters—the parents and family members themselves. As Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Louis Sullivan has noted, "many have overlooked the most pow-

erful supporter, advocate, and ally children have—the family."

Yet the family itself has been one of the least underfunded departments over the past several decades. The Tax Fairness for Families Act which increases the deduction for dependents to \$3,500, from the present level of \$2,050, is a first step on the road to economic freedom for families whereby they can provide more for themselves and of themselves in matters involving their children. Nevertheless, I would like to put this bill in the greater context of a vision for families as we look toward the 21st century.

I have been a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families since its inception in 1982. On this committee I have become all too familiar with the declining condition of children in today's culture. Pediatricians and child development experts of all stripes agree that the most important ingredient in a child's life is the consistent love and support of a primary caregiver. Dr. T. Berry Brazelton has written on how important it is "to listen to a child"—to be tuned in to a child's needs. And Dr. James Dobson has warned us of the time-consuming challenges of parenting in warning, "parenting isn't for cowards!"

Yet children are often not listened to, nor courageously reared. From outright violence and abuse, down the scale to neglecting or ignoring the needs of a child, many children today are falling far short of what common sense tells us is beneficial for them and society.

Perhaps the overwhelming statistics on increased teen violence and arrests, increased suicide and homicides by teens on teens, increased teenage pregnancy, increased numbers of single parents, increased child abuse and neglect, and the still high levels of infant mortality and drug use, cease to have an impact on us anymore—we have been numbed by the numbers. Yet depravity is becoming a way of life for a small, but considerable, group of children. Many observers have identified a pattern of crimes by children who do not seem to have a conscience. We were justifiably shocked by the Central Park "wilding" incident and the gruesome murder several years ago here in Washington, DC, of Catherine Fuller, a middle-aged mother who was gang raped and murdered in an alleyway by a group of young boys who sang and joked throughout this atrocity. For many children today, childhood has become a dangerous venture through "The Killing Fields," where they are both the hunter and the hunted.

Our children deserve far better and if for no other reason than to save our own skins we must, instead of offering them "The Killing Fields" begin to build them a "Field of Dreams" in which their physical, mental, social, and spiritual health is cultivated and nourished.

In order to do so, it is necessary to speak normatively about what is good for the family and to support and sustain it as one of the most valuable resources of society. This case has been persuasively made by many across the political spectrum:

It's not enough to mourn the good old days, when neighborhoods were safe and people cared about their neighbors. We have to

do what we can to restore the values of the good old days, or the days ahead will be worse than anything we can now imagine.—William Raspberry, Syndicated Columnist.

There is no commitment in the world like having children. Even though they often will drive you to consider commitment of another kind, the value of a family still cannot be measured. The great French writer Andre Malraux said it well: "Without a family, man, alone in the world, trembles with the cold."—Bill Cosby.

The family is not an accident of history, it is the most basic unit of human life. The family is the cradle of our infancy, the foundation of our youth, and the scaffolding of our majority.—Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Louis Sullivan.

Fathers and mothers, if you have children . . . they must come first. You must read to your children, you must hug your children, you must love your children. Your success as a family * * * our success as a society * * * depends not on what happens at the White House, but on what happened inside your house.—First Lady, Barbara Bush.

* * * studies aren't necessary to discover what common sense tells us—intact families are better off—mothers and fathers both need to be there. Children need their parents. Too many of America's children are suffering from a "parent deficit."—Dr. James Dobson, "Focus on the Family."

Americans believe "parents having less time to spend with their families" is the most important reason for the family's decline in our society, according to a recent survey. And most parents would like to see the work-family pendulum swing back in the direction of home. . . . To be sure most children would not object to spending more time with their parents.—William Mattox, Family Research Council.

Government cannot, under any set of conditions, provide the kind of nurturance that children, particularly young children, need. Given all the money in the world, government programs will not be able to instill self-esteem, good study habits, advanced language skills, or sound moral values in children as effectively as can strong families * * * Government will never have the resources or the ability to replace what children lose when they lose supportive families. This suggests that the focus of public policy should be to look for ways to create stable families, not substitute families.—Progressive Policy Institute.

As these examples demonstrate, in speaking about the family normatively, we can still work within a context of great diversity. However, the similarities will be in the communal values held by families, the ideals held up to children, and the priority placed on "putting children first." No doubt, Bill Cosby and First Lady Barbara Bush would have many similar stories about how they each raised their five children.

Robert Woodson, of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, has long advocated the study of success:

You cannot learn to produce success by studying failure. It's a mystery to me why we spend so much time crying over our failures and so little time trying to learn from our successes.

His work in advocating self-help for minorities is well known. Here in Washington, his organization was instrumental in promoting the resident ownership of the successful Ken-

ilworth-Parkside housing development in Northeast, DC.

Using the entrepreneurial skills of the residents, businesses were established within the project to provide jobs for unemployed tenants. The management has not only succeeded in taking residents off welfare by giving them jobs, they also have kept families together and sent more than 500 youngsters off to college through strong community programs.

This community, value-based effort also had other startling results: teenage pregnancies dropped by 50 percent, welfare dependency was reduced by 50 percent, and crime was reduced by 75 percent. As Mr. Woodson points out, many social programs today unwisely spend much of their money studying failure. As Tolstoy wrote long ago, "All happy families are alike, every unhappy family is unhappy in its own way." Since failure has so many faces, it is just good common sense to study and model success.

If we study the successes we will find that families are indeed the best Department of Health and Human Services. The simplest and most effective way to reinvest and strengthen families is by allowing families to keep their hard-earned money. It makes no sense for Government to take away a family's own money with one hand only to return a small Government-sponsored allowance with the other hand.

This broad consensus for letting families be families has resulted in extensive support for increasing the dependent deduction. Diverse groups such as the Heritage Foundation, the Family Research Council, and the Progressive Policy Institute have all called for an increase in the personal exemption for children.

A FAMILY FIELD OF DREAMS

I. FIRST BASE—REESTABLISHING FINANCIAL INTEGRITY TO FAMILIES

By making a restoration of fiscal fitness to families a goal and priority, families will better be able to allocate their time and money in favor of family concerns. In comparison to Government programs, families require much less overhead and oversight to perform effectively. A dollar in the hands of a caring parent can be stretched more creatively than any Government expert might imagine.

A. INCREASING THE DEPENDENT DEDUCTION

Children are an investment in the future. The existence of the dependent deduction recognizes that families with children need more of their earned money to support themselves. The primary purpose for the personal exemption is to provide a threshold of income that is not subject to Federal income tax. Considering that even a restoration of the dependent deduction to 1948 levels would not put families where they were in 1948 because of the increased costs of social security, we should at least begin to provide some equity in comparison to other taxpayers by enacting this modest measure.

The personal exemption and dependent deduction have not kept up with income growth or inflation. In 1948, the personal exemption was set at \$600. By 1979, the exemption was raised to \$1,000. In 1985, it was finally indexed for inflation. The 1986 tax reform resulted in an increase in the personal exemp-

tion to \$2,000. With indexing the current level for tax year 1990 is \$2,050.

In 1948, a family of four had approximately three-quarters of its income shielded from Federal income tax. Today that percentage has eroded to only one-quarter. If the personal exemptions were to offset the same percentage of average income as it did in 1948, it would be worth approximately \$7,800 today.

Families are carrying an increasingly disproportionate burden of taxes. For example, in 1990, a single parent with two children earning \$14,000—whose approximate take home pay would be less than \$1,000 a month—would have to pay Federal income tax of \$469. This same family would be eligible for numerous Government subsidized services at this income level. Under the Tax Fairness for Families Act the Federal income tax would be reduced to \$32. That this below sustenance level family is presently subject to Federal income tax shows how much the personal exemption has been allowed to erode.

In two-earner families we often find that the second earner's wages only covers the tax bite. It is estimated that the second earner in a family is only earnings 28 percent of total family income at present. This is just about the size of the average family's total family tax bill of 24 percent of income. In other words, for the average family, a second income only covers the bills from Uncle Sam. When contemplating the considerable burdens taken on by two-earner couples, this result is a strikingly unfair reward for their efforts.

There are also many low to lower middle class one-earner families who, recognizing the reality that a second salary will only marginally improve their situation, elect to have one parent stay home with children. Their loss in income, however, is not met with any additional tax relief, despite the fact they are providing a valuable resource to society by caring and nurturing their own children.

Many parents today also operate on what has come to be known as a tag team parenting schedule where parents work different shifts in order for at least one parent to be available to provide all or most of the child care needs of the family at any given time. There are little tax benefits for those performing such juggling acts.

There are just a few of the families who are lost in the shuffle in the family debate. In terms of the value of the dependent deduction, children today are worth only one-quarter of what they were in 1948. Is it any wonder that the burden is increasing for families and they are less able to perform effectively when the Tax Code only provides for our grandchildren one-quarter of the tax protection that we provide to our parents?

Therefore, the Tax Fairness for Families Act which will increase the dependent deduction for children under 18 to \$3,500, is an important start that can be viewed as the first downpayment on an improved future for families. We should aim to reach the appropriate level by the year 2000.

B. OTHER TAX RELIEF MEASURES FOR FAMILIES

We should also consider other additional tax measures to make the Tax Code more family friendly. We can look into expanding the young child tax credit that was adopted last fall. Currently, a family making less than ap-

proximately \$20,000 is eligible for up to \$357 in tax credit for a child under 1 year of age. We should look into expanding this concept by age, income range, and amount.

We can also develop tax language for an easier deduction to be taken for homebased offices for those who are primary caretakers and conduct their primary business from home.

Additional tax protection to those families who adopt children and provide foster care should also be explored. Particularly with foster care we should look more to the private sector to solve this pressing public problem.

SECOND BASE—PROVIDING MORE OPTIONS FOR FAMILIES

With an agenda for tax fairness on base, we can also turn to providing more work options for families. I have long supported what one commentator has called a "more fluid, less rigid job market" by promoting flexitime, flexiplace, home-based work, telecommuting, part-time, and job sharing opportunities so that each family may decide for themselves what work options they find most suitable for their situation.

Numerous poll studies show that more and more parents wish to spend more time with their children and want more flexibility to allow for either taking time out of the work force or cutting back their work hours. Many parents are experiencing what President Bush has called "the irresistible force of a child's hand" leading them to spend more time at home. In particular, a majority of mothers of preschool children express their desire to be home with their children. To use the words of one support group for mothers, these mothers are interested in finding ways in which "they can put their families first without putting themselves last." These mothers take comfort in the fact that role models such as Margaret Thatcher, Sandra Day O'Connor, and Jeanne Kirkpatrick took time off from employment when their children were young and later resumed their careers with great acclaim. Since all experts agree that increased parent care is the ideal situation and it is what many mothers want, we should not be financially closing off this option to families.

It is important to recognize that by providing tax fairness and options we are not trying to dictate to families what is best for them. Rather these measures put in place a system that offers families different options to meet their diverse family needs. This policy demonstrates a proper respect for the diversity among today's families. Some families with children wish to have one earner stay home full-time with the children, others have one parent cut back to parttime, while others still return to the workplace fulltime.

Today, it is also more apparent that mothers are not entrenched in an exclusively working camp or an at-home camp; rather many cross back and forth between the two camps throughout their lives depending upon their family needs, their financial needs, the ages of their children, the number of children they have, and their own personal interest. Many mothers and fathers at home are also venturing into home-based businesses or telecommuting or other flexible job opportunities.

Therefore, there is no need to play one group of families off of another. In a fluid, less rigid job market, stereotypes will be harder to find. We must transcend the dichotomy that has previously characterized the family debate and recognize that while some families have been treated more unfairly than others, almost all families have been unfairly treated in the Tax Code and most families would also welcome more options in their work and financial picture.

THIRD BASE—CREATING A CULTURE OF CHARACTER

Even with economic security and options in place, it is necessary to continue the debate in the context of the culture of society. Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Louis Sullivan has compellingly called for a debate on the need for a culture of character:

If character is to be cultivated in our young, the nation's cultural and intellectual leadership must celebrate self-discipline and family commitment, rather than self-indulgence and short-term gratification. Our media must honor those who succeed through hard work and discipline—not those who succeed by preying on others.

Government has a role to play, as well. Our public officials must use their "bully pulpits" to emphasize the importance of values in the lives of our children. That's what my "culture of character" campaign is all about.

As Dr. Sullivan has noted, many family problems today stem largely from poor behavioral choices. These choices also lead to family structures that are disastrous for a child's economic security:

***in any given year, nine out of ten children from intact (i.e. two-parent) families avoid poverty, but one out of two children living in a female-headed households are poor *** The last few decades have witnessed the parallel growth of two trends—children being raised in single-parent families and children living in poverty. One child in five is poor, and one child in five is raised in a female-headed household.

This is not to say that all single parent families are doomed. In fact study after study shows that:

*** children raised in an environment of strong values and moral guidance tend to thrive in every way. For the generation of children growing up without two biological parents, we can strive to provide a family-like experience. Extended kin networks are an invaluable resource in providing loving homes, care and attention.

This evidence demonstrates that it is even more crucial for families on the edge that a culture of character be promoted. Columnist William Raspberry weighs in with one of the simple reasons "why so many youngsters haven't learned the values espoused by their elders: They haven't been taught."

Therefore, financial security for families must go hand in hand with a forceful debate on the need for a family friendly cultural reform. As we improve the financial state of families we must then also demand an increasing responsibility by the parents in these families. This is especially important for those children who still face evil everyday in their own families. A community steeped in a culture of character would reach out to help those still trapped in the darkness of family disintegration. For some children, a neglectful or abusive parent threatens their very existence. And

as we have recently seen in the reports on the lawsuit against the District's foster care system, often a faceless bureaucracy is equally as dangerous to a child as an abusive parent.

Yet there is hope if we fight this war one battle at a time. Mother Teresa, perhaps the most famous social worker of all time, tells of how she started out with only 5 rupees, "but gradually, as people came to know what I was doing, they brought things and money." Mother Teresa challenges the conventional wisdom about providing for the disadvantaged:

I do not agree with the big way of doing things. To us what matters is an individual. To get to love the person we must come in close contact with him. If we wait until we get the numbers, then we will be lost in the numbers. And we will never be able to show that love and respect for the person.

For those who might doubt the existence of other Mother Teresas I would offer the example of Ann Brown, a constituent from my district who works at George Washington Hospital. Ann knows all too well about the results of cultural and family breakdown for children. Ann is the discharge coordinator for the neonatal intensive care unit at George Washington University Medical Center. Many of the babies under her care are born prematurely to single mothers on drugs, especially crack cocaine.

Every week, Ann visits many of the recently discharged and their children at their homes in unsafe neighborhoods and hotels for the homeless. She reviews the child's care with the mother, provides free formula and schedules future visits with the mother. When a story about Ann's work appeared last fall in the Washingtonian magazine, she was met with offers of "things and money" for these children—not unlike Mother Teresa's experience. Former patients offered clothing and equipment for their children and Ann keeps a cache of these donated supplies in her car and distributes items as she makes her rounds each week—an effort that is not in her job description and is voluntary on her part.

As Ann observes, "darkness often enters the world through families, even at birth." The problem of evil is very real to these children. "People are living in a fantasy world if they think they can do whatever they want to do and it's not going to have any consequences," Ann explains. Yet Ann believes in the possibility of change and challenges the mothers to make better and healthier choices for themselves and their children. She also "prays for the babies, first seeking the mother's permission." Only once, she says, "has she been asked not to." Culture does have consequences but so do points of light such as Ann Brown.

We can no longer ridicule good character and expect to find it amongst our children. Jaime Escalante, the teacher on whom the movie "Stand and Deliver" is based, is known for his exhortation that "children will rise to the level of expectation." While it is true that not all children will be able to excel; this practice of holding up ideals at least sets a standard instead of the fashionable lowest-common-denominator approach.

Fortunately, today we are hearing more voices in favor of abandoning our neutrality

about the culture our children are raised in. Individuals across the ideological spectrum are recognizing that when children are in the war zone, neutrality is an egregious evasion of responsibility.

HOME PLATE—BUT NOT HOME FREE

Even with this game plan in place, it is important to recognize that no strategy for dealing with fallible human beings is foolproof. "Civilization," wrote William James, "is always in need of being saved." Since time began, men and women have been continually challenged by the obstacles presented in family life. As the song says even "Adam raised a Cain."

From the inception of our Government, this concept has been recognized. James Madison wrote in the Federalist Papers, "if men were angels, no government would be necessary." But men are not angels and this reality is brought home to us everyday here at home and abroad. Tragically, for some children, they need not live in a war zone to experience evil. The notorious case of 6-year old Lisa Steinberg, beaten to death by her father, attorney Joel Steinberg, reminds us of the potential for family violence. A culture of character will properly demand a heavy price from those who prey upon and destroy the lives of children.

The presence of evil constantly challenges us to be vigilant when it comes to our children. As William Bennett states:

*** the membrane separating civilized behavior from barbarism is a thin one. For children, adults are that membrane. You needn't travel to a desert island [such as in Lord of the Flies] to see this truth in action; in some cities, all you have to do is travel to the nearest street corner, or subway. The amazing thing is that where the membrane is present, where parents do their work, children can survive even enormous disadvantages.

The aim of the Tax Fairness for Families Act, which I am introducing today, is to reduce the economic hardships that families face and allow parents to do their work. Economically invigorated families would then serve as a model and resource to culturally impoverished families who have been the most ill-served by the erosion of the family over the past several decades.

Once again, we need to put a human face on compassion. The Progressive Policy Institute writes of the concern developing in the Scandinavian welfare states, in which the group sense of obligation "to distant strangers" is "beginning to make it more difficult to express a sense of obligation to those with whom one shares family ties. The irony of this development may be that as intimate ties weaken, so will distant ones."

A return to a personal culture of character by financially secure families may very well be the success study needed for a new community order.

CONCLUSION

And so, I hope we will begin this important and crucial debate on the important needs of the family. I am not naive to the fact that I have set forth a tall order. But perhaps we need to raise the level of expectations from this body and see if we can then follow the wisdom of Mr. Escalante and rise to that level

of expectation. Today, in introducing the Tax Fairness for Families Act of 1991, I hope we will at least have thrown the ball out into the park. It is my hope for the millions of children who need our time and assistance that someone will soon be out there playing ball with them and maybe even hit a few balls out of the park.

The following provides a summary of the proposal:

SUMMARY OF THE TAX FAIRNESS FOR FAMILIES ACT OF 1991

This initiative will amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the exemption of dependent children under 18 to \$3,500. The exemption amount for nondependents will remain at the current level of \$2,050. Both amounts will be indexed for inflation.

However, the adjustment for inflation will be changed by amending the Internal Revenue Code to require that in determining the increase for inflation, such increase shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$10. Presently, the IRS is permitted to round down to the nearest multiple of \$50.

The amendments made by this act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1991.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and the balance of the week, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, each day on March 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. WOLF, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ZIMMER, for 5 minutes, on March 6.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, on March 6.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today,

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, on March 7.

Mr. WEISS, for 5 minutes, on March 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. LEWIS of California in two instances.

Ms. SNOWE in two instances.

Mr. COX in two instances.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in two instances.

Mr. GALLEGHLY.

Mr. DOOLITTLE.

Mr. MACHTLEY.

Mr. BOEHLERT in two instances.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. RINALDO in three instances.

Mr. SOLOMON in three instances.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. MCEWEN.

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

Mr. LAFALCE.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. PEASE.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. PANETTA.

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. KLECZKA.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mr. STARK in three instances.

Mr. DYMALLY.

Mr. HOCKBRUECKNER.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. MAVROULES.

Mr. DARDEN in two instances.

Mr. ERDREICH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 6, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

756. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of amounts spent on, and use of humans for testing biological and chemical warfare agents through September 30, 1990, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1511; to the Committee on Armed Services.

757. A letter from the Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting notice of proposed rulemaking on regulations to implement title I of the ADA in the Federal Register for public comment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

758. A letter from the Acting Director of National Institutes of Health, transmitting a copy of the 13th annual report of National

Institutes of Health Program in Biomedical and Behavioral Nutrition Research and Training for Fiscal Year 1989, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 288b(c); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

759. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Interior, transmitting a copy of a final audit report entitled "Accounting for Reimbursable Expenditures of Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Money, Office of Environmental Affairs, Office of the Secretary," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 nt.; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

760. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting its quarterly report concerning human rights activities in Ethiopia, covering the period October 15, 1990-January 14, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 100-456, section 1310(c) (102 Stat. 2065); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notice that effective January 24, 1991, the Department designated Riyadh and the Eastern Province of Saudi Arabia as danger pay locations, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

762. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

763. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "The U.S. Efforts to Address Climate Changes," pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2901 nt.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

764. A letter from the Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

765. A letter from the Federal Election Commission, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

766. A letter from the Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

767. A letter from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

768. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

769. A letter from the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on its activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

770. A letter from the U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

771. A letter from the U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on its

activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

772. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

773. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the Reclamation States Drought Assistance Recommendations Report, pursuant to Public Law 100-387, section 416 (102 Stat. 958); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

774. A letter from the Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's case decisions during the fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7701(1)(2); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

775. A letter from the Federal Highway Administration, transmitting the fourth status report on certain highway demonstration projects, as of September 30, 1990, pursuant to Public Law 100-17, section 149(j)(1) (101 Stat. 202); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

776. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a biennial report, "The Status of the Nation's Local Mass Transportation; Performance and Conditions," pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 308(e); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

777. A letter from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, space flight, control and data communications, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and inspector general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

778. A letter from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on Systeme Internationale (SI) metric system of measurement; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

779. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting modifications of long-term timber sale contracts in Southeast Alaska, pursuant to Public Law 101-626, section 301(d) (104 Stat. 4431); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Report of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Rept. 102-8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1281. A bill making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for the consequences of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, food stamps, unemployment compensation administration, veterans compensation and pensions, and other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September

30, 1991, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-9). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1282. A bill making supplemental appropriations and transfers for "Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm" for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-10). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 1227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit taxpayers to increase the amount of their Federal income tax liability by 5 percent for purposes of funding the Desert Storm operation; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Armed Services.

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 1228. A bill to permit certain lands in Merced County, CA, to be used for purposes of an elementary school; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr.

HERGER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ORTON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. MCCANDLESS, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1229. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the California National Historic Trail and Pony Express National Historic Trail as components of the National Trails System; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANDY (for himself, Mr.

GOODLING, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. HENRY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 1230. A bill to provide for universal access to basic group health benefits coverage and to remove barriers and provide incentives in order to make such coverage more affordable; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for

himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. KLECZKA):

H.R. 1231. A bill disapproving the extension of "fast track" procedures to bills to implement trade agreements entered into after May 31, 1991; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr.

DONNELLY):

H.R. 1232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a \$100 income tax credit to individuals who are volunteer firefighters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN (for himself, Mr.

BUNNING, and Mr. Hansen):

H.R. 1233. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to clarify the intent of the Congress regarding the establishment and collection of certain fees for vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURBIN (For himself, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. SAWYER):

H.R. 1234. A bill to provide for the payment of a special pay differential to a Federal employee serving on active duty as a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces during the Persian Gulf conflict to compensate for any decrease in pay experienced during the period of that military service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERDREICH (for himself, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. GOSS):

H.R. 1235. A bill to establish the Modular Construction Commission and provide for national regulation of modular home construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ERDREICH (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KANJORSKI)

H.R. 1236. A bill to revise the national flood insurance program to provide for mitigation of potential flood damages and management of coastal erosion, ensure the financial soundness of the program, and increase compliance with the mandatory purchase requirement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ESPY (for himself, Mr. IRELAND, and Mr. SISISKY):

H.R. 1237. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the application of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 1238. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Defense from granting a waiver of the Buy American Act or other buy-national laws in the procurement of goods or services, or in the negotiation of certain memoranda of understanding, unless the waiver is specifically authorized by statute and the Secretary has found that the waiver will not weaken the defense industrial base of the United States or otherwise endanger the national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. YATES, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. COYNE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ROE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FISH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 1239. A bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 to authorize seizures and forfeitures of vessels used to violate title I of such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. ROE,

Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TORRES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida):

H.R. 1240. A bill to provide for the rehiring of certain former air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 1241. A bill to impose a criminal penalty for flight to avoid payment of arrearages in child support; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1242. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make nondischargeable debts for liabilities under the terms of a property settlement agreement entered into in connection with a separation agreement or divorce decree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 1243. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow post differentials to be paid to Federal employees serving on detail in the Arabian Peninsula combat zone in support of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1244. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants to reduce the incidence of infant mortality and provide for the well-being of mothers and their infants through the provision of certain services in the home; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. YATRON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. STUMP, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BRUCE):

H.R. 1245. A bill to provide for the minting and circulation of \$1 coins, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. DIXON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. GRAY, Mr. WHEAT, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1246. A bill to authorize the establishment of the National African-American Museum within the Smithsonian Institution; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. LOWERY of California (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 1247. A bill to provide authorities to the Secretary of the Interior to undertake certain activities to reduce the impacts of drought conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MACHTLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. KAP-

TUR, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RHODES, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. GALLO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ECKART, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1248. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the limited deduction of health insurance costs of self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 1249. A bill to make appropriations for the planning, development, and protection of the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MOODY:

H.R. 1250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage revenue bond financing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GILCHRIST, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. DURBIN):

H.R. 1251. A bill to amend section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide rental housing assistance for displaced families affected by domestic violence; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GILCHRIST, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GREEN of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE):

H.R. 1252. A bill to authorize the State Justice Institute to analyze and disseminate information regarding the admissibility and quality of testimony of witnesses with expertise relating to battered women, and to develop and disseminate training materials to increase the use of such experts to provide testimony in criminal trials of battered women, particularly in cases involving indigent women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEILEN-SON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GILCHRIST, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1253. A bill to amend the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 to carry out research, and develop judicial training curricula, relating to child custody litigation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER (for himself, Mr. ESPY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. NEAL of Massachu-

setts, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RAY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ERDREICH, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BROWDER, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. FISH, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois):

H.R. 1254. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Margaret Walker Alexander National African-American Research Center; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEASE:

H.R. 1255. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make health insurance widely available to individuals, based on income and assets, under a competitive system; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 1256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the taxation of Social Security and tier 1 railroad retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 1257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the provision terminating the exclusion for benefits under educational assistance programs and to repeal the provision limiting such exclusion to benefits for undergraduate education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 1258. A bill to continue until the close of December 31, 1994, the existing suspension of duties on color couplers and coupler intermediates used in the manufacture of photographic sensitized material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RHODES, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ECKART, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LONG, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina):

H.R. 1259. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the luxury excise tax shall not apply to certain equipment installed on a passenger vehicle for the use of disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 1260. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on butyl methoxydibenzoylmethane; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 1261. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to eliminate the payment of

witness fees to prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 1262. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Employment Security Administration account in the unemployment trust fund for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROE, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SHARP, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 1263. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Research on Women's Health within the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GUARINI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROE, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SHARP, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Research on Women's Health and Mental Health within the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 1265. A bill to protect Federal civilian employees who were called to active military duty during the Persian Gulf crisis from diminution, due to such call, of their Federal salaries or benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1266. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on 2-(4-Aminophenyl)-6-methylbenzothiazole-7-sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1267. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on 6-Amino-1-naphthol-3-sulfonic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1268. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on 1-Amino-2-chloro-4-hydroxyanthraquinone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER):

H.R. 1269. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to remove the restriction which

prevents locality-based comparability payments from being extended to prevailing rate employees, and to provide an 8-percent pay increase to prevailing rate employees within certain high-cost areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RAY, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1270. A bill to strengthen the family structure of the United States by providing protection for eligible individuals who leave employment for a legitimate family purpose, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and House Administration.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. WELDON):

H.R. 1271. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Office of Environmental Quality for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996; to ensure consideration of the impact of Federal actions on the global environment; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 1272. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refundable income tax credit for the recycling of hazardous wastes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRICELLI:

H.R. 1273. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the payment of claims of nationals of the United States against Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1274. A bill to provide that the percentage of total apportionments of funds allocated to any State from the highway trust fund in any fiscal year be at least 95 percent of the percentage of estimated tax payments paid into the highway trust fund which are attributable to highway users in such State in the latest fiscal year for which data is available; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1275. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, relating to the determination of the minimum amount of Federal-aid highway funds to be allocated to a State in a fiscal year; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1276. A bill to provide that receipts and disbursements of the highway trust fund shall not be included in the totals of the budget of the U.S. Government or the congressional budget; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WELDON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COX of California, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. INHOPE):

H.R. 1277. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the exemption for dependent children under age 18 to \$3,500, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MFUME, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LAN-

CASTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 1278. A bill to modify the application of the antitrust laws to increase competition in trade by encouraging small businesses to jointly manufacture and distribute products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.J. Res. 170. Joint resolution designating the month of April 1991 as "National Walk For Health and Fitness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HENRY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia):

H.J. Res. 171. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning April 21, 1991, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution designating May 27, 1991, "Memorial Day," as a national day of celebration recognizing the extraordinary bravery of members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in the Persian Gulf region in connection with Operation Desert Shield/Storm; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MOLINARI, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. DE LUGO, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE):

H.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution to designate May 1991 and May 1992 as "Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. APLEGATE, and Mr. MCEWEN):

H.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives in support of a national victory parade in Washington, DC, and regional parades throughout the rest of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. RINALDO):

H.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the weeks beginning December 1, 1991, and November 29, 1992, as "National Home Care Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to designate November 16, 1991, as "Dutch-American Heritage Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should suspend all foreign assistance for Jordan until the President certifies to the Congress that Jordan is complying with the United Nations economic embargo against Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution commending employers who continue to compensate their employees who are called to active duty in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. KOLTER):

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that medical examiners and coroners should make reasonable, good-faith efforts to locate the next of kin of deceased individuals to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. LOWEY of New York (for herself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution urging Arab States to recognize, and make peace with, Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE):

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that expert testimony concerning the nature and effect of domestic violence, including descriptions of the experiences of battered women, should be admissible when offered in a State court by a defendant in a criminal case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution commending women serving in the U.S. Armed Forces with special recognition of those servicewomen in the Persian Gulf region; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. PAXON, Mr. JAMES, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H. Res. 99. Resolution supporting Operation Homefront; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. KYL, Mr.

BENNETT, Mr. GALLO, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. GRANDY, and Mr. STEARNS):

H. Res. 100. Resolution to urge the establishment of an international military tribunal to prosecute war crimes arising out of the Persian Gulf conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Charlotte S. Neal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Earl B. Chappell, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 8: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 34: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FISH, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. PACKARD, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 53: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 62: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. BERETER.

H.R. 66: Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 68: Mr. FISH, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 77: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FAWELL, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 78: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 102: Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HYDE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROE, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 103: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 104: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 105: Mr. FISH and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 107: Mr. HORTON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 116: Mr. CLINGER.

H.R. 117: Mr. PENNY, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 135: Mr. FISH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 138: Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 141: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GOSS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LENT, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 142: Mr. HORTON and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 179: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 198: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 201: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 204: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 213: Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.R. 252: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 261: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. VENTO, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ECKART, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 298: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BLAZ.

H.R. 300: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 317: Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. TALLON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. CARR.

H.R. 327: Mr. LANCASTER and Mr. LAROCO.

H.R. 330: Mr. WASHINGTON and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 355: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 369: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 371: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 375: Mr. ANDREWS of Texas and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 381: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 382: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 383: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 384: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 385: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 386: Mr. NAGLE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 400: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 401: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 414: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 415: Mr. GOSS and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 418: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 446: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 482: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 504: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. COX of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 534: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WELDON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. LUKE, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 559: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. EARLY.

H.R. 573: Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 574: Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 575: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 576: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. McDADE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WISE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RAY, Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 640: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 644: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 647: Mr. GORDON, Mr. OLIN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. HUGHES, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 652: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 667: Mr. CLAY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 673: Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 735: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 742: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 755: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 763: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 771: Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. GOSS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PARKER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 772: Mr. ECKART, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. FISH, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GROSS, Mr. DERRICK, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 784: Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. OBEY, and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 786: Mr. LENT, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 793: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DIXON, Mr. PENNY, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 797: Mr. WYDEN and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 830: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 856: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. VENTO, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 905: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 906: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 907: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 908: Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 917: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REED, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FISH, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.R. 945: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. PRICE, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 953: Mr. DELAY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FISH, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 960: Mr. MCEWEN and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 976: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FROST, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 980: Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 989: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1000: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 1001: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1016: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BILLEY, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 1021: Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 1024: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1049: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1052: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HENRY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1059: Mr. HORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MBRAZEC, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1067: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. APPELEGATE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1074: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1081: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 1089: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 1118: Mr. GALLO, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. FISH, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KYL, Mr. ROE, Mr. INHOPE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1163: Mr. HORTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1164: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1165: Mr. ESPY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. McGRATH.

H.R. 1176: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1197: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 1201: Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. OXLEY.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.J. Res. 95: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 104: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. MACTHLEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. EARLY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHUSTER, Mr. FISH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SHARP, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SWETT, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. YATRON, Mr. HERTEL, Mrs. BYRON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr.

MICHEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. LENT, Mr. WELDON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. WEISS, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.J. Res. 154: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. NATCHER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WEBER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MINETA, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.J. Res. 156: Mr. SWETT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. BRUCE.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. ECKART, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ROTH.

H. Con. Res. 56: Mr. WASHINGTON and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. FISH.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. STEARNS.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SOLO-

MON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. WALKER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H. Res. 18: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ECKART, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. KLUG, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. ESPY, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H. Res. 95: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KLUG, Mr. JAMES, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. COX of California, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. KYL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MACTHLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. HARRIS.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 759: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. BARTLETT.