

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 7, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

On this day our hearts and minds go out to all people who have any kind of need. We especially pray, O God, for the hostages from several nations who do not experience the fullness of life and who do not share the devotion and warmth of those they love. We earnestly pray that at this special time the bonds that have held them will be broken and the darkness of isolation will be illumined by the brightness of a new freedom. May they be supported by our prayers and encouraged each day by the presence of Your spirit. 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 gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. OAKAR 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.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING 5-MINUTE RULE TODAY

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be permitted to sit today for the consideration of H.R. 26, the money laundering enforcement amendments of 1991, and two bills providing funding for the RTC, while the House is sitting for amendments under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive 1-minute requests. The Chair will

limit 1-minute requests to 10 on each side.

BANKS MUST BE ENCOURAGED TO LOAN MONEY

(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, the Small Business Committee held hearings this week on the so-called credit crunch. The testimony provided a great deal of insight into this problem which many people believe is the primary reason for the current recession.

Some bankers contend that the lack of credit is due to overbearing regulators who are forcing banks to set aside large amounts of money to cover potential losses. These loan losses are the result of overvalued real estate and highly leveraged transactions among other things.

Mr. Speaker, we all support proper and stringent regulation of banks, but we need to strike a balance which will keep banks making good, quality loans. Toward this end, I want to commend the plan put forward by the banking regulators which would alter the way they judge a bank's problem loans. I am hopeful these changes will increase the amount of money available for good loans to creditworthy borrowers.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential for us to encourage banks to loan money for business expansions and new business. Without it, I am fearful that this recession will be much worse than it would be otherwise.

BRING FORWARD CLEAN RESOLUTION TRUST BILL

(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, the President last night reminded us that Desert Storm's ground operations took 100 hours, and he challenged the Congress to pass some bills in 100 days. As we look at the Resolution Trust Corporation's funding problem, we can appreciate why he may doubt the ability of Congress to act.

As of today, we have thrown away \$56 million, totally wasted money, because Congress still has not passed the Resolution Trust Corporation funding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say on behalf of the Republicans, we would extend the hand of bipartisan effort to the

Democratic leadership. If you would schedule a clean bill, we would be glad to help pass it. But to waste \$8 million a day, every day, just strikes us as a true waste of the taxpayers' money. Surely the Congress can do better.

So I say to the Democratic leaders, please bring forward a clean Resolution Trust bill.

PALESTINIANS NEED A TRUE MODERATE LEADER

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, President Bush in his fine address last night rightly stressed the importance of achieving some kind of consensus between the Israelis and the Palestinians. But if by that he or anybody else means that the PLO should play a lead role in that, it makes the future disturbingly murky.

The immediate images conjured up by the PLO are its worldwide terrorist network, bombing airports, hijacking airplanes, murdering Olympic athletes, throwing tourists from boats into the sea, commando attacks against families spending the day at the beach, and riddling buses full of women and children with bullets. Modern Palestinian history, especially that inspired by the present PLO leadership, is mired in calls for Islamic jihad, or holy war, and drenched in the blood of the Intifada. Let us not forget, that the Intifada was created to foment the violent return of the Palestinian state, founded on top of the bodies of the people of Israel. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the Intifada has killed many more Palestinians in the last year than it has Israelis.

Astonishingly, the Palestinian leadership continues to be dominated by world class terrorists. Of course, the Palestinians themselves are not a violent people. They do not carry guns, they do not throw stones. So many Palestinians on the West Bank and Gaza and around the world are doctors, lawyers, academics, teachers, and scientists. The vast majority have never committed any act of violence. Yet, as a group, they continue to let themselves be led by terrorists controlled and bankrolled by the Arab extremists from their mansions in Tunis.

If only the Palestinians could have leadership that faced the realities of the world as it exists. Yet each time a moderate Arab steps forward, and there are many of them in the West Bank and Gaza, willing to negotiate with Is-

□ 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.

rael, willing to establish peace in that region, he is shot down by his own people, literally and figuratively.

Mr. Speaker, until the Palestinians rise up in support of a true moderate leader, to be found in amplitude on the West Bank, and not a fake moderate, like King Hussein or Yasser Arafat, until then, a lasting Arab-Israeli peace will remain forever beyond anybody's grasp.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 15 United States Code 1024(a), the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Economic Committee the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. HAMILTON of Indiana;
Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin;
Mr. SCHEUER of New York;
Mr. STARK of California;
Mr. SOLARZ of New York;
Mr. MFUME of Maryland;
Mr. ARMEY of Texas;
Mr. WYLIE of Ohio;
Ms. SNOWE of Maine; and
Mr. FISH of New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE AND REMOVAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 411(a)(2) of Public Law 101-650, the Chair appoints the following members to the National Commission on Judicial Discipline and Removal on the part of the House:

Mr. HAMILTON FISH, JR., of New York;
Mr. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER of Arlington, VA; and
Mr. STEPHEN B. BURBANK of Philadelphia, PA.

SELECTION OF MEMBERS AS ADDITIONAL OFFICIAL ADVISERS TO U.S. DELEGATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES, MEETINGS, AND NEGOTIATION SESSIONS RELATING TO TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 19 U.S.C. 2211, the Chair has selected the following members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce to be accredited by the President as additional official advisers to the U.S. delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiation sessions relating to trade agreements: Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. LENT of New York.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last night, the President challenged the Congress—as well as the various parties in the region—to work for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

The President said that such a peace must be based on U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and on the principle of territory for peace. He said:

This principle must be elaborated to provide for Israel's security and recognition, and at the same time for legitimate Palestinian political rights. Anything else would fail the twin tests of fairness and security.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a cosponsor of legislation authorizing \$650 million in aid to Israel. No one who witnessed the courageous restraint shown by the people of Israel in the face of numerous Iraqi missile attacks can honestly question whether Israel deserves our help today.

Now I call on my friends in Israel to bring the same courage to the quest for peace—to work, in good faith, for political solutions which promise to end generations of conflict because they are fair to all parties. We in Congress must do all that we can to help Israel down the path of peace.

□ 1010

WINNING THE WAR ON DOMESTIC ISSUES

(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, thank God we have won the battle in the desert, but we cannot afford to lose the war in America.

Infant mortality rates and poverty rates of children are higher in America than most Third World nations. Our high school dropout rate is the highest of all industrialized nations. To boot, we have 700,000 high school graduates that cannot read.

In a world survey of 13-year-olds, American kids finished dead last in math. Our teenage pregnancy rate is one of the world's highest. We lead the world in murder. Our savings and loans have already collapsed. Pensions are underfunded, banks are teetering.

I say it is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that Congress can find money for smart bombs but we cannot seem to ever find money to develop smart kids.

Thank God the war is over. But let us get now at the battle that looms in the streets of America.

REQUIRING THE DISPLAY OF POW-MIA FLAGS AT FEDERAL BUILDINGS

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage Members to join me as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 164, which I introduced on February 29, 1991. This resolution would require the display of the POW-MIA flag at Federal buildings.

In this time of jubilation about the liberation of Kuwait and the relief that the fighting has stopped, we cannot forget our POW-MIA's and the torment that they have undergone. Certainly, we are thankful for the release of the POW's from the Persian Gulf war and pray that the remaining 29 MIA's will someday be able to come home to their families.

In addition, we can never forget those POW-MIA's of previous conflicts, especially those held in Southeast Asia. While we continue to pray for the safety of these soldiers and civilians, we should take action here at home to show that these POW-MIA's are not forgotten.

House Joint Resolution 164 would require the display of the POW-MIA's flag at Federal buildings until such time that a satisfactory accounting has been made of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilians who are known to have become prisoners of war or who are missing in action in Southeast Asia and the Persian Gulf.

Please join me in recognizing the noble sacrifices made by these men and women of the United States who have served our country so bravely. We pray for their safe return.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

FIGHTING THE DOMESTIC BATTLE

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, last night the President addressed an ebullient joint session. The success of Operation Desert Storm has brought a new sense of unity and pride to this Nation.

As President Bush noted, it is time to seize that moment. Surely what has been done so successfully thousands of miles away can be our model for confronting tough issues at home. Think of the investing of \$50 billion, committing half a million people, launching the greatest movement of materiel since World War II all in a matter of months. What an example.

So Mr. Speaker, I say we can take the initiative at home. Following the war, there is a nation that has one-half of its roads substandard, 40 percent of its bridges deficient, all of its major airports clogged. Is it Iraq? No, it is the United States of America, and it is time to have a transportation policy that gets us moving.

So let us have a Schwarzkopf approach to transportation.

For a nation where over 25 percent of our children never graduate from high school, where children finish school and cannot read, bring on Colin Powell and the overwhelming concept of overwhelming force to conquer our lack of competitiveness.

Mr. Speaker, a broad cross-section of half a million Americans working under sterling leadership amazed the world. Let us bring that spirit now home to the United States.

OUR RIGHT TO DEBATE THE ISSUES

(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, I count among my friends here in the House of Representatives people on both sides of the aisle from very diverse political philosophies. But I am greatly concerned over what appears to be developing in this town, a debate over whether or not we can debate.

In particular, I am concerned about those who are now suggesting that we as Members of Congress on both sides of the issue on both sides of the political aisle somehow ought not be allowed to defend our vote on the decision to authorize the use of force.

To those who suggest that we cannot conduct that debate, I would ask this: If the war had bogged down and if there had been thousands of casualties on our side, is there any doubt in anybody's mind that those who stood up to the use of force and authorized it would not have been held politically accountable? I was told in a town meeting in my district shortly before that vote of January 12 that I would be held politically accountable for my vote, and I said that is fair, and frankly it is the least of my worries. The decision as to whether or not it is right and the decision as to how it will be paid for in the lives of people is much more important to me than political ramifications.

But for those who suggest we cannot conduct this debate, I only ask: If the outcome had been different, would you not have conducted the debate you now want shut off?

COOKING THE BOOKS ON UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUNDS

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

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to the \$200 million in the supplemental for the continued operation of the unemployment program.

Everybody outside of Washington must be wondering "Why didn't Congress and the administration release these funds earlier?" After all, employers and employees paid into the Unem-

ployment Trust Fund. After all, the fund contains a huge surplus.

The answer is simple. Congress and the administration play accounting tricks with the books and use employment trust funds to meet budget targets. The end result is that unemployment funds have to jump through hoops in order to get released.

While the books are being cooked, unemployed American workers wait for hours at unemployment offices and then wait for weeks to get their checks.

It is my hope that we will act on unemployment insurance legislation soon, and, when we do, I ask my colleagues to remember this day and support comprehensive budget reform of the unemployment insurance program.

LEGISLATION DESIGNATING PORTIONS OF ALLEGHENY RIVER AS A NATIONAL RECREATION RIVER

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will continue to protect an important part of northwestern Pennsylvania's environmental heritage. This bill seeks to include 85 miles of the Allegheny River as a national recreation river under the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

During the 101st Congress, this body unanimously passed a version of this bill, but unfortunately, the Senate did not act before that Congress adjourned. Hopefully, during this Congress, both the House and the Senate will be able to act quickly.

In 1978, Congress directed the Forest Service to study 128 miles of the Allegheny River from the Kinzua Dam to East Brady, PA, to determine if the river was eligible for protection under the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Early last year, they reported that 85 miles of the river contained outstandingly remarkable values.

While no section of the Allegheny River was remote enough or free enough of development to be classified as a wild river area, the 85 miles that this bill would designate are a national treasure worthy of the additional protection of a recreational river designation.

Approximately 30 percent of the 85-mile river segment winds through the Allegheny National Forest with the remaining portion moving through State and private lands. The national recreation river designation will add additional protection to the many islands of the Allegheny River, including those designated as wilderness in the 1984 Pennsylvania Wilderness Act.

This bill creates two citizen advisory councils to ensure the maximum input by local governments and private citi-

zens into a U.S. Forest Service management plan. Additionally, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to implement interim protection measures to protect the river's remarkable values prior to the full implementation of the management plan.

The Allegheny River is a wonderful natural asset for both the people of northwestern Pennsylvania and the people of the entire Nation. A brief excerpt from Frederick Way's 1942 book, "The Allegheny," still sums up the natural beauty of this area nicely:

*** Strange and untamed and little explored. Curious that such a place should exist so close to civilization and still be untouched. Miles and miles of pioneer river *** the Allegheny is a breed of its own, and it should remain so!

There is also great support for this bill in Pennsylvania. After the House passed this legislation in 1990, a major western Pennsylvania newspaper, the Erie Times-News, had this to say about the bill:

With the U.S. and world population continuing to climb, wilderness areas will be even more prized in the future. The Allegheny Forest and the national recreation river status of the Allegheny River will become even greater assets as time goes on ***. The federal action *** not only means that future generations will be enriched—it also offers a lift to today's residents, those who love the area and are proud to serve as hosts to admiring visitors.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill would give much deserved protection to this pristine river and I urge the House of Representatives to consider this legislation as early as possible.

□ 1020

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CHANNELING U.S. AID DIRECTLY TO BALTIC REPUBLICS

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, we proclaim in our Declaration of Independence that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Amongst these are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the unalienable rights of the people of the Baltic Republics of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, people who have been forcibly annexed into the Soviet Empire since 1940 and who desire very much to be free.

Last weekend in Latvia, 74 percent of the people voted to be free of the Soviet Empire. In Estonia it was 78 percent. Several weeks ago Lithuania, by an astounding 90 percent of the people, indicated they wish to be free.

The people in these Baltic Republics do not enjoy unalienable rights. They have been brutally repressed, tortured,

and murdered, and other terrible forms of repression have been commonplace. Recently the press, the newspaper, in Latvia was taken over. Freedom of the press was eliminated, and in Lithuania Soviet troops stormed a TV and radio station killing 14 and injuring 150 innocent civilians.

I have cosponsored with the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] a resolution that channels U.S. aid directly to the republics, bypassing the central government. The United States, with its concepts of unalienable rights, must not be party to this repression but must raise its voice in defense of these innocent people who seek their freedom.

NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM LACKS ADEQUATE CARE

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, later today the House is to vote on a supplemental appropriations bill. The additional appropriations are needed to help get back some of the funding so vital to keep our veterans hospitals operational, fully fund compensation to service-connected veterans, as well as a variety of other needs. One of these needs not addressed is our national cemetery system.

Today I take the floor as chairman of the Housing and Memorial Affairs Subcommittee to complain about the lack of adequate care for the national cemetery system. Last year, the House Veterans' Affairs Committee asked for more money for the care of our national cemeteries. I should note that from 1984 to 1992, burials and gravesite maintenance increased 36.1 percent and 24.8 percent respectively while staffing has decreased 5.4 percent.

The national cemetery system is quickly becoming a disgrace. As this House jumps at the chance to show our veterans how much we support them, we are failing miserably in providing a decent final resting place for America's veterans. This system literally is out of money to buy or fix a backhoe, to water the grounds, to open the new national cemetery in California or even to fertilize the grass.

Perhaps nothing says more about who we are as a nation than the way we treat our dead. As we consider a supplemental appropriation to cover a variety of matters, let us remember that many of those brave veterans who died in Saudi Arabia will be buried in a national cemetery system that is inadequate as their final resting place.

SUPPORT KENNEDY-SLATTERY AMENDMENT FOR S&L BAILOUT

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some question as to whether the RTC has money to continue to do business. An earlier speaker today indicated that we have somehow squandered \$56 million, because we have not passed the RTC legislation, the reauthorization bill. That is absolutely incorrect.

Based on information the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs obtained from the RTC, it is clear the RTC has enough money to continue to do business. Last year the Congress approved \$18.8 billion in additional borrowing authority for the RTC. The RTC currently has \$8 billion to \$10 billion which they have left from the \$18 billion that we appropriated and made available last year. So any suggestion that by delaying this legislation we are costing the taxpayers some \$8 million a day is absolutely inaccurate.

For those who are concerned about reducing the cost of the savings and loan bailout, I would urge them to support the Kennedy-Slattery amendment, which will save \$121 billion of taxpayers' money by requiring a pay-as-you-go payment mechanism for the S&L bailout.

CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE A HARD LOOK AT HEALTH CARE IN THE UNITED STATES

(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, as I traveled throughout the Third District of Indiana last year, I met many fine people, but today one special mother of three stands out in my mind.

This woman told me she had a terrible fear that one of her young children might get sick. All loving parents hope for health for their children and at times all share a fear of illnesses striking young ones.

But, Mr. Speaker, this woman's anxiety was deeper because her family literally cannot afford sickness.

She, like 37 million other Americans, does not have health insurance.

Is she lazy? This woman has worked hard and done her best to save all her life. But when the bills are paid at the end of the month, there's no money left for health insurance.

And no wonder.

Today in Indiana the average yearly cost of health care—per person—was \$2,201.

In the 1980's, out-of-pocket health care costs for families rose 157 percent, outpacing spending in the general economy. In 1989, national health expenditures exceeded \$604 billion, accounting for almost 12 percent of the gross national budget in this country.

By the year 2000, the average cost of health care for each person in Indiana will be over \$5,000.

That trend means more and more working men and women in Indiana and all over this Nation will be joining the ranks of America's uninsured.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that is wrong. We can do better, and in this 102d Congress, it is my hope that we will.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO AMENDMENT WOULD RAISE TAXES

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of days we have had an interesting debate over the question of the RTC and whether or not money is being wasted by not going ahead and passing a clean bill to refund the RTC.

We had a gentleman here a moment ago who suggested that doing something other than having a clean bill, adding an amendment to it that he calls a pay-as-you-go amendment, would, in fact, save the taxpayers money.

Because of the way the Democratic leadership structured last year's budget plan, the S&L account is a separate item within the budget. It is not part of the general revenue. If you had pay as you go, the only way that you could have a pay-as-you-go plan would be to raise taxes on someone.

We are not talking about saving taxpayers' money. We are talking about charging taxpayers additional taxes in order to fund the pay-as-you-go plan.

I suggest that many taxpayers will find it a little bit hard to understand why Congress could not get its work done, proved itself to be incompetent in terms of scheduling, proved itself to be incompetent in terms of developing a budget, and then passes the bill along to them in terms of higher taxes. That is not what the American taxpayers are looking for from this Congress.

□ 1030

COMMITMENT TO POSTWAR CHALLENGES

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

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, last night the President summarized the mood of the American people and of the Congress.

This is a time to celebrate, to commemorate and to commit ourselves to meet the challenges that are ahead.

We celebrate our tremendous American military victory over Saddam Hussein's unprovoked brutality and aggression.

We commemorate the outstanding effort of American troops, including the

115th, 118th, and 119th Military Police Companies of the Rhode Island National Guard who served their country so well. And we commit ourselves to meeting postwar challenges, at home and abroad.

Abroad we must now turn to securing peace in the Middle East.

Here at home, we face domestic challenges that require the same energy and commitment we focused on Operation Desert Storm.

As we bring our troops home and prepare for a new generation of veterans, let everyone thank them with health care, education, and jobs.

These are true American heroes who deserve a hero's welcome. But when the parades stop, let everyone not forget the men and women who made these sacrifices for us. Let Members repay them with the promise of a bright future.

INTRODUCTION OF SPOILS OF WAR ACT

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, most of us have seen the pictures of American troops destroying captured Iraqi arms. What we have not seen is what is happening to those weapons not destroyed.

We have captured enough military equipment to enable some countries to wage a major war. Next week I will introduce the Spoils of War Act to ensure that captured military equipment be subject to the Arms Export Control Act so that none of these weapons are given away without congressional approval. This spells out in no uncertain terms the guidelines laid out under article 1 section 8 of the Constitution which states, "Congress shall have the power to * * * make rules concerning captures on land and water."

Furthermore, my bill will ensure that captured war materiel will not, under any circumstances, be transferred to a country on the State Department's list of terrorist nations—such as Syria. These countries are on the list for a reason. They continue to participate in state sponsored terrorism and give safe haven to terrorists.

All too often in the past, Mr. Speaker, arms delivered to the Middle East have ended up in wrong hands. Now that we have come into possession of a large store of Iraqi arms through the brilliant actions of our troops, let's not make the dumb mistake of transferring these weapons to dangerous states in the region and, thereby, contribute to their rearmament.

Yet, I am very concerned that this could happen, and I want to make absolutely sure it won't.

We must make sure that all our actions and the heroism of our troops do not go to waste.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spoils of War Act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). For our guests in the gallery, they are reminded that they should not respond to the statements on the floor.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 1281, DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSEQUENCES OF OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM, FOOD STAMPS, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION, VETERANS COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS, AND OTHER URGENT NEEDS ACT OF 1991

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 103, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 103

Resolved, That all points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and with clause 2(L)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI are hereby waived against consideration of the bill (H.R. 1281) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for the consequences of Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield, 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. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived, except against the provisions beginning on page 24, line 17 through page 25, line 10; beginning on page 28, lines 14 through 21; and beginning on page 32, lines 15 through 22. It shall be in order to consider the following amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution: (1) the amendment to be offered by Representative Slattery of Kansas, said amendment shall be debatable for not to exceed thirty minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived; (2) the amendment to be offered by Representative Chapman of Texas, said amendment to be debatable for not to exceed thirty minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto, and all points of order against said amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived; and (3) the amendments to be offered by Representative Kolbe of Arizona, said amendments shall be considered en bloc, shall be debatable for not to exceed one hour, to

be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto, and all points of order against said amendments en bloc for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI and clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During the consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 103 waives certain points of order against the consideration of H.R. 1281, and against certain provisions of the bill. H.R. 1281 makes dire emergency supplemental appropriations for some of the consequences of Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield, food stamps, unemployment compensation administration, veterans compensation and pensions, and other urgent needs for fiscal year 1991.

The rule waives two provisions of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill: Section 302(f) which prohibits consideration of measures which would cause the appropriate committee allocation to be exceeded; and section 311(a) which prohibits the consideration of legislation which causes the budget authority or outlay ceilings to be exceeded or the revenue floor to be breached. The Committee on Rules has recommended these waivers in the rule in order that the dire emergency supplemental can be considered by the House.

The bill provides \$1.503 billion in new budget authority which is \$159 million above the Appropriations Committee 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 1991. This amount does not include those portions of the bill which have been designated as emergency for purposes of the Balance Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act and are therefore not subject to its provisions.

House Joint Resolution 157, the Technical Corrections Appropriations Act, which has been passed by the House, would reduce \$403.5 million from the appropriations made to foreign operations for fiscal year 1991, thus bringing the Appropriations Committee below its 302(a) allocation for the current fiscal year. Once the Technical Corrections Act has been passed by the Senate and signed by the President, the need for the section 302(f) waiver as well as the need for a waiver of section 311 of the Budget Act will be obviated. However, until the Senate and the President act on House Joint Resolution 157, the waiver of section 302(f) and 311 will be required in order for the House to consider H.R. 1281.

The rule also waives clause 2(L)(6) of rule XXI, which requires that a bill lay

over for 3 days prior to consideration, and clause 7, rule XXI, which requires relevant printed hearings and report to be available for 3 days prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill, against consideration of H.R. 1281. The Committee on Rules has recommended these waivers in order to expedite the consideration of H.R. 1281 and to move these important appropriations quickly to the President's desk for his signature.

House Resolution 103 also waives two provisions of the Rules of the House against all but three specific provisions of the bill. The rule waives clause 2 and 6 of rule XXI against all provisions of the bill except one provision transferring funds relating to storage and warehouse facilities for the Library of Congress, one provision relating to the obligation of funds for construction of the Northern Virginia Naval Systems Command Headquarters, and one provision relating to section 310(c) of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for which the Committee on Public Works requested that no waiver be provided.

Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits the inclusion of unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. Because H.R. 1281 contains many instances of unauthorized appropriations and legislation, including funds for additional missile procurement, including additional Patriot missiles, the Committee on Rules recommends this waiver. Clause 6 of rule XXI prohibits reappropriations in a general appropriations bill or transfer of funds outside the same department or agency. Because H.R. 1281 transfers funds for missile procurement from the Defense Cooperation Account, which was established last year to accept foreign contributions to the gulf war effort, this is one reason the Committee on Rules also recommends this waiver of the Rules of the House.

House Resolution 103 makes in order the consideration of three amendments which are printed in the report accompanying the resolution and waives clause 2 of rules XXI against those amendments.

The first amendment, to be offered by Mr. SLATTERY of Kansas, prohibits the use of any funds in the Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1991 for the restoration of the birthplace of Lawrence Welk. The rule provides that the Slattery amendment shall be debated for 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed to the amendment.

The second amendment, to be offered by Mr. CHAPMAN of Texas, is a sense of the Congress amendment which urges those nations who have pledged funds to help meet the costs of the coalition effort during the gulf war to comply substantially with those pledges or to

reach an agreed upon payment schedule no later than April 15 of this year. The rule also waives the provisions of clause 7 of rule XVI, which prohibits the consideration of nongermane amendments, against the Chapman amendment and provides that the amendment shall be debatable for 30 minutes with the time to be equally divided and controlled.

Finally, the rule makes in order the consideration of en bloc amendments to be offered by Mr. KOLBE of Arizona. The Kolbe amendment seeks to transfer funds from various programs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development to fund Hope grants, the Home Program and the Shelter Plus Care Program which were created by the National Affordable Housing Act. The rule also waives clause 7 of rule XVI against the Kolbe amendment and provides that the amendment shall be debatable for 1 hour with the time to be equally divided and controlled.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1281 provides funds to offset the extraordinary expenses of the U.S. Government associated with Operation Desert Shield as well as funds for food stamps for the remainder of this fiscal year, funds for veterans compensation and pensions, funds for SSI and CHAMPUS medical care, unemployment compensation administration and funds for Israel and the District of Columbia. I urge my colleagues to support this rule in order that the House may proceed to the consideration of this most important supplemental appropriation.

□ 1040

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this could have been a highly controversial rule, but because the Democrats on the Rules Committee were willing to work with Republicans on that committee, I think we have a product which will be acceptable to a majority on both sides of the aisle; and I hope we will get a unanimous vote on it.

I am particularly pleased that the rule provides for consideration of an amendment to be offered by the able gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]. The Kolbe amendment will transfer funds to the Hope, Home, and Shelter Care Plus Programs that are so vitally needed today. These three programs represent innovative approaches—in coordination with State, local and non-profit sectors—to provide affordable housing for low income citizens and to deal with the deep and persistent problems of the homeless throughout our country.

These programs were authorized in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act and are supported by the administration. We need to fund them now, not in the next fiscal year,

and not 2 years from now. I commend the gentleman from Arizona for his persistence in pushing for this much needed step forward on the domestic front.

A second provision I am glad to see in this rule makes in order an amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. This amendment will rescind the funds to restore the birthplace of Lawrence Welk.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when we are having to borrow enormous sums to pay the necessary bills of this government, we should be very careful to spend the taxpayers money as prudently as we possibly can.

Lawrence Welk's birthplace is doubtless an interesting spot, but if it is to be restored, it should be restored with private funds, not government funds. We ought to set this example here today, and keep that in mind for future legislation.

This rule makes in order a third amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]. It is designed to put the Congress on record in favor of the proposition that those Nations which have pledged contributions to help pay for Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm should pay up by April 15. This is certainly a reasonable concept and I support it. April 15 is a day when taxpayers, you and me and all Americans, have to shell out our taxes, and certainly we should expect no less from our allies overseas.

Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this rule has several provisions dealing with veterans benefits. As the former ranking Republican member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the welfare of veterans is a leading concern of mine, as it is of every Member of this House. We will soon be welcoming back into this country over half a million victorious military men and women who have served their Nation so bravely in its time of need.

It is up to us, it is up to this Congress, to look out for the survivors of those who died, to provide proper care for those who were injured, and to provide readjustment assistance to those who need it. A few weeks ago this Congress passed and the President signed into law a 5.4-percent increase in the rates of veterans disability and dependency and indemnity compensation.

This bill today, this dire supplemental that the committee chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] are bringing to the floor provides the funding for that cost-of-living adjustment. It is another reason why we should all be voting for it.

In addition, because of the extra expenses which will result from Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm,

this bill includes a supplemental appropriation of \$46 million for medical care and an additional \$12 million for operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs. The veterans of the Persian Gulf conflict deserve our whole-hearted support.

I am strongly in favor of the provisions of this bill which are a way for us to show our returning military people that we appreciate what they have done for their country.

Mr. Speaker, this rule contains a number of waivers of points of order. These have been explained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], and I will not repeat them.

However, I would like to make the point that the two waivers of the budget act included in this rule were supported by the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADDE], because these budget waivers are technical and not substantive; they do not bust the budget. I think everybody listening back in their offices ought to keep that in mind. Let me tell you, if I thought for 1 minute they were going to bust this budget in any way, this Member of Congress would not be standing here asking you to vote for this rule today.

The chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON], concur in the conclusion that I just drew here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule so that the House may proceed to act promptly on the supplemental appropriation I urge every Member, when you come to the floor, to support the rule and get on with the supplemental.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I will have a series of amendments; one would reduce the aid in the dire supplemental of \$650 million to \$400 million to Israel. It is pretty much a buzz word that the administration's original request for funds were in that particular neighborhood. Feeling that there might be an expansion of that count to \$1 billion, there was a figure settled on of \$650 million.

I would also like to say that there was money not in here for some housing programs, HOPE and HOME, that will be addressed by Representative KOLBE, which I will support. It would be nice to see if we could have some money available that could deal with that.

Let me just say this. I am not so sure that this aid to Israel should be considered under an emergency condition in the first place, and second of all, I be-

lieve that this money should be counted against the strict budgetary limitations that were passed in the last session. We were up here late at night worrying about the Congress shutting down and our country and our Government shutting down.

So I will have a series of amendments. If the \$250 million amendment will fail, I will return with another amendment, and I would hope that if we are going to find some money for the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] that we would take a look at some of our own problems and maybe we could cut some funds from this particular account.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

□ 1050

Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will only take a moment.

Mr. Speaker, I will be able to discuss the amendment more fully when the appropriate time arrives, but what I really wanted to do is to thank the members of the Committee on Rules for giving Mr. SLATTERY and me an opportunity to have a chance to offer this amendment today.

I think this is kind of a breakthrough. In some respects it is unprecedented because in the 9 years that I have been here I have never seen an opportunity to have a freestanding vote on an issue like this.

I think, in the process, some people are going to get aggravated that we have had a chance to do this, but I want to make clear that our fight on this is not a fight on just the project itself, it is not directed at any Member of the Congress, either the House or the Senate. What we are attempting to do is to have a shot across the bow and to say that it is very appropriate for the Congress to begin the careful review of the kinds of projects that are put in these budgets or in these appropriations bills and that it is very appropriate for people to stand up on a bipartisan basis on both sides of the aisle and make sure that very late at night things are not going to be added that clearly are not going to reflect the will of the majority.

So this is not something that we want to use today to beat our chests and crow about how bad a particular project is, but rather we look at this as the beginning of a very constructive effort to do a more thorough job in the Congress.

So I want to rise for two reasons: One, to praise JIM SLATTERY, who has decided, and decided sometime ago, that the issue of pork is something that needed to be discussed and needed to be addressed, and I want to really praise him for his courage and his energy in focusing on a project like this; but, more important, the overall effort designed to make the Congress more

thorough in the way in which it does its budgeting.

Second, I really want to thank the Committee on Rules for giving us an opportunity to offer this. Hopefully, it is a new spirit of some bipartisanship when it comes to this.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, let me thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

I know not yet how I am going to vote on the rule. I should vote "no" as a protest because of the failure of the Committee on Rules to see the wisdom of the amendment that I wanted to make in order.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that the Congress of the United States will fail to meet its budget deadline created by the Congress for the control of the Congress, for the benefit of the Congress and the American people, to be completed by September 30 of each fiscal year so that the next day, October 1, we can begin with a new budget and a new wave of freedom for the American people to be able to express their wills and desires through the budget process. But, no, year after year on September 30 we begin the process of indulging in temporary stopgap resolutions, the continuing resolutions that carry us for 30 days or 40 days and then another one for 15 days. Meanwhile a lot of mischief is done by Members of Congress, special interests get involved, no one knows what is in the budget, and on midnight or 3 o'clock in the morning on New Year's Eve, in a drastic, last-minute session, we pass an overwhelming budget. The people want us to stop that kind of chicanery.

My proposition, the one I offered to the Committee on Rules yesterday, is a simple one which would say that on September 30, if a budget has not been completed by the Congress of the United States, then the next day automatically last year's budget will go into effect as a continuing resolution until the Congress should act.

That will end the shutdown of Government or the threat of a shutdown of the Government forever, and it is one—a proposition which almost every Member of Congress says we should have but simply will not, they will not buckle down to the job that I offered them that can be done through the adoption of this way of doing things.

The Republican rules package that was offered on the first day of the session had in it a proposition that would allow for such a rule, that would say that a CR would come into effect on October 1 if, on September 30, we have not done our collective job in preparing an appropriation.

That was a good step forward. This proposition is backed by the chamber of commerce, by the small businessmen, by taxpayers unions, by all kinds of organizations who see it as a good-government entity to allow such a proposition to take hold in our budget process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members, I know we cannot do it and I probably will support the dire emergency appropriations, but I urge the Members to keep it in mind. I intend to go before the Committee on Rules on every conceivable fiscal matter that comes up before them to press this point and ask for some future help from the members of the Committee on Rules and other Members on this proposition.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am here to lament that the Committee on Appropriations, on which I serve, chose not to include an incredibly fantastic program in this bill. They chose to continue our public housing programs like they are and like they have been in the past, keeping them in a welfare culture and not empowering the people who live in public housing to pull themselves out of this culture.

We have an amendment that will be offered today, by Congressman KOLBE and Congressman MORAN of Virginia, that would provide for \$500 million to the new HOME Housing Block Grant Program to expand housing assistance to more than 35,000 needy Americans; \$165 million for the HOPE Program, the Home Ownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere Program, to promote home ownership opportunities for low-income residents in public and assisted housing; and \$122 million for the Shelter-Plus Care Program for service-supported housing for the homeless.

This is a budget-neutral amendment because it is shifting money from other categories with HUD to this program. This legislation transfers funds from the public housing new construction, and programs slated to be terminated under the National Affordable Housing Act.

With public housing already experiencing a 27,000-unit backlog, with new construction of public housing taking almost 5 years to complete and costing twice as much as other forms of housing assistance, and with merely 100,000 units of vacant public housing, it is reasonable and justifiable to transfer these funds to the HOME block grant, which would provide immediate assistance to the poor, and a predictable flow of funds to nearly 300 States, cities, and towns.

What we are trying to do here is empower people to have the dignity that comes from owning their own home or being a part of a tenant-management system managing their own housing projects.

We have proven this through the pilot projects all across this country. If you give people home ownership, the chance to manage their own housing, that housing is cheaper and they are kept up. These people have more dignity and pride in what they are and who they are and pull themselves out of the ghetto.

This bill does not fund these programs. We are interested in people, not buildings or programs. We want to empower people to have their own homes and to manage their own housing projects, to pull themselves out of the gutter.

So if you believe in people, my colleagues, then you will vote for the Kolbe-Moran amendment when it is offered.

□ 1100

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER].

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address basically the same subject as the previous speaker in the well, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], and I want to begin by extending a real heartfelt thanks to the Committee on Rules for making the Kolbe-Moran amendment in order today.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I understand that we usually try to bring these bills to the floor with a minimum of amendments in order. I generally, frankly, support that approach, but in this case I think that the Committee on Rules has done a great service to the Congress and the country by allowing the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] to offer an amendment to the HUD-independent agencies bill.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] made some important points about the substance of the amendment. Other Members this afternoon in the debate will elaborate on that. I am going to be fairly brief on my remarks. I just want to make a couple of points.

First of all, the approach that Secretary Kemp and President Bush have asked us for in housing is a bipartisan approach. No one in this House should feel as if one party is trying to beat out the other on this issue. Basically the HOPE and the HOME innovations were passed in the Cranston-Gonzalez legislation by overwhelming bipartisan majorities. The Congress has addressed itself to this issue, and they have said, "We want to go in this direction. We want to go in the direction of innovation of private ownership and management of public housing facilities."

The committee report in and of itself is not critical of HOPE and HOME. The committee report says that the committee has not included funding for

any new housing initiatives. This action was taken without prejudice. There is really not any opposition to the substance of the proposals that have been voiced, and the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Appropriations are, frankly, to any significant extent in the full Congress. Why then do we not have any funding at all in the HUD-independent agencies bill for these important initiatives?

Mr. Speaker, it really comes down to a question of timing. The members of the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee basically have argued to us that they are supportive of the programs. They intend to take a hard look at them next year. But there is not room in this year's bill for them.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I say we have an opportunity today. We all sat and listened to the President last night talk to us and challenge us as a Congress about the next 100 days, and he listed a large number of initiatives. This is an initiative where the Congress can claim genuine partnership with the President, and we ought to be able to say we can do something right now, not within 100 days, but literally within 24 hours of the President coming to us. We can say that we have funded a major new housing initiative in the Congress of the United States with excellent opportunities for funding on the Senate side. I do not think that we ought to allow questions of timing to prevent us from acting forthrightly today. The regulations by the Department of Housing and Urban Development have been promulgated. The States are already inquiring of the Department about their ability to participate in this program. The President has challenged us to act.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has already said it wants to go down this path. Let us not delay any longer. Let us take up that challenge and pass the Kolbe-Moran amendment today.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding, and I take this opportunity to say I will support this rule.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed in this rule. The Subcommittee on Energy and Water Appropriations took \$140,500,000 out of the request, the supplemental request, last week, and immediately after the markup started hearing from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, the President's Mr. Scowcroft, all saying this was the wrong thing, to reduce this account which was a cleanup for Rocky Flats, CO. I appeared yesterday before the Committee on Rules asking for the opportunity to reverse, take the money back out of one account, and put it back in for the cleanup of Rocky

Flats, CO, where there is an environmental threat and safety threat.

Mr. Speaker, the work has to be done. The Committee on Rules did not allow that, but fortunately we have been able to work out a compromise this morning where that work will continue.

This is once again where we in Congress try to micromanage the Department of Defense. It was done for years, but thank goodness the President last night spoke very proudly about the accomplishments of the United States and the success of the Persian Gulf war and a proud nation, a grateful nation, watched, as did an appreciative world. It was a success because we had provided the military with the finest equipment available and the best training, and the young people fighting over there did not have their hands tied by Washington, as has happened in the past. It was not micromanaged, or we probably would still be fighting.

But I am disappointed. Congress is once again trying to micromanage the Defense Department, but fortunately I think we do have a compromise worked out where we now can clean up Rocky Flats, CO, resume the timely plutonium operations, and keep production that is very vitally needed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise, too, in support of this rule and just to add additional comments that were mentioned earlier by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WEBER] and others. That has to do with the question as to the timing of the importance of the HOPE Program in allowing the privatization of many of our housing projects across the Nation.

We are all fully aware that this has been around the Congress for many, many years. This is a pattern on the privatization program of Margaret Thatcher, which at one time nearly 60 percent of all the housing apartments in the city of London were controlled by the Government, and what she suggested was to those, rather than being held into that position of not being able to purchase a home, to allow them to purchase that privately, and then suddenly a very interesting thing began to happen, that those housing projects where the screen doors were torn off and where the windows were broken, that, as they began to purchase them, suddenly, not only did they come off the Government subsidy roll, but they went back on the private tax rolls, and then those people that instead of waiting for some Government repairman to come and repair the screen door, they began to repair them themselves with private ownership, and suddenly flowers began to appear in the boxes in the window, and indeed the whole complexion of London began to

change. Now the Socialist Labor Party was strongly opposed, and they said:

This is terrible that these people that are trapped into these homes should be left there for generation, after generation, after generation, and the idea that they would own their own property and have a piece of opportunity themselves was certainly anathema to what the Socialist Labor Party believed in.

And yet, as those homes began to be marketed, and as the money began to flow into the treasury, and the subsidy rolls began to drop off, and the property taxes began to come up, and the value of the property began to rise, the political activities were such that more than half of those homes were sold to private ownership, and the Socialist Labor Party in their 1987 conference said that, if they were to get power again in Britain, that they would continue the privatization program because it had been so popular.

And in this country we understand about the America pie. We understand about private ownership of property. We understand about the hope of individuals having the opportunity to themselves own a home, and indeed where it has been allowed to work on a pilot basis; Kimi Gray, right here at the Kenilworth project, and so many others across the country, where those people that were previously trapped into poverty, unable to own a home, unable to have their own private investment of their own capital stock worth, discovered that when they were able to control it themselves so that rather than depending upon some government agencies to come back 5, 6, 7, 8 months later and repair the windows, or to repair the toilet that was stopped, or repair the damage in the hallways, but when they themselves owned it and when they themselves began to have an interest and a personal concern, how much better their standard of living was and how much better their life style was, and, indeed, how much better America was because of these improvements.

Now that program was debated extensively. It has been heard in the Housing and Urban Affairs Committee. It has been heard in the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. It was debated at great length on the floor. As my colleagues know, it has been discussed on the floor for many, many years, and in fact it was debated extensively during the last Congress, and under the leadership of Mr. CRANSTON in the Senate, and under the leadership of Chairman GONZALEZ in the House. The Cranston-Gonzalez bill was crafted, and indeed this program is ready to move forward.

The question is: How do you get money for this kind of thing, and so, rather than asking for more money or more taxes, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development said;

Here's what I'll do. I will take some funds that I have over here, and I'll move them to get this program off the ground, to get it moving for the benefit of those that are trapped in poverty in the inner city. Congress has approved it, the President has signed it, the debate has been taking place. Let me supply my own funds.

Under this amendment that will be heard today under the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], very simple it says:

No new dollars from any taxpayer. It will be within the Department of Housing and Urban Development where their priorities are matching those of the 101st Congress so that in the 102d Congress we can move forward.

There will be a certain amount of debate by those that lost on the floor here last year. For those who lost the debate on its merits will now want to say we can now trap it and constrain the Congress even though it was overwhelmingly approved in both the House and the Senate and signed by the President.

□ 1110

If we can just control the moneys, then nothing will never happen.

This morning on channel 5, you may have seen the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development discussing this very activity. He said as a former member of the Committee on Appropriations, he was pleading with his friends to not use this tactic to deny the will of the Congress. So I would encourage all Members in the House to act as they acted last year, to join that vote with the money, not from new taxes, not from new spending, but allowing the priority shaper of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary himself, to make those allocations, to get this program moving, for the benefit of the poor, for the benefit of those trapped in the inner city, for the benefit of those who pray every day that someone will come and turn the heat on in those housing developments, and will clean up the broken down cars in the parking lots, will do the things, because they do not own it, they do not have the authority. They are under the mercy of this housing authority. And we want to move beyond that.

I urge Members to support the Kolbe amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H.R. 1281, providing supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 and that which will follow.

I am especially pleased that the Appropriations Committee included language that directs the administration to spend previously appropriated fiscal year 1991 funds for the remanufacture

of 12 F-14 fighter aircraft. For months now, the Grumman Corp. has teetered on the edge of collapse, left in limbo by the Department of Defense who refused to relinquish congressionally approved funding for the F-14 remanufacturer program.

Mr. Speaker, my arguments in favor of the F-14 are the same as when I first came to Congress in 1981. In my mind, there is no better first line of defense against enemy air attack than the F-14. It has distinguished itself in Operation Desert Storm, and during several other periods of heightened alert of U.S. Naval Forces. In short, the F-14 is a proven fighter—an asset in the defense of this country, and a genuine deterrent to those who attempt to penetrate our carrier battle groups.

My concern at this time, is with the Grumman Corp. Plain and simple: If no funds are included for the F-14 in fiscal year 1991, Grumman will be out of the aircraft business. When the A-12 program was terminated, steps were taken to preserve the industrial base of General Dynamics, and McDonnell Douglas, even after these companies were cited for poor performance in the research and development of the A-12. Now, Grumman is facing a situation where it will be forced to shutdown all of its defense production lines, marking an end of an era—a glorious era, of Grumman naval aircraft.

Without the legislation that is before us today, Grumman will be out of the prime aircraft manufacturing business in a matter of a few months. Despite many studies performed by the Navy that verify that the F-14 is the most capable aircraft to perform future Navy missions, despite a rich history of performance, the F-14, as we know it, will no longer exist.

We all know that slicing the DOD pie becomes even more difficult, especially with a pie that keeps shrinking every year. Yet, as systems and programs are cancelled, we cannot lead entire corporations through the gauntlet of shutdowns and bankruptcy.

In closing, I want to thank the members of the Appropriations Committee who voted to support the F-14. Now, I am urging all Members to vote to keep the F-14 a viable option for the Navy, and this country's overall defense scheme. Eliminating the F-14 will have wide repercussions beyond this fiscal year—it will lead to the shut down of one of America's premier defense contractors.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] has 22 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers on our side.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I might, I wanted to yield 3 minutes to

the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and close with 1 minute myself.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have to begin by extending my appreciation. I would like to think of the 3 minutes I am going to be taking here, that 1 of those 3 minutes has come from the Democratic side. I appreciate that. The distinguished ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], thinks that possibly there was an addition error made up at the Chair. I am not going to pass judgment on that.

□ 1115

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I am very pleased with the rule which has come forward. This has not been the first provision that I have had as a new member of the Rules Committee, but it is among the first ones, and I hope that it is the beginning of a trend which will move us away from restrictive rules which we have seen in the past several years.

It is my hope that as we look at some of the issues before us that we are able to put together bipartisan support for some of these amendments. I think one of the most important ones is the amendment to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

I served on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs for many years until I got the appointment to the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, and during the last authorization bill on the housing issue we were able to get support for the HOPE Program, the HOME Block Grant Program, and the Shelter Plus Care Program. There was concern raised when we got into the appropriations process by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on housing, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], that the regulations dealing specifically with these programs had not yet been promulgated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He indicated at that time that when those regulations would be forthcoming, we would make the change that is necessary so that we could transfer from some of these antiquated boondoggle housing programs of the past which have been proven failures to this more innovative approach which President Bush talked about last night and has been talking about in his domestic issues package.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is one which is worthy of the support of every Member of this House. As we look at these programs, I am convinced that

we have the potential to benefit four, maybe as many as five times as many people who are in need of assistance through this innovative approach, and I think that it is crucial for us to recognize that our goal is to help those who are truly in need. And the regulations have to come forward.

Some say why is it that we are dealing with this in a dire emergency supplemental appropriation bill? The reason is that it is not going to cost a nickel. We are simply transferring funds from the outdated programs to these new innovative programs.

Several other amendments in here are worthy of consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say again that it is a privilege to work under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and to be working with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], and the other members of the Rules Committee who have very generously welcomed me upstairs, and I look forward to dealing with a wide range of rules. I hope that the rest of them are as open to consideration for all of our colleagues for their provisions as this one is.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman MOAKLEY and the ranking Republican on the Rules Committee, Mr. SOLOMON, for their leadership in constructing a reasonable rule for such a complex piece of legislation. I'm disappointed, of course, that the rule does not make in order a couple of Republican amendments. But I am hopeful that this is the beginning of a trend away from the use of restrictive rules that deny Members, particularly on this side of the aisle, the opportunity to improve substantive legislation.

As a result of this rule, we will have the chance to vote on an amendment by my colleague from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], to fund the administration's HOPE, HOME, and Shelter Plus Care Programs. Over the past several months, in light of the President's proven ability to address national emergencies abroad, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have challenged the President to come up with programs to address domestic emergencies. With the help of Secretary Kemp, the President has done just that.

HOPE, HOME, and Shelter Plus Care offer innovative solutions to the problems of homelessness and housing affordability for low-income Americans. For the same \$500 million, the HOME Block Grant Program will serve 30,000 more families than new public housing, which itself will require billions more in the future to protect tenants from drug dealers and gang violence.

Over the past 2 years, these programs were debated thoroughly and were enacted as part of last year's housing bill. Secretary Kemp has jumped through hoops to address all of the concerns raised in this Chamber. Implementing regulations are in place, and there's no longer justification to hold up funding.

This rule will also deny sanctuary for those who want to reduce badly needed and already obligated transportation funds for several

States, including California. It will also make in order an amendment by my colleague from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], to rescind the \$500,000 in Federal funds for the proposed Lawrence Welk Museum. While I appreciate the contributions Lawrence Welk made to American entertainment, I plan to support the Slattery amendment because turning Welk's North Dakota home into a museum is not a taxpayer priority.

Finally, I strongly support Mr. STENHOLM's motion to strike language that would prohibit the Labor Department from implementing regulations to permit contractors on federally funded construction projects to use semiskilled helpers. This provision will cost the taxpayers \$500 million, money that could be spent for more urgent needs.

Again, I want to congratulate Chairman MOAKLEY and Mr. SOLOMON, and urge support of this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his cogent remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize to you. I was going to give you an adding machine for St. Patrick's Day to honor your Irish heritage. But I found out that the error is with my staff, so I will give the adding machine to them.

Let me just close by urging all Members to support this rule. I want to again thank Chairman MOAKLEY and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] and the majority for their fairness in producing this rule, which is a fair rule.

Again, the budget waivers, for those who might be concerned about them, are technical in nature. That is verified by both Chairman WHITTEN and the Appropriations Committee Republicans as well as by the Budget Committee. I would urge support for the rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1282, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND TRANSFERS FOR OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 104

Resolved, That all points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2(1)(6) of rule XI and clause 7 of rule XXI are hereby waived against consideration of the bill (H.R. 1282) making supplemental appro-

priations and transfers for "Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm" for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes. During consideration of the bill, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 104 waives points of order against certain provisions of H.R. 1282, Operation Desert Shield-Desert Storm Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1991. This rule does not provide for the bill's consideration since general appropriation bills are privileged under the rules of the House. This rule, therefore, does not contain any provisions relating to time for general debate. Customarily, general debate will be limited by a unanimous-consent request by the floor manager when the bill is considered.

House Resolution 104 waives clause 2(1)(6) of rule 11 which requires a 3-day layover of committee reports prior to their consideration as well as clause 7 of rule 21 which requires the relevant printed hearings and report to be available prior to consideration of a general appropriation bill.

The rule also waives against provisions in the bill, clause 2 of rule 21, which prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. Finally, the rule waives provisions of rule 21, clause 6, which prohibits reappropriations or transfers in general appropriation bills, against provisions in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1282 establishes a Persian Gulf regional defense fund in the Treasury to pay for the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield-Desert Storm. This bill appropriates \$15 billion from the Treasury to the defense fund and also appropriates to the defense fund such sums as necessary for current and future balances in the defense cooperation account. Foreign countries have so far pledged \$53.5 billion in cash and in-kind assistance. At the present time \$12 billion in cash and \$2.7 billion of in-kind assistance has been received. The bill transfers up to \$42.588 billion from the defense fund to specific accounts including: \$7.9 billion for military personnel; \$25 billion to cover operation and maintenance costs; \$2.9 billion for procurement; and \$6.3 billion to cover the estimated costs of actual combat operations.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take this opportunity to say how proud I am of all of our American troops who serve in the Persian Gulf. Their bravery and skills are to be commended.

As a South Carolinian, I am especially proud a large number of those serving in the Persian Gulf are from units based in South Carolina. Military units from my congressional district serving in the Persian Gulf include the Aiken-based 450th Ordnance Division Army Reserve Unit, to the Army National Guard's 265th Quartermaster Detachment in Allendale, and the Army Reserve's 371st Chemical Unit based in Greenwood.

I am always proud to be an American, but I have never been prouder than today. Our country, and the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces, demonstrated that freedom is not simply a motivator, it is the essential ingredient to the human spirit.

Mr. Speaker, the measure before us is one of great significance. This rule will allow for its expeditious consideration and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join with the gentleman from South Carolina in urging all of our Members to support the rule. I also urge all Members to support the bill that this rule makes in order.

I must be quite candid and say that this rule is of the kind that I usually must oppose because of the numerous waivers that it contains. The waivers include the 3-day layover, the requirement for hearings to be printed, and prohibitions against reappropriations, unauthorized appropriations, and legislative language. All of what I normally would stand on this floor and fight against.

But Mr. Speaker, if a rule such as this is something I would ordinarily criticize, let me also say this: Within the context of all of the events we have witnessed during the past 8 weeks, this rule makes sense. So I urge the Members to support the rule.

The rule will facilitate the consideration of H.R. 1282, making supplemental appropriations for Operation Desert Storm-Desert Shield.

Mr. Speaker, it was only 8 short weeks ago today that the House began its historic debate that culminated in the passage of a resolution that authorized President Bush to use force in support of the U.N. resolutions calling for the eviction of Iraq from Kuwait.

The swift and overwhelming success of Operation Desert Storm marked a very decisive turning point in our own history as a Nation, and I trust in the history of the entire world—especially in the troubled, volatile Mideast area.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we will consider today appropriates \$15 billion for a new account called the Persian Gulf regional defense fund. The bill allows for

the appropriation and transfer of funds to this new account from another new entity known as the defense cooperation account. This is the account that contains the money that our coalition partners and other allies are contributing to Operation Desert Shield and, then, Operation Desert Storm.

The bill sets a cap on the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield-Desert Storm at approximately \$42.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1282 is a necessary and appropriate step to take at this time. The swift completion of Operation Desert Storm would seem to assure that the entire cost of our military operations in the Persian Gulf will stay within the overall limit set by this bill.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the preamble of the Appropriations Committee's report on this bill which we will be considering in a few minutes. These words from the Appropriations Committee speak I am sure for all Americans. I quote:

The committee takes this opportunity to express its pride in the outstanding valor, professionalism, commitment, and tenacity of the men and women who served in Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

The sacrifices they endured, the skill with which they carried out their duties, the courage which they displayed in conducting operations, and the totality and swiftness of their victory is a source of enormous pride to all Americans. The Middle East and the world will be safer and more peaceful because of their sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, no one could have said it better, I would say to Chairman WHITTEN. I would certainly urge all Members of this House to support this rule and the bill to follow.

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1130

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1281, a bill making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 and for other purposes, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATION DESERT SHIELD-DESERT STORM, FOOD STAMPS, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION, VETERANS COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS, AND OTHER URGENT NEEDS ACT OF 1991

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1281) 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; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART] as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1131

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill, H.R. 1281, with Mr. DERRICK (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues, it was a real pleasure to join with you in the tremendous show of appreciation to our President, our military leaders, and our troops last night.

I believe this meant more to me than to many. I became a member of the Ap-

propriations Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations 14 months after I came to Congress. In World War II, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Navy, I was around the world in practically all theaters of the war with top naval officials. I was on Guam and the Philippines with General MacArthur; in China with Gen. Pat Hurley, flying over the hump to get there. I was with our troops in Iwo Jima 10 days after the flag raising on Mt. Surabachi. We were in Europe, Asia, and Africa, and our group was in Frankfurt, Germany, when our troops were to have gone into Berlin, but stayed out by agreement with Russia.

In 1956, I toured Russia—we rode their highways, their railways, and their airlines, and visited factories and the University of Moscow; and my trip report was determined invaluable by the Secretary of Navy. We were in Poland for the Poznan trials, and have made many trips to our military in Europe and Asia since then.

I served on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Defense during the no win wars in Korea and Vietnam where our leaders said "we hoped to win by proving to them that they can't win."

Thus, it meant so much for our President to take his stand and I join with you in the praise he has received.

Today, serving my seventh term as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and continuing to serve on the Subcommittee on Defense, I have the duty and obligation to point out to you and the country what we must face up to on the homefront now that the fighting is over.

To those who lost loved ones we extend our deepest sympathy. Because of their sacrifice we are able, I hope, to plan for real peace.

We are here today to provide funds to meet the costs of Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, with foreign contributions to be used before U.S. funds are used.

However, our first order of business is to see that here at home we take such action as will keep our Government operating and prevent the present recession from going into a real depression.

Title I of the bill before you includes \$151,113,000 for 16 agencies whose activities have been directly affected by Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. These include activities of the FBI, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the legislative branch, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the Secret Service, and the District of Columbia that have required additional overtime, extra security, counterterrorism, and the like.

It provides, by transfer from the defense cooperation account, \$333,600,000

for procurement of missiles and ammunition as replacement of stocks. This is not an incremental cost of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, but a consequence of that operation. In addition, \$650,000,000 is included, at the request of the Administration, to assist Israel with costs that have been incurred in the Persian Gulf conflict.

Title II, the non Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm emergency portion of the bill provides funds for several important programs including:

The sum of \$270,000,000 for CHAMPUS costs due to relocation of military providers overseas;

The sum of \$200,000,000 to reduce the backlog for rehabilitation of military equipment—trucks, tanks, aircraft;

The sum of \$58,000,000 for development of a quick response program for the Patriot missile;

A \$100,000,000 increase in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia;

The sum of \$30,000,000 to the Bureau of Reclamation for California drought relief initiatives;

The sum of \$482,500,000 for atomic energy defense activities;

The sum of \$200,000,000 to process and pay unemployment compensation claims;

The sum of \$25,000,000 to start the targeted initiative to reduce high infant mortality rates in urban and rural areas of the country;

A \$232,000,000 increase in the limitation on Social Security Administration costs to implement the court decision on children's disability claims;

The sum of \$100,000,000 is released from the Social Security Administration contingency fund to handle additional workload;

The sum of \$1,500,000,000 for food stamps of which \$1,300,000,000 is available only upon the receipt of an official budget request for a specific dollar amount;

The sum of \$303,084,000 for veterans compensation and pensions for the comparability increase contained in Public Law 102-3 which was approved February 6, 1991.

The sum of \$75,000,000 for public housing operating subsidy.

The committee also directs each department and agency to provide information that will be needed if we are to proceed with legislation to help work our way out of the recession. Information on activities that would lead to productive jobs in creating national assets that will have a long-term value such as highways, bridges, dams, flood control facilities, water resource development facilities, aviation facilities and equipment, housing, sewer and water facilities, educational facilities, and public buildings, as well as programs to offset the effect of natural disasters resulting from droughts, freezes, floods, and other catastrophes. This information will be available for

any further legislation or appropriations.

Today we consider two supplemental appropriations bills—at a time when our national debt is estimated to exceed \$4 trillion by October 1992, and thousands and thousands of our people are receiving notice that their job has been eliminated and they are unemployed.

At this time, I call attention to the fact that our Committee on Appropriations, with the support of the Congress, has held the total of appropriations \$180 billion below the recommendations of our Presidents since 1945.

Our financial problems come from the passage of entitlements and entering into binding contracts which we have to pay and from allowing tremendous imports to compete with our domestic industry, plus the Tax Act of 1981.

With a debt of that size, I am convinced that the only way to meet it is to produce more than we need at home, move the surplus into world trade as we did for 48 years, and apply it on the debt, and return to using the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose for which it was created.

Instead of that, we seem to be headed the other way, giving up our domestic markets to foreign producers or American gone foreign depriving American labor of jobs.

We pay our farmers half price not to produce while the people of much of the world go hungry.

Lands lie idle, towns and villages are drying up, more and more people are moving into our cities to add to city problems, housing and homeless, drugs and law enforcement.

As thousands upon thousands receive notice that they are out of a job in practically all areas of the Nation, this appears the first step in preventing the present recession from becoming an all-out depression.

Thus, in this bill and report we call on departments and agencies to supply information to the committee for sound investments in national assets which will lead to productive jobs in the area over which such departments and agencies have jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I urge it be adopted.

At this time I call attention to the fact that, again, we on the Committee on Appropriations have held the line, but, unfortunately, much spending goes around our committee with entitlements and binding contracts which have to be paid. This leaves at this time, the amount of money in our total budget that is available for discretionary spending by the Congress on our recommendations at only about 16 percent of the total budget.

Mr. Chairman, we need to pass this bill and help prevent the recession from going deeper.

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1281.

This is the first of two supplemental funding bills that we will consider today. The one to follow is the single-purpose supplemental to deal with the military costs of Operation Desert Storm, authorizing expenditures in the order of \$43 billion from allied and U.S. contributions.

The supplemental we are dealing with right now is much smaller, about \$4.1 billion, covering a number of areas, with three purposes. It is intended, first, to deal with nondefense Desert Storm-related expenses. Second, it is to take on the annual task of addressing funding shortfalls and problems in the programs funded under the 13 appropriation bills that we passed last fall. Third, it is to meet shortfalls in entitlement programs, where spending is determined by demand for benefits, and last fall's estimates proved mistaken.

□ 1140

In another sense, this supplemental is about bigger issues. It is the first test as to whether Congress can live within the spending caps and budget enforcement rules that were passed as part of last fall's budget agreement. And it is about how Congress will acquit itself with respect to loopholes built into the caps, the two being the Desert Storm exception and the dire emergency exception. Many eyes are rightly upon the Congress to see how we live up to these tests.

As the chairman said, this is a \$4.1 billion bill, about \$600 million more than the administration requested. In title I, the administration requested \$89.7 million in nondefense discretionary spending: money for agencies like the State Department, AID, the FBI, and indeed all the way down to the Capitol Police and others for increased cost of security and antiterrorism during the war. These are designated as emergency requirements, and under last fall's budget agreement, are exempt from spending caps.

The administration and Congress reached an accord with Israel to provide \$650 million for its extra war costs, and just before the full committee markup on Tuesday, indeed at the very last second, that was offered on a bipartisan basis and included in the bill.

The committee endorsed most of these requests, but then it went on to add \$58 million for the Veterans' Administration and \$8 million for the Department of Commerce. The Office of Management and Budget, after taking a preliminary look at those particular add-ons said that only \$12 million in

the VA is acceptable to them as an additional expense arising from a true emergency under Desert Shield-Desert Storm.

That means that the remaining \$54 million, in combination with the funding in title II, could put the bill over the spending caps, and, under the terms of the Federal budget agreement, result in an automatic across-the-board sequestration on all discretionary programs to bring the spending back within the caps.

Lesson No. 1, the spending caps meant to enforce restraint are holding. Lesson No. 2, as the bill moves to the conference with the Senate, and into conference committee, Congress will have to decide whether to reduce these accounts or let that sequestration fall across the domestic discretionary accounts.

Title II contains the usual catchall discretionary supplementals, as we examine what we did last year in all the 13 appropriation bills and discover problems or find shortfalls.

Under the budget agreement, these have to fit within the 1991 spending caps. And we had some room: about \$500 million in domestic programs, and about \$1 billion in defense programs.

The administration requested \$930 million in additional funding for things like \$100 million for unemployment insurance; \$232 million needed for a Supreme Court decision on disability benefits to children; \$75 million for the Judiciary; and \$155 million for expiring section 8 housing contracts.

Predictably, the committee has increased those requests up to the limit of about \$1.5 billion, and the increases are for things like an additional \$100 million for unemployment insurance; \$100 million in additional Federal payment for the District of Columbia; \$75 million for public housing subsidies to cover higher energy costs; \$30 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to cover the drought around the country; \$25 million for infant mortality initiatives; and \$500 million for defense programs such as CHAMPUS, the military health program, and depot maintenance.

The committee also decreased some requests, notably in committee, \$140 million was cut out in funding for the resumption of plutonium production at Rocky Flats in Colorado. I am advised, as we meet on the floor, that our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] has been working with that issue, and we can expect to see a compromise amendment, which will add back some monies into the Rocky Flats program as the bill proceeds, and we will therefore make a corresponding effort to stay within the caps. I commend my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for his forthright and diligent work in achieving that compromise.

Second, the administration and our friend and former colleague, Secretary

Kemp, failed to get any funding on new housing initiatives authorized in last year's housing bill, and requested by Secretary Kemp. There will be amendments, I believe, to address that issue as we go along.

But overall, with a possible exception of that amount of money for the VA that I described, the funding is within the fiscal year 1991 spending caps, and the caps are holding.

Finally, the bill provides \$1.8 billion in new entitlement spending: \$300 million for veterans COLA's that we passed earlier this year; and \$1.5 billion under the Food Stamp Program. Those are mandatory items.

Mr. Chairman, while this bill is not perfect, it is a reasonable effort, in my judgment, to meet existing needs within the confines of last year's spending restraint mandated by the budget agreement that we all worked so hard to achieve. There will be attempts to perfect this bill through the amendment process as we go along, and there will be the opportunity to work out some disagreements over what constitutes an emergency, as the bill goes through the process. I am prepared, Mr. Chairman, to support it, and I ask my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, on the issue of what the emergency needs of the VA are with respect to Desert Storm, I just received a letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, which I will include for the RECORD.

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, March 7, 1991.

Hon. JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MCDADE: The Desert Storm war has generated much discussion about how to cover immediate costs of the war. Well-intentioned proposals affecting many Federal programs are surfacing everywhere. This is not only understandable but is absolutely appropriate. Department of Veterans Affairs programs are a natural focus of activity, and we expect logic and caution will guide the rush to legislate. VA does not seek money we can't spend, and we are even less interested in authorizations that set up false hopes we can't meet.

As we proceed in this post-war period, VA won't be blind to the need for practical adjustments here and there, but the fact is, veterans' benefits are in place and available to these newest veterans; there is no need for a new body of laws to repay them. Where U.S. veterans really need Congress's help is in implementing the progressive adjustments needed to fine-tune the present system, to clean up inconsistencies and ensure fairness. If we do that, and reduce the micromanagement that adds to costs and detracts from fairness, we will have accomplished a great deal.

For the record, we want to offer a factual explanation of VA's needs as a result of the war. In all honesty, VA's only truly immediate need is for additional resources so we can gear up for a large and sudden influx of new veterans seeking benefits. We got caught short after Vietnam, and we have no intention of allowing that to happen again.

We estimate that \$12 million will cover what we need to do in terms of staffing and support for our benefits offices. This, plus authority to transfer funds to our cemetery system, will fill the bill.

Our medical system absorbed about \$3 million in costs preparing for potential casualties. Up to this point, we have received fewer than a dozen patients from the Gulf. Even if we receive more in coming weeks, we can absorb any further costs in our \$12 billion medical budget. We have submitted legislation to make Gulf War veterans eligible for readjustment counseling at Vet Centers, and would recommend our proposal over any other that would expand eligibility for counseling.

Our big job now is to make sure we can deliver existing benefits and services quickly and effectively over the next weeks and months. You may be assured of our commitment to do just that.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 1281, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1991.

I would especially like to thank my good friend from Alabama, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Mr. BEVILL, and my California colleague, Mr. FAZIO, for their assistance in securing a provision in this legislation to permit the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to utilize funds appropriated in fiscal year 1991 for preconstruction engineering and design of the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors project for completion of the feasibility study for this project.

Our subcommittee chairman will recall, Mr. Chairman, that when we passed the 1991 energy and water development appropriations bill, he included \$250,000 to complete the Corps of Engineers' feasibility study of phase 1 of the Los Angeles-Long Beach 2020 expansion plan. However, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], in the normal process of reviewing the project's environmental impact statement [EIS], required the Corps of Engineers to proceed with additional, and unanticipated, work with the EIS which exceeded the \$250,000 appropriation for 1991. Because of this additional work to respond to the EPA's concerns, the corps now estimates that it will take an additional 6 months and \$900,000 to complete this study once and for all.

Today's House action will simply enable the Corps of Engineers to use already appropriated funds for the initiation of preconstruction engineering and design for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors project for the completion of the feasibility study. And, as I have already said, the corps will need approximately \$900,000 to complete its work.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman and his fine staff, for all their assistance with this matter.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the members of the Committee on Appropriations for the expedited consideration given to the President's request for emergency funding for the Desert Storm-related activities.

I want to remind Members, however, that the bill contains certain items which the President has not designated as emergencies. According to preliminary administration estimates, the additional nonemergency funding would cause the domestic discretionary budget authority limits, set last fall, to be exceeded by roughly \$53 million.

Thus, if enacted, the bill would cause a \$53 billion sequester in fiscal year 1991 domestic discretionary programs.

The President has also expressed concerns about several items in the non-emergency section of the bill. In lieu of the unrequested \$75 million for public housing operating subsidies, the administration would prefer adoption of its proposal to reprogram housing funds for the HOPE, HOME and Shelter Plus Care Programs.

I certainly intend to support the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. KOLBE's, amendment that will implement the President's housing initiative. These programs represent new innovative approaches to address the affordable housing needs for low-income residents, agreed to by Congress last year in the Cranston-Gonzalez Affordable Housing Act.

These new programs should, of course, now be funded.

Finally, the President has additional concerns with inrequested defense spending in a nonemergency title and with several language provisions. I support the measure today so that we can move the process along quickly. I hope, however, that the administration's concerns will be addressed in the amendment process and in the conference with the other body. Let Members learn a lesson from this experience. We abuse language so much here that we tend to forget that the word emergency has a specific legislative meaning.

□ 1150

Let us not have that word "emergency" fall victim to semantic inflation.

I thank the gentleman for giving the leader the opportunity to make these few comments relative to clarifying the position of the administration, and I applaud the gentleman and his committee again for what they have done.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to express how pleased I am to be in the well following my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and to echo his sentiments and to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the expeditious manner in which the committee has conducted itself. It is getting more frequent that I am joining with my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] in pointing out some of the harmony that exists now with respect to working our legislative will.

I truly want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee along with members of his committee for their swift action providing critical administrative funding for the Unemployment Compensation and Social Security Programs. With growing caseloads resulting from a major Supreme Court decision and rising unemployment, these appropriations come at a critical time for the Nation's unemployed workers, the aged, blind, and disabled, and in particular for disabled children.

As unemployment has risen during the recession, long lines of claimants have formed at unemployment insurance offices and benefit checks have been delayed. The additional \$200 million appropriated for administration of the unemployment insurance system should help ease the burden of increased caseloads and delays in the system.

In addition, the committee appropriated \$232 million to implement the Zebly Supreme Court decision, which requires liberalized criteria for assessing children's disabilities under the Supplemental Security Income Program. Given these children's urgent needs and the lead time required to train disability examiners, the committee's rapid response will facilitate timely action by the Social Security Administration on this very important issue.

Finally, the Social Security system is burdened by critical problems in three areas. First, SSA's backlog of unprocessed disability claims is rising. As a result, the agency is now holding more than 60,000 applications in boxes and on shelves across the country on which no action whatsoever has been taken. Second, SSA is experiencing busy rates in excess of 50 percent on its 800 telephone number for beneficiary assistance. Third, the agency's general funding crisis has left it short of basic supplies such as applications, forms, and Xerox paper, and unable to make repairs in office equipment. By releasing \$100 million from the contingency reserve, this dire emergency appropriation will equip SSA to deal with their critical needs.

Again, I commend Chairman WHITTEN and the Appropriations Committee for moving so swiftly in providing the requisite administrative funds for these critical programs so that those who need help will receive it in a timely and efficient manner.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for yielding me this time. I will be as brief as possible.

I spoke earlier about the confusion in part of the bill, the defense section. Something that most people do not realize is that the Department of Energy is responsible for the construction, testing, and manufacturing of nuclear weapons for the Defense Department, as well as nuclear reactors for the Navy.

The administration, in a supplemental request, requested \$283 million for cleanup of Rocky Flats, CO, which is just west of Denver. The old Atomic Energy Commission established Rocky Flats as a place to fabricate plutonium, uranium, beryllium, some stainless steel alloys into components for nuclear weapons and also for waste management and the reprocessing of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons have what we call a half life. The effect of the weapon each year reduces it in half, so necessarily just for the effectiveness of the weapon they have to be reprocessed on a regular basis, and also they are very unsafe to handle because of the instability of nuclear fuel. So a facility was created in Rocky Flats to do this kind of job. This was back in 1952. It has gone on for almost 40 years.

In late 1989 it was found that the Rocky Flats installation of about seven buildings had a high concentration of plutonium in the duct work and elsewhere that had to be cleaned up. It was unsafe to continue operations there for the people who had to work in the plant, as well as the surrounding community and the environment. It was decided by the Department of Energy that no more plutonium would be manufactured there or reprocessed there until the cleanup could be accomplished; so during 1990 the cleanup work was started. It has been progressing since that time, but there comes a critical time right now when the Defense Department is needing plutonium for many reasons. Plutonium is used, of course, in nuclear weapons. Plutonium was also used in the highly effective Persian Gulf operations in the 30 millimeter Gatling gun used in the Warthog that penetrates tanks; so plutonium is needed badly at this time, the Defense Department calls them the Pits. The media calls it the trigger, that goes in the nuclear weapon.

I know some people are opposed to nuclear weapons, but we will never know what effectiveness the fact that we have nuclear weapons, not as large as those 20 years ago, but a more modern, cleaner, and effective nuclear arsenal, what effect it may have had on the fact that Iraq did not use the chemicals that they had, the nerve agents, and so forth; the fact that we have the nuclear weapons, I think, is a deterrent.

Nevertheless, it is required under the defense stockpile memorandum that we do modernize these weapons, and we are unable to fulfill this obligation unless we get Rocky Flats on line.

Rocky Flats, unfortunately, is the only place in the United States where this processing can be done; so it has been the intent and the hope of our Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development that we would continue the progress in making this a safe place to work and safe for the environment and to effectively start reprocessing and reprocessing the weapons and coming on with the badly needed plutonium.

The administration did request \$283 million. Our subcommittee reduced that to \$142,500,000. Immediately following that, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Scowcroft and many others have called and said, "You did the wrong thing. We cannot continue the cleanup. We can't do the job that is a mandate unless we have that money."

The rule prohibits us from doing the job that is required, so the only effective way we can do that is to take back part of that \$140 million that we had given to the Defense Committee that was put over into a different Department. What has happened in this bill, the \$140,500,000 that we had turned back was picked up by the Defense Subcommittee and put into depot maintenance.

The amendments I will be offering later in the bill will take \$120.5 million of the money that we gave back to the committee for continuing this cleanup job at Rocky Flats, and the money remaining will stay in the depot maintenance account. Depot maintenance is needed, no question about that, but a higher priority is the job at Rocky Flats. It just absolutely has to be done.

So the amendment this afternoon and, I hope it will not be necessary to have a vote, contains no new money. The vote will be an environmental vote because we have to clean up the environment. It certainly is a national security vote.

The tragedy is that if we in Congress do not do this, we will go back to the old process where we in the Congress try to micromanage the Defense Department. The great success in the Persian Gulf that our troops experienced, one of which, of course, was the fine equipment that we were able to give them, the other is that they were the best trained. We had the finest troops,

but even probably more important, the administration gave a free hand to the military to conduct the military operations.

□ 1200

It would be wrong for us today in Congress to tell the military, "You can't do the job we have given you, we are going to tell you how to do it."

So we will be offering an amendment to reverse this and put some money back in for the cleanup of Rocky Flats. Mr. Chairman, I urge everyone to support that, and thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to give my good wishes to the new ranking minority member of the committee, who has big shoes to fill, and he will fill them.

I commend the committee, the chairman, for releasing part of the contingency fund for the Social Security Program. They are pretty hard up for help over there right now. Some people who wonder where their benefits are, why their checks have not arrived, it is because they have not had enough administrative personnel.

On September 30, 1989, the Social Security System disconnected 2,500 local telephone lines. That is a list of them right there.

Last year we passed a law that required the Social Security Administration to reconnect them, in effect, by saying that the access to those local offices had to be restored to the level it was on September 30, 1989.

I hope that the administration will pay heed to this statute, recognize the \$100 million that the committee has been, in its wisdom, good enough to release from the contingency fund, and that we can get on with letting the people who pay their Social Security taxes get what they pay for.

Justice delayed is justice denied; benefits delayed are benefits that you go to the bank and borrow money on and pay interest.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ].

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the supplemental appropriations bill and would first like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for yielding me this time.

To the credit of the Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, and Chairmen WHITTEN and TRAXLER, the supplemental appropriations bill we are considering today contains \$4 million for the establishment of eight new inpatient units in VA medical centers for the treatment of post-trau-

matic stress disorder [PTSD]. The bill also includes \$1.4 million to provide for readjustment counseling services for veterans returning from the Persian Gulf. This is proposed in Persian Gulf veterans' benefits legislation authored by the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Honorable G.V. MONTGOMERY. Both the inpatient and the readjustment provisions are included in H.R. 841, legislation I introduced to expand the VA's PTSD treatment and readjustment counseling programs.

Mr. Chairman, our troops from the Persian Gulf will be returning home soon. They will be welcomed with parades and other homecoming celebrations, and their honor and bravery will be remembered.

Fortunately, a large number of our Armed Forces have been spared exposure to intense combat. But a significant number were in battle, and to each and every one of them, those scenes will not be soon forgotten. It may take years before we know the extent to which their combat experience will affect their readjustment to civilian life.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ] will suspend.

The Chair takes note of a disturbance in the gallery. It is in contravention of the law and the rules of the House.

The Chair will remind the doorkeepers and the sergeant at arms to maintain the order of the gallery. He will also remind our guests that they are welcome to be here to observe the procedures of the House. Public demonstrations, expressions of opinions and the like are not permitted under the rules or under the appropriate laws of the United States.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ] is recognized.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, PTSD still affects 1 of every 7 Vietnam veterans. It is a normal response, in normal people, to a situation outside the realm of normal experience, such as combat, natural disaster, or violent crime. PTSD can manifest itself in many different ways, including depression, insomnia, withdrawal from interpersonal relationships, chronic unemployment, an increased "startle response" to noises similar to combat, and substance abuse.

The VA does have good programs to treat PTSD, but they lack the resources to meet even a portion of the needs which exist. For the past 7 years the VA's own special committee on PTSD has recommended the establishment of an inpatient unit for each State, but only 20 are currently in operation. That is why this funding to establish eight new units is so important.

Veterans of the Vietnam war had to wait 10 years before our Government even recognized PTSD, and longer for treatment. Our Persian Gulf veterans shouldn't be asked to endure such delays. Approving these funds for additional treatment and counseling services will help to ensure that we meet our obligation to our Persian Gulf veterans who may be suffering from PTSD in a timely and compassionate manner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues' support for this funding and for passage of the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time from the distinguished chairman.

A few minutes ago the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] addressed the House with regard to the underlying premises for the dispute about the money for the Rocky Flats plant in my district in Colorado.

The House needs to understand that, contrary to the gentleman's assertion, this dispute has virtually nothing to do with the cleanup of the Rocky Flats site. The moneys for cleanup were fully funded in the bill as reported and remain so.

I would urge the House not to consider this a question of micromanagement. The Department of Energy, for decades, while this body largely defaulted in its responsibilities to superintend the proper management of the taxpayers' money, succeeded in running up a bill for the environmental devastation of nuclear weapons sites around this country that will make the savings-and-loan bill pale by comparison.

We need to get straight what we are about here. This is not a question of micromanagement. It is very much a question of Congress meeting its most profound responsibilities to see that the taxpayers' money is well spent for purposes that are truly in the national interest.

I, for one, am not about to back off of that responsibility.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriations bills before us today and commend Chairman WHITTEN and the members of the Appropriations Committee for the speed with which they brought these bills to the House floor today. These measures contain necessary provisions which address needs which were not anticipated when the fiscal year 1991 spending bills were passed last fall.

The committee has done a yeoman's job of balancing requests for funding for many pressing matters, both foreign and domestic, which are worthy of consideration. Unfortunately, we have limited resources to allocate and very strict budgetary disciplines which we must adhere to and therefore were not able to accommodate every request.

I commend the committee's decision to provide emergency funding for the Veterans' Administration medical services of \$58 million to counter the burden placed on the VA by costs of Operation Desert Storm. Without this additional money the VA might face reductions in veterans' medical care. At this time, more than ever in recent memory, Congress has an obligation to support the men and women who serve in America's Armed Forces, both during their service for their country and after they have left active duty.

Because of the outstanding sacrifices made by our allies in Israel during the gulf war, we provided an additional \$650 million to help them defray the enormous costs incurred in defending their people. The Israelis played a pivotal role in the U.S. gulf war strategy by respecting our desire that they remain in a defensive position throughout the conflict rather than engaging Iraqi forces.

The House is also acting today to provide the District of Columbia with needed resources to help it during its fiscal crisis. Without these funds, the Mayor assures Congress that the District government would not be able to provide vital services for its citizens, and may ultimately become insolvent. The Mayor has done an excellent job with the challenges facing her and her administration, and successfully convinced the members of the committee that an equitable increase in Federal funding was needed.

And finally, I would be remiss in not mentioning the money Congress is appropriating in the Desert Storm supplemental, at the President's request for incremental costs incurred through military operations in the Persian Gulf. This bill, by requiring that foreign contributions be used prior to U.S. funds, sends a clear message that Operation Desert Storm was not a coalition effort in name alone—the members of the coalition who now share in the glow of victory, must share in the cost of the battle, as well.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this dire emergency supplemental and want to call special attention to the item in the Department of Defense section concerning the F-14 fighter program.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation to the two gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA and Mr. MCDADE, for their strong support in this matter. My Long Island constituents who build the F-14 for Grumman are grateful as well. They are justifiably proud of their work on the F-14 and want to continue to build naval aircraft if that is the will of the Congress.

And that—the will of the Congress—is a big part of what is at stake in this bill. As the House knows, this bill specifically requires that the Pentagon obligate \$987.9 million appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1991 for the remanufacture of 12 F-14 fighters produced by Grumman Corp. for the Navy.

This language is in the bill because of the need to jog the memory of our friends in the Defense Department and remind them that the F-14 question was decided by the Congress last year and that our directives in this matter must be followed. So far this year, the Pentagon has acted unilaterally to financially starve the Grumman Corp. and cause its possible elimination as a competitor for Navy aircraft

projects. The Congress decided to authorize the remanufacture of 12 F-14's and we appropriated money for that purpose. The President signed these bills into law. Moreover, the Pentagon has said that the future of naval aviation will be decided this year in the context of the debate on the fiscal year 1992 defense budget. But if Grumman is eliminated as a competitor, it is going to be a very one-sided debate.

Furthermore, at a time when the defense budget is shrinking overall and when we must maximize the bang for the buck, it strikes me as sheer folly to put all our eggs in the basket of one defense contractor. That will be the clear result of what DOD is doing in the case of Grumman and the F-14. Every Member of this House has expressed concern and outrage about the business practices of certain defense contractors and the tens of millions of taxpayer dollars that have been wasted on programs that have spun out of control. Some of these excuses may be checked by tighter internal control on the part of DOD. But the only sure way to deal with the problem is through competition, and the knowledge on the part of a contractor that if they do not perform according to plan, we will award the business to another company that will. If we learned any lesson from the scandals of recent years that should be it. And I am frankly disappointed that the Pentagon has such a short memory in this case.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion it is important to note that the F-14 is a truly remarkable aircraft that has proved to be the master of the sky over and over again in recent years. With proper modification, it can continue to play this critical role for the Navy into the next century. The future of naval aviation will be a key part in the defense debate this year and Congress must safeguard its voice in that debate. We can only do this if we compel the Pentagon to release these funds for the F-14 remanufacture. Without this infusion of money, Grumman Corp. will drop out of the aircraft manufacturing business and an important part of our industrial base for defense will be gone. This is a key institutional issue for this Congress and a matter of plain commonsense when it comes to future defense policy. I urge the adoption of this bill and the support of this House for the F-14.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, the Congress can be proud of its record on the Persian Gulf conflict. We can take pride not only in the caliber of our debate regarding a U.S. role in the gulf, but also in our response to the aftermath of the fighting. This supplemental funding measure recognizes that the costs of war include more than weaponry. For the Department of Veterans Affairs, war has a profound impact. This conflict was brief. But behind the scenes, our VA hospitals were gearing up to play a major support role in the event we sustained heavy casualties. At the same time, those hospitals lost several thousand staff members to reserve and national guard mobilization. As a result, those facilities incurred substantial costs in overtime pay and contracting for replacement staff. Finally, the immediate costs of benefits and services for returning combatants will take a heavy toll.

When our young men and women return from the gulf, and are released from service with service-connected disabilities, we must be

prepared to provide timely health care. In addition, the VA must do a better job of processing all of its claims and the \$12 million for the Veterans Benefits Administration will help somewhat.

Mr. Chairman, in light of this situation, I'm very pleased that the Appropriations Committee has included in this supplemental \$46 million for veterans medical care and \$12 million for the Veterans Benefits Administration. Four million dollars of the medical care funds are earmarked for additional Post Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD] units. I regret the administration did not request these funds in that they are sorely needed. The needs are greater than the amounts contained in the bill; however, if enacted, this supplemental will provide some relief to VA's current staffing problems.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the \$10 million I recommended for our national cemetery system is not included in the supplemental. With the upsurge in visits to national cemeteries, the funds would have been very useful to make the cemeteries more attractive. Some of our cemeteries are in deplorable condition and something has to be done to bring them up to the standard we in the Congress expect.

I appreciate the leadership's help with this package. It provides much needed support for a VA transition assistance program to assure timely benefits assistance to our Desert Storm veterans. It also provides monies for immediately identifiable health needs we know some of these veterans will have. The lessons of earlier wars have helped those who planned this effort. They could anticipate not only injuries but psychological trauma. This supplemental funding measure appropriately includes money for readjustment counseling and for the treatment of PTSD. We know that in the area of PTSD treatment, VA's specialized treatment programs have had difficulty even meeting the needs of service-connected veterans—both for inpatient and outpatient treatment. Clearly additional funding is needed to set up additional capacity to treat returning combatants who have this problem. The addition of new outpatient teams and inpatient units will provide the needed continuum of care for our veterans.

Reactions to the experience of war affect us all differently. Everyone is not scarred psychologically. Yet many veterans may have significant problems readjusting after returning home. With this concern in mind, I have sponsored legislation to make veterans of this conflict eligible for readjustment counseling services. This measure would expressly authorize VA to provide that counseling in any VA facility. Let me note that while this provision aims to extend to Persian Gulf veterans the kind of counseling support made available to Vietnam-era veterans, I do not envision that those services would necessarily be provided exclusively or even primarily in so-called Vet Centers. Vet Centers were established to assist veterans of a war which did not enjoy the same popular support as this one. Many Vietnam veterans expressed hostility to the VA, and we set up a program operated out of storefronts to respond to their unique needs. This was clearly a different war, and we must address the needs of its veterans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee

on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. TRAXLER, and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. GREEN, for their work on this measure in behalf of veterans.

I also want to thank the Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WHITTEN, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MCDADE, for making certain that these funds are included in the supplemental.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of request for \$650 million in supplemental aid to the State of Israel.

As we rejoice in the successful victory over Iraqi aggression, we cannot forget the sacrifices made by the Israeli people during the last 6 weeks.

When President Bush put together this magnificent and unprecedented coalition of forces in the Persian Gulf, there were many concerns that Iraq would incite Israel into joining the conflict.

Once Israel became involved, Iraq hoped to fragment the coalition, and instigate a holy war against the Jewish state.

And with that holy war, the Iraqis hoped to fulfill their desire to push Israel into the sea and thereby dominate that troubled region.

Well, that didn't happen.

Instead, the Jewish people rallied, they withstood the terror of missile attacks, never knowing if one of those missiles were loaded with deadly gas.

Children learned how to do their homework in sealed rooms while nervous parents wondered if these cowardly acts by the Iraqis would tragically alter their lives forever.

Through it all, Israel remained firm in its commitment to this country and the coalition that it would not respond to the wanton attacks by Iraq.

Due to the actions of the State of Israel, the coalition held and produced a swift, complete victory.

The Israelis showed how patience is a virtue.

But these actions carried a price for the people of Israel. By keeping their powder dry, Israelis were killed and property was damaged.

More importantly, Israel made a commitment to this country and the alliance, and kept it.

Mr. Chairman, we should, in turn, show that we are ready to assist Israel in rebuilding its losses and standing ready to work with her to build a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill H.R. 1281, making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 and for other purposes. This bill provides urgently needed funds to meet a variety of critical needs from food stamps and unemployment assistance to veterans compensation and pension programs.

In addition, the bill includes \$30 million to help the Bureau of Reclamation to meet Federal obligations to help respond to the emergency drought conditions which currently exist throughout a variety of areas in the West.

Most of the 17 reclamation States have suffered from extreme drought conditions over the last 5 years. Key water storage reservoirs

in a number of States are at record low levels, resulting in sharp reductions in water deliveries to agricultural, municipal, and industrial water customers.

In California, which is also experiencing its 5th year of drought and its 4th critically dry year, reservoir storage statewide is less than one-half of its historical average. As a result, the Bureau of Reclamation has advised its agricultural and urban customers that deliveries of water from the Federal Central Valley project [CVP] will be cut by up to 75 percent of normal supplies.

In response to these emergency drought conditions, the bill provides \$30 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to launch a number of drought-response initiatives. Examples of such initiatives include drilling wells and purchasing and delivering water for wildlife refuges, making authorized project modifications to assure water deliveries at low reservoir levels, providing alternate sources of water to municipal and industrial users and to increase fish and wildlife survival rates, and constructing temporary saltwater intrusion barriers, particularly in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, to protect water quality and thereby increase availability of project water.

Only authorized activities are to be undertaken using the funds provided in the bill. This provision does not authorize any new activities that are expected to be included in the drought bill under consideration by the House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs. Moreover, this measure can in no way substitute for the important drought-relief bill the House Interior Committee intends to markup next week. That bill is essential to an effective Federal response to the drought.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a bailout for the California or any other drought stricken area. This appropriation simply enables the Federal Government to do its part to help lessen the economic and environmental consequences of the worst drought on record. The State of California intends to put more than \$100 million into drought relief activities—nearly three-quarters of which will complement work in California financed by this appropriation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, none of the funds in this appropriation will be used for drought-impacted, crop loss assistance. This appropriation will simply help the Bureau mitigate against future losses to fish and wildlife habitat, help provide additional water supplies to municipal and industrial users and help limit future crop damage by funding a variety of measures that will help make the most of the limited water supplies currently available.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the cooperation and leadership of the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, as well as the support and cooperation of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Mr. BEVILL, and the ranking minority member, Mr. MYERS. Without their assistance, this drought emergency assistance would not be possible.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss budget issues related to H.R. 1281, the dire emergency supplemental appropriation for

fiscal year 1991, and H.R. 1282, the Desert Shield supplemental for fiscal year 1991.

H.R. 1282, the Desert Shield bill, provides that all of the funds made available in the bill are considered to be incremental costs for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. It is our understanding that the funding provided in the bill is consistent with the administration's request. Under the Budget Enforcement Act, incremental costs for Operation Desert Shield are exempt from the defense spending limits. In this case, where there is agreement between Congress and the President that these funds are incremental Desert Shield costs, these costs will not be subject to the defense spending limits and will not cause a sequester. In addition, the Budget Enforcement Act provides that the costs of emergency provisions, including Desert Shield costs, are not to be counted for purposes of determinations under points of order under sections 302, 303, and 311 of the Budget Act. These costs therefore will not be scored against the committee's allocation or its subdivisions and will not be scored against the total spending levels in the budget resolution. In our view, therefore, the bill does not violate the Budget Act.

H.R. 1281, however, required two Budget Act waivers. Enactment of the bill as reported would cause the bill to exceed the committee's allocation and would cause total outlays in the budget resolution to be exceeded. However, it is important to note that House Joint Resolution 157, a technical corrections bill passed by the House on February 28, 1991, by voice vote, is pending in the Senate and may be cleared at any time. That bill, if enacted, would reduce the level of budget authority provided in the fiscal year 1991 foreign operations bill by \$403.5 million. If that bill had been enacted prior to consideration of H.R. 1281, the Committee on Appropriations would have been within its overall committee allocation and, because of the provisions of the Fazio exemption, there would have been no need for a waiver of section 311. Because some individual subcommittees would still be over their subdivisions, there would still be a need for a waiver of section 302(f), notwithstanding the fact that the committee was within its overall allocation.

Having addressed the issue of the budget waivers for the bill, however, I would also like to discuss the treatment of some of the emergency costs in title I of H.R. 1281. Title I provides that the funds in the title are designated "emergency requirements" for all purposes of Gramm-Rudman. As discussed above, it is clear that provisions which the President and Congress both designate as emergencies are exempt from the applicable discretionary spending limit, or from the pay-as-you-go scorecard, in the case of direct spending and receipts legislation. The committee bill reflects the President's emergency request and designation except for two matters: \$46 million for veterans medical care and \$8 million for the Department of Commerce and the USIA.

If there is no agreement between the President and Congress on those items by the time of enactment, the President could insist that these items be scored against the domestic discretionary spending limits. The costs of the bill, other than the costs related to the issues in title I, would bring us to within approxi-

mately \$23 million of the domestic budget authority cap for fiscal year 1991. If provisions discussed above were not ultimately agreed to be emergencies, their enactment could cause a sequester of all the accounts in the domestic category 15 days after enactment of this bill.

While I expect that these issues will be resolved by the time the conference report is agreed to, I feel obligated to alert the House to the possibility of a small breach in the domestic budget authority caps.

The questions related to the emergency provisions in the Budget Enforcement Act are clearly new for all of us. Those provisions are intended to ensure that real emergencies do not cause sequestrations of other accounts. There are not intended, obviously, as loopholes in the budget agreement. Determining an appropriate standard for the use of the emergency provisions and addressing the timing issues related to the role of the President in designating emergencies are tough questions. For this reason, I have asked my staff, on a bipartisan basis, to work with the Office of Management and Budget to explore these questions.

Regardless of whether that effort is successful, however, it is my intention to continue to review issues related to use of the emergency provisions and, where appropriate, to oppose unjustified use of those provisions.

I also want to commend the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee for the design of the Persian Gulf regional defense fund. The \$15 billion of taxpayer funds will be spent for Operation Desert Storm only if no funds are available from the defense cooperation account, which is where the allied contributions are maintained. Furthermore, if any portion of the \$15 billion of taxpayer money is spent then it will be restored from available allied contributions. I believe this process will maintain the maximum amount of pressure on our allies to make good on their total pledges of \$53.5 billion. In fact, if these pledges are realized the taxpayer funds used for Operation Desert Storm could be minimal.

The following are two factsheets prepared by the Budget Committee on the two appropriations bills:

FACT SHEET: OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/ DESERT STORM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT 1991—H.R. 1282

H.R. 1282, the Desert Shield/Storm Supplemental for fiscal year 1991 will be considered by the House on Thursday, March 7, 1991. A related bill, H.R. 1821, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations which also includes Defense funding is discussed in a separate fact sheet. H.R. 1282 provides funding for the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Storm by appropriating \$15 billion in new budget authority to a newly-created Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund and allows and appropriates the transfer of funds from the Defense Cooperation Account (DCA). The total amount available to finance the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Storm is limited to \$42.6 billion.

	<i>Billions</i>
Noncombat costs Oct. 1, 1990 to Mar. 31, 1991	\$21.2
Post combat phase-down	7.0
Return of personnel and equipment ...	5.2
Near-term investment costs	2.9
Additional costs of combat	6.3
Total	42.6

Section 251(b)(2)(D)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 as amended, provides that the costs for Operation Desert Shield are not subject to the defense spending limits. The bill:

Directs that foreign contributions received for Operation Desert Shield/Storm will be obligated prior to the obligation of any U.S. Funds (the \$15 billion).

Directs that any of the \$15 billion in new budget obligational authority provided in the bill, which is not expended, will be returned to the Treasury.

Allocates the funds by appropriation account as opposed to the approach of unallocated funding proposed in the Administration's supplemental request.

Prohibits the use of any funding in this bill to be used for defense expenses unrelated to Operation Desert Shield/Storm.

Foreign countries have pledged a total of \$53.5 billion to support Operation Desert Shield/Storm. To date, the U.S. has received \$14.8 billion in cash and in-kind assistance. If the remaining foreign pledges are forthcoming, it is possible that none or not all of the \$15 billion in new budget authority provided in the bill will have to be expended.

FACT SHEET: H.R. 1281, DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE CONSEQUENCES OF OPERATION DESERT STORM/ DESERT SHIELD, FOOD STAMPS, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION, VETERANS COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS, AND FOR OTHER URGENT NEEDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

(H. Rept. 102-9)

The House Appropriations Committee filed H.R. 1281, the Fiscal Year 1991 supplemental appropriations, on Monday, March 5, 1991.

H.R. 1281 is scheduled to be considered Thursday, May 7, 1991, subject to a rule being adopted. The rule as reported waives all Budget Act points of order.

The current level for Fiscal Year 1991 budget (filed in the Congressional Record on March 6) shows that the Appropriations Committee is under its 302(a) allocation by \$1,344 million in discretionary budget authority and that one subcommittee is over its 302(b) subdivision. This bill provides \$1,503 million in non-emergency discretionary budget authority more than the available room; therefore, this appropriations measure would be subject to two Budget Act points of order: 302(f) and 311(a).

It should be noted that the House passed H.J. Res. 157 on Feb. 28, 1991, correcting the technical error in the Foreign Assistance Appropriations bill and reducing budget authority by \$404 million. If that bill had cleared the Senate by now (as had been expected), the supplemental now under consideration would not have violated the total Appropriations 302(a) allocation.

The bill provides, for fiscal year 1991 in Title I, as estimated by CBO, \$1,135 million in discretionary budget authority and \$814 million in outlays for programs requiring Desert Shield/Storm emergency related expenditures. Title II provides \$3,335 million in budget authority and \$1,498 million in outlays for supplemental funding requirements. The bill is below the fiscal year 1991 defense, international and domestic discretionary spending caps established in the BEA (Budget Enforcement Act of 1990) as of the start of this session.

The following table shows CBO's scoring of the bill as reported for selected programs:

(CBO estimates in millions of dollars, by subcommittee within title)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Emergency related Desert Shield/Storm:		
State Department	49	39
Defense procurement	334	34
Aid to Israel	650	650
Veterans medical care	46	40
Other supplementals (including mandatory payments):		
Judiciary and related activities	97	97
Defense operations and maintenance	500	366
Defense research and development	58	32
Rocky flats plutonium operations	483	67
Supplemental security income (SSI)	232	94
Infant mortality	25	15
Food stamps	1,500	
Veterans compensation and pensions	303	303

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill and I commend Appropriations Committee Chairman JAMIE WHITTEN and his staff for quickly bringing this legislation to the floor. With our Nation's attention focused on the Persian Gulf, I am pleased that this bill addresses some of the pressing problems we face here at home.

One of the most important provisions of this legislation is the inclusion of \$25 million to combat infant mortality in areas with unusually high infant mortality rates. These funds will provide grants to localities to link and coordinate the activities of health departments, community health centers, State maternal and child health administrators and community residents in a focused effort to reduce our inexcusable infant mortality rate. Unlike the President's request to cut the maternal and child health block grant and reallocate funds from vital community health centers to pay for this important initiative, this legislation provides additional funds so that we do not make the grave mistake of sacrificing one important program for another.

Another important item in this legislation is the \$30 million included for drought assistance, which is so vital to my home State of California, now in the fifth year of a drought. The funds provided in this bill will enable us to address some of the critical consumer, industrial and environmental needs brought on by the severe drought.

This supplemental appropriations bill also realistically addresses the strain on our states resulting from increased unemployment due to the recession by providing \$200 million for the costs of administering the Unemployment Insurance Program. For many individuals and families who are dependent on unemployment benefits for their income, this supplemental appropriation will ensure that they receive these essential benefits, to which they are entitled, in a timely fashion.

This legislation also includes \$303 million to cover the cost-of-living adjustment for service-connected veterans who were denied their COLA earlier this year. This provision brings equity to our Nation's veterans program.

Finally, I am pleased that this legislation acknowledges our Federal responsibility to maintain our nation's infrastructure. Now is the time to turn our attention to investment in our citizens and the valuable programs and projects which strengthen our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1281, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991. I would like to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee

on Legislative branch appropriations, the Honorable VIC FAZIO, and his esteemed ranking minority member, the Honorable JERRY LEWIS, for their outstanding and conscientious understanding of the needs of the U.S. Capitol Police force—which comprises one aspect of this supplemental legislation.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to take the opportunity to say that the men and women who constitute the U.S. Capitol Police are highly skilled, competent and accomplished individuals. They are charged with the important task of protecting the Capitol of the United States, Members of Congress and their staff, foreign dignitaries, and millions of tourists who visit the Capitol every year.

Because of Operation Desert Storm, the Capitol Police force is in need of a supplemental appropriation. In order to provide the level of security necessary for the protection of the congressional community, the U.S. Capitol Police has nearly exhausted all of its overtime funds appropriated for fiscal year 1991. At their current rate of expenditures, the force only has enough overtime funds remaining for approximately 2 more weeks.

The supplemental request slated for the Capitol Police totals approximately \$7,152,000. Broken down, this figure represents approximately \$6 million in overtime, \$63,000 to hire five freight handlers, and \$978,000 in supplies and equipment.

Mr. Chairman, we all depend on the members of the U.S. Capitol Police force for our security and overall well being in these recent times of apprehension. I urge my colleagues to support this supplemental appropriation to ensure that this sense of security on Capitol Hill is maintained.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill which is necessary to fund special government expenses due to the consequences of Operation Desert Shield/Storm. I should like to comment briefly on one provision of this bill which is immensely important, and that is the emergency assistance the legislation provides for Israel to offset that Nation's costs because of the Persian Gulf war.

For weeks throughout the war, the world watched in horror as the Israeli population suffered night after night of malicious Iraqi Scud missile attacks. In all, Israel absorbed 39 missile attacks which were, in most cases, aimed at civilian population centers such as Tel Aviv. Fortunately, the Patriot system ultimately proved effective in protecting Israel's citizens against the Scuds, but loss of life did occur, as well as significant destruction of property. Those senseless attacks resulted in more damage and casualties per capita than any other frontline state.

The legislation we are considering today provides \$650 million in emergency economic assistance to Israel to help that nation cover increased military and civil defense costs incurred throughout the crisis. Israel has incurred over \$1 billion in direct military costs since August 2, and I hope that this new assistance will provide some relief from the financial burden that nation is experiencing.

As you know, in addition to expending substantial funds due to the gulf crisis, Israel is simultaneously providing refuge from hundreds

of thousands of Soviet Jews who are leaving the Soviet Union to live in Israel. In 1990, over 200,000 Soviet Jews immigrated to Israel, and in 1991 that figure may be 300,000. The financial burden is great, and I am pleased that the United States is able to assist Israel at this time.

In short, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this important bill, and I commend both Representative OBEY, chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and the administration, for their leadership and support of this emergency assistance to Israel. As the newest member of Representative OBEY's Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I look forward to working with him in the coming months.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1281, the supplemental appropriations bill. This legislation includes a number of critical items of which I am very supportive. However, at this point I want to commend the committee for including strong report language against diverting funds away from community and migrant health centers.

It is a travesty that the United States ranks behind 21 other industrialized nations in the rate of infant mortality. Here we have programs that provide health care services to one out of every ten low-income pregnant women in this country. These centers are already having to turn away people in critical need of care, and they are now confronted with a proposal for multimillion dollar cuts. That will clearly not solve the problem.

Today, I am sending a letter to Secretary Sullivan, signed by 73 of my colleagues, calling on the administration not to use community and migrant health center grants to finance the infant mortality pilot program. In the letter, we assert that the United States cannot afford to take funds away from a program that has been proven effective in reducing infant deaths.

The Community and Migrant Health Center Program is broad and far-reaching. Two thousand centers serve nearly 6 million people in every State of the Union. Virtually all health center clients have incomes below or near the poverty level and have no other access to medical care. Half of health center patients live in isolated rural areas, and the other half live in economically depressed inner cities. Most are without insurance from any source.

Community and migrant health centers have a proven track record on infant mortality. They care for more than 10 percent of all low-income pregnant women, and they improve the quality and comprehensiveness of care for more than 200,000 pregnant women and infants each year. In fact, infant mortality rates in communities with health centers are significantly lower than in communities not served by health centers.

Reducing community health centers' funding will be counterproductive because it will limit their ability to provide the prenatal, obstetric and gynecological services required to prevent infant deaths and improve women and children's health. I commend the Appropriations Committee for recognizing that diverting funds from these valuable programs would be imprudent.

Despite their ability to provide high quality care, health centers report that for every 10 people served, 3 must be placed on waiting

lists. In my district, the Mount Vernon Community Health Center reports a severe lack of funding for responding to women in need of obstetric and gynecological care. In order to continue to build on this program's record of success, we should seek additional funds for these programs in the upcoming fiscal year so that we can further reduce our infant mortality rates and expand access to health care.

Again, I thank my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their wise statement against the diversion of funds from the Community and Migrant Health Center Program. As we move forward to fiscal 1992 appropriations, I am hopeful that we will be able not only to protect, but also to expand, funding for this vital program which reduces infant mortality and provides a full range of health care services to our most at-risk populations.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before the House (H.R. 1281) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations.

This bill contains many critical provisions, but one has a particular interest for me. The legislation disapproves redirecting existing funds for the administration's "target cities" initiative on infant mortality. The administration's program would take resources targeted to combat infant mortality in rural areas in some States, including New Hampshire, and redirect those funds to 10 major cities.

It is important, Mr. Chairman, to deal with infant mortality in these 10 major cities, but it is equally important to confront infant mortality in rural areas and smaller communities. We cannot deal with urgent health care problems by taking funds from one area and giving to another, it is essential that funds be fairly distributed. Unfortunately, preventable infant mortality is not limited to 10 major cities. Our rural areas face unique health care problems that contribute to infant mortality, and Federal MCH and community health granting programs are needed to address these questions.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. WHITTEN, and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, Mr. NATCHER, for their outstanding leadership and support in disapproving redirection of funds for the administration's target cities initiative, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, we are considering two spending bills that share an important relationship to the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. One, H.R. 1282, makes appropriations to cover the financial costs of our military involvement in Operation Desert Shield. The other, H.R. 1281, makes supplemental appropriations for the nonmilitary consequence of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, plus provisions for food stamps, unemployment compensation, administration, veterans compensation and other urgent needs.

Last fall, we enacted a new system of deficit controls that switched the focus away from the enforcement of arbitrary deficit limits to a system concerned with limiting net spending increases. These spending measures break new ground for the new budget process.

As part of that budget reform effort, we enacted ceilings on domestic, international, and military discretionary spending. We also pro-

vided ourselves with an escape hatch if emergency circumstances warranted.

The new budget process explicitly exempts the costs of Operation Desert Shield from the defense spending cap. At the time the Budget Enforcement Act was adopted, there was no way to predict the cost of the war, or even know if there would be a war. Likewise, the drafters of the budget enforcement bill knew that from time to time emergency circumstances might warrant additional discretionary spending that could be accommodated under the spending ceilings. They provided that if both Congress and the White House agreed that an emergency necessitated an expenditure, then new spending for that emergency would not violate the spending caps.

These supplementals mark the first time under the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act that the House has tested its ability to demonstrate fiscal restraint on discretionary spending. Frankly, the results are mixed.

The Desert Shield supplemental, H.R. 1282, appears to meet fully the Budget Enforcement Act criteria. It includes only incremental expenses associated with the operation. Moreover, the costs of Desert Shield will be paid for largely by contributions made by the governments of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Japan, and Germany to the defense cooperation account. When the final costs of the war are known, and all expenses have been paid, any U.S. funds remaining in the Persian Gulf regional defense fund will be returned to the Treasury.

The other supplemental, H.R. 1281, contains some problematic provisions.

Title I of this so-called dire emergency supplemental consists of expenses designated as "emergency" requirements. Unfortunately, not all of the items in title I merit emergency status. From the perspective of the budget agreement and the new budget process, there are several unacceptable provisions.

During the markup on this bill, an amendment was adopted to appropriate \$8.336 million for the International Trade Administration, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the U.S. Information Agency. The administration has not recognized these provisions as emergencies. In a March 6, 1991 statement of administration policy, OMB stated,

These proposals are not directly related to Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm and are not emergencies. In several cases, the costs either could be reimbursed by other agencies or could be absorbed within these agencies fiscal year 1991 budget allotments.

Additionally, only part of the veterans initiatives included in title I, chapter VIII will be designated by the administration as emergency spending. The bill proposes \$46 million for veterans medical care and \$12 million for general VA operating expenses. OMB has reviewed the VA provisions and concurs with the committee's designation of the \$12 million operating expense as an emergency because of the need to provide information and process the claims of returning reserve and active duty military personnel. However, the administration has reviewed the \$46 million for VA medical care and does not believe it qualifies as an emergency.

Under the Budget Enforcement Act, both Congress and the White House must agree to an emergency designation in order for spending on it to be exempt from the spending caps. Since both do not agree, \$54.3 million of the so-called emergency expenses in title I will now be subject to the discretionary spending cap.

Not counting this \$54.3 million brings us within \$25 million of the domestic discretionary budget authority cap for fiscal year 1991. But when the \$54.3 million is counted as non-emergency provisions, spending exceeds the domestic cap by about \$29 million and will trigger a sequester of all accounts in the domestic category 15 days after the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the questions and problems related to the emergency provisions in the Budget Enforcement Act are new for all of us. Those provisions are intended to ensure that real emergencies do not cause sequesters of unrelated accounts. They were not intended as loopholes in the budget agreement. Determining an appropriate standard for the use of emergency provisions and addressing the timing issues related to the role of the President and the Congress in designating emergencies are tough questions.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support H.R. 1282, the Desert Shield supplemental, but I cannot support H.R. 1281, the dire emergency and other purposes supplemental. I have already mentioned the problems the bill has from a budget process perspective.

These alone force me to vote against this bill, but they are not the only reasons I oppose it. I do not believe this supplemental appropriations bill is the proper place to fund \$650 million in aid to Israel, \$100 million for the District of Columbia, or \$224 million in additional procurement of the Patriot missile. While each of these items may be defensible on its own merits, they are not emergencies, in the context of the budget process, and they all set a terrible budget process precedent.

If we allow an exception for aid to Israel without requiring that it be fully offset with savings in other accounts, how can we ever hope to control future requests for domestic spending that many argue is of dire necessity?

Likewise, with the war essentially over, I see no reason to procure on an emergency basis more Patriot missiles than we need to replace the ones actually used in the war. If the promoters of the Patriot missile provisions believe it is necessary to acquire these additional missiles, then they should also propose an offset in title II of the bill to pay for them.

I also do not believe the District of Columbia should be singled out for special treatment. Every other city in America, my own Cincinnati included, could make equally compelling arguments on why we should give them the money instead. The only fair way to determine to whom Federal funds should go is through the give and take of the regular appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, since it was agreed to change the budget process last fall, we are now committed to play by a new set of rules. Under these new rules, these items should not qualify as emergency expenses. They could and should all be handled through the regular

appropriations process where they can be weighed against other competing needs.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the dire emergency supplemental bill, H.R. 1281.

After all of the blood and sweat that was expended during the budget summit last year, ultimately we passed a budget that starts us on the road to fiscal responsibility. I had problems with the agreement, but I supported it because it put strict limits on spending. At the end of the fiscal year, the agreement is only as good as the Members of this body want it to be. So the issue today is, will we live up to the agreement we signed last year? Maybe, maybe not. Let me explain.

We violated the Budget Enforcement Act right first thing out of the box by moving scoring responsibility from the Office of Management and Budget to the Congressional Budget Office. And here, in the first spending bill we hitch more cars to the train than it can haul. Some might call this a "Christmas tree" bill.

The President sent a request to Congress for \$2.8 billion in supplemental spending—\$89 million of it would be emergency spending for the purposes of the Budget Enforcement Act. So what do we do? We send back a bill for \$4.1 billion—\$801 million in emergency spending—exceeding the cap for domestic discretionary spending, a cap we swore on a stack of budget agreements to live with.

I have no problem with the priorities of this bill. It is merely how much we're spending. If we don't stand firm at the beginning, how are we going to judge ourselves at the end?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express strong support for H.R. 1281, a bill to appropriate supplemental assistance for certain emergency costs associated with the Persian Gulf war, and I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] for his outstanding and expeditious handling of this critically important measure.

This measure is important because it augments the State Department's ability to meet its increased demands in several specific areas: First, the Department has taken extraordinary actions to enhance its ability to protect life and property in response to terrorist threats at several worldwide posts, at some of our domestic facilities, and in response to threats against foreign dignitaries in the United States.

Another component of this bill will enable the State Department to expand secure voice communication capabilities in the Persian Gulf, as well as to improve other means of communication which is so essential when our Cabinet members travel throughout the world.

This bill will provide funding for crisis operations, emergency travel support, and evacuation claims costs resulting from this crisis. Each of these is legitimate and each of these are necessary to improve the day-to-day capabilities of our Government to perform its diplomatic function.

This measure also provides \$650 million in dire emergency supplementary assistance to the State of Israel, a nation that suffered tremendously throughout the gulf crisis.

Mr. Chairman, this is a needed measure. It is necessary. Accordingly, I strongly urge its wholehearted adoption by this body.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the Appropriations Committee for sending to us a responsible and much-needed supplemental appropriations bill. I recognize the many pressing needs the committee had to address in this bill, and for that reason, I am particularly gratified to see that the committee included \$200 million to take care of the shortfall in administrative funding for our unemployment insurance [UI] program.

We are all too familiar with the administrative funding crisis facing our UI program. As the recession has deepened, too many unemployed workers in my home State of Michigan have been left stranded by a UI program woefully unequipped to handle the increased demands placed on it. Six-hour waits in unemployment lines and 5 week delays in receiving benefit checks are common. That experience has unfortunately been replicated around the country.

Why is our UI program failing the very workers it was intended to help? Because the Federal Government has shirked its responsibility to provide to the States administrative funding for the program.

Though UI is an entitlement program paid for through a dedicated tax, and though the administrative account in the UI trust fund has more than adequate resources to cover any shortfalls, the States have not been given the administrative funding they need. Why? Because the need for these funds has been consistently underestimated in the past so as not to draw down the trust fund and increase the budget deficit.

A group of us in Congress have been trying to bring this unjust situation to the attention of the Bush administration and our fellow Members. When we first discovered there would be a large shortfall in UI administrative funds, 60 of us wrote President Bush asking that he request the necessary supplemental funds, declare the request an emergency, and propose a contingency reserve fund to take care of any more unanticipated increases in unemployment.

Our reply came the very next week, in the President's budget. Though the Labor Department's budget estimated the administrative funding shortfall at \$200 million, the President requested only \$100 million in supplemental funding for fiscal year 1991. Moreover, the request wasn't designated as an emergency, raising concerns that it might contribute to exceeding the domestic cap and triggering a sequester. Finally, despite the fact that we've faced shortfalls for 2 years running, and subjected workers to unnecessary and unfair delays in receiving UI benefits, the administration proposed no long-term solution to the problem.

As is so often true, the administration dropped the ball, leaving it to Congress to remedy this tragic situation. Over the past several weeks, a number of Members, including myself, spoke to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HHS about this, urging him to provide the full \$200 million and take steps to establish a contingency reserve fund. We were pleased, then, to see that the subcommittee included the full

\$200 million during its markup, and 50 of us sent a letter to Chairman WHITTEN urging the full committee to do the same.

Thanks to the Appropriations Committee, our efforts have finally met with success. The supplemental moneys in this bill will allow the States to get on with their basic and vital task of providing timely benefit checks to UI claimants. The long waits in unemployment lines and the disruption of the lives of American workers and their families should diminish, and a measure of credibility restored to our UI program.

Mr. Chairman, our work on the UI program is not finished. We still must find a long-term solution to administrative financing, so that the UI program can respond quickly and efficiently to jumps in the unemployment rate. I believe we must put UI on the same basis as other State-administered entitlement programs, and for that reason, DON PEASE and I have introduced legislation to change UI administrative funding from a discretionary to a mandatory spending program.

But we should take a moment to thank those responsible for relieving the current funding shortage, and apologize to American workers and their families for this unfortunate situation.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1281, the emergency dire supplemental appropriation for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

There is one provision in the bill, however, that I find particularly noteworthy—the one relating to mothers in the military.

Mr. Chairman, under current Pentagon policy, pregnant women are exempt from being sent into imminent danger areas. However, only weeks after these women give birth, the Pentagon can send them anywhere it feels necessary.

This policy does not make sense to me. That is why I am glad that language like that found in H.R. 1025, the Military Family Relief Act of 1991 which I introduced on February 20, has been included to change this Defense Department policy.

Under this provision in the supplemental, women in the armed services with a child under the age of 6 months may not be called to active duty without prior consent. And, these women may not be assigned to locations that do not have facilities for these infants, either.

While it is never easy to leave a child, it is especially difficult in the first 6 months of life. By passing this bill, we are providing mothers in the military with a little compassion during a special time in their lives and a special time in their baby's lives.

As a father and a grandfather, I could not imagine my wife or daughter being forced apart from their newborn baby. We should not expect our military mothers to do this.

This provision would not place a major burden on our military, either. Out of the hundreds of thousands of women in our military, only 15,000 give birth each year.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important measure and I am glad that it has been added to the bill. I urge its adoption.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1281, the dire emergency supplemental for costs associated with

Operation Desert Storm. The war in the Persian Gulf has taken a heavy economic toll on many of our friends and allies around the world, but none more so than Turkey, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, and Israel—the frontline states. Each of them, with the exception of Israel, has received substantial compensation—more than \$20 billion to date—from the Gulf Crisis Coordinating Council. Mr. Chairman, it is altogether appropriate that in this measure we provide urgently needed and well deserved compensation to Israel.

Mr. Chairman, 3½ weeks ago while on a factfinding visit for the Foreign Affairs Committee, I witnessed firsthand a Scud attack and the effectiveness of our Patriot missiles. I experienced for a moment a feeling of profound vulnerability; one shared, I think, by all Israelis who huddled in sealed rooms day after day throughout this crisis. I was struck then by the depth and importance of our relationship as well as the true value of Israel's restraint to the war effort.

Throughout the course of this conflict, in which 39 Scud missiles were directed at civilian population centers, Israel has maintained the highest state of defensive readiness. This means that the Israeli Air Force, on increased alert, has been continuously patrolling and training around the clock. Reserve units were mobilized, 4 million gas masks were distributed, and a nationwide civil defense network responded to the threat of chemical and conventional attack. For a country that spends one-third of its budget on defense, this additional expense has been an enormous burden.

Mr. Chairman, the \$650 million provided for in this bill will be of tremendous assistance in repairing the 8,000 homes and apartments destroyed in Scud missile attacks, and in restoring a degree of calm and confidence in the aftermath of the war.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, last October this Congress adopted a budget resolution which mandates a pay-as-you-go funding mechanism for spending increases. Yet, here we are exceeding the defense budget cap, increasing the deficit, when there are ample savings to be found elsewhere in the defense budget. Why are we not applying that same pay-as-you-go funding mechanism to the \$15 billion U.S. share of the cost of Operation Desert Storm? So early in this session we should not initiate changes which violate the spirit of the budget agreement.

Almost half a million military personnel were transferred from the United States to the Persian Gulf for Operation Desert Storm. We should find savings to pay for that operation by cutting what we spend in other U.S. bases in foreign countries around the world.

Prior to the gulf buildup, 435,000 U.S. troops were stationed at 395 major military bases in 35 foreign countries; 168,000 civilian Pentagon employees accompanied them. Another 47,000 U.S. Navy and Marine Corps personnel were stationed aboard ships in foreign waters. During the course of Operation Desert Storm, the number of troops stationed abroad rose to 900,000.

According to a recent publication of the Center for Defense Information, every year during the 1980's, the United States spent approximately \$160 to \$170 billion to defend countries in Europe, \$30 to \$40 billion to de-

fend countries in Asia, and \$20 to \$40 billion to protect U.S. access to Persian Gulf oil. That's a total of \$210 to \$250 billion.

Surely there are \$15 billion in savings that can be found within this vast sea of expenditures we already spend on defending other countries. We could cut just 6 percent of what we currently spend in those 395 bases in 35 countries and be able to finance Operation Desert Storm without increasing the deficit by 1 cent.

We are in a time of great budgetary distress. We must examine every detail of spending increases that cost as little as a few million dollars and search for something in the budget that can be cut to finance them.

We must do the same thing for this \$15 billion supplemental appropriation for Operation Desert Storm. We must look to the current defense budget to find savings to finance the war.

Last year we talked frequently in this body about the feasibility of bringing the troops stationed in Germany, Japan, the Philippines, and select other countries home. This movement gained strength at the time because of the gains democracy had made in Eastern Europe and because of public realization that while the United States makes massive and expensive efforts to protect the Japanese, their economy continues to gain in strength while competing with our economy.

At that time we wanted to see the savings from such force reductions incorporated in a peace dividend that could be applied to domestic social programs for the disadvantaged, children, and elderly. Many of these programs have seen their budgets cut drastically over the last decade to benefit the military buildup of the Reagan era.

Now the savings would be used, not to fund desperate social programs, not to provide a peace dividend, but to fund another military operation. This funding mechanism which I propose is precisely of the spirit which imbued the budget agreement reached last October. From now on we must find savings in one function of the budget to fund a new program in that same function. Let us begin this brilliantly conceived process right now—tonight.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only fair and equitable way to proceed with finding funds for Operation Desert Storm.

In the next few years we will have to find cuts in education programs to fund needed increases in other education programs.

We are going to have to find cuts in nutrition programs to fund needed increases in other nutrition programs.

We must find cuts in housing programs to fund increases in other housing programs.

Mr. Chairman, we must find cuts in our defense budget to pay for Operation Desert Storm. It is only fair. It is definitely doable if we lay aside our business as usual attitude. Cut the bases in Germany and Japan now. Save \$15 billion and transfer the funds to pay for Operation Desert Storm.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this violation of the budget agreement.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate on this bill has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1281

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide dire emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

All funds provided under this title are hereby designated to be "emergency requirements" for all purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I have three points of order to paragraphs not protected by the rule, and I ask unanimous consent that the paragraphs beginning on page 24, line 17, through page 25, line 10; page 28, lines 14 through 21; and page 32, lines 15 through 22, be considered at this time so I can exercise my rights under the rule.

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not intending to offer any objection. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] has been kind enough to discuss this with me. I simply want to protect the rights of my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] to know that he will be recognized in accordance with our prior discussion.

Mr. ROE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent order, the Clerk will report the first paragraph against which the gentleman from New Jersey may raise a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to approval by the Joint Committee on the Library, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized (1) to procure, through a rental, lease, or other agreement, not more than 25,000 square feet of temporary storage and warehouse space outside the Capitol Grounds for use by the Library of Congress during fiscal year 1991, and (2) to incur incidental expenses in connection with such use. Subject to approval by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, amounts for the

purposes of the preceding sentence may be transferred from the appropriation "Library of Congress, Salaries and expenses" to the appropriation "Architect of the Capitol, Library buildings and grounds, Structural and mechanical care". Amounts so transferred shall be available for expenditure upon vouchers approved by the Architect of the Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] have a point of order on this paragraph?

Mr. ROE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the provision in title II, chapter VI, entitled "Architect of the Capitol," beginning on page 24, line 17 through page 25, line 10. That provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentleman would not insist on his point of order. This is only a small amount of space that the Library of Congress wants to lease temporarily—about twice the size of the room we are standing in.

And the lease authority is for fiscal year 1991 only. That will give your committee ample time to look into the authorization question. Let me explain:

Due to an emergency, the bill contains language which authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to lease 25,000 square feet of warehouse space needed by the Library of Congress for book storage for fiscal 1991.

The Library has run out of space to catalog and store their collections. Last year, we found out that 40 percent of their collections have not been fully processed or cataloged.

We gave them funds to hire the staff to begin working down this vast arrearage.

Now they tell us they need more space immediately to process the special collections: For example, the special collection of 695,000 pieces in the NAACP archives, the collections of the leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the League of Women Voters, and the National Council of Jewish Women, Look Magazine, the Urban League collection, and literally millions of other items in special collections.

The library had estimated a cost of about \$13 to \$17 per square foot to lease this space through their current GSA arrangement.

That is about three times the current local rate for comparable space. And we have heard of instances where it has taken GSA a year or more to locate and negotiate space.

Since this is legislative branch space, and an emergency need for the Library of Congress, the bill authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to locate the necessary space, just for the current fiscal year. The Architect has been providing space maintenance for the Library of

Congress for years. This only furthers that relationship.

Both the Librarian and Architect strongly support this authority.

In the meantime, it would be helpful if the Committee on Public Works provided permanent authority to the Architect of the Capitol to lease space for the Library of Congress. It is unnecessary to have GSA do that for us. It is an anachronism from an earlier time when the legislative branch did not have the necessary expertise.

Mr. Chairman, this is only 25,000 square feet. It is for fiscal year 1991 only. We are trying to save the taxpayers some money here—maybe \$200,000. In the meantime, it gives the authorizing committee sufficient time to review the entire situation.

But we want the Library to proceed to clear up these arrearages. It will get the NAACP archives on the shelf much sooner—and the Urban League material—and the tens of thousands of other material that require space now to be processed.

The language merely authorizes a transfer of funds from current appropriations. There is no new money here.

That is another point I want to make. If this language fails and you do come along later with an authorization, the funds will not be there. This same provision provides transfer authority from the Library to the Architect for the lease costs.

If the gentleman persists in his point of order, we would have to concede this is legislation and violates clause 2 of rule 21.

I would hope the gentleman would withdraw the point of order. This is such a small and urgently needed portion of warehouse space. The merit of proceeding seems overwhelming.

□ 1210

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order raised by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE]?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I want to strongly support the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], for his insistence on the point of order. Obviously it is authorization on an appropriation bill, and we should follow the rules of the House. I strongly support it for all the good reasons previously stated by our distinguished chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

I almost feel like an ogre. There is nobody I have higher regard for in this House than the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], but may I call to the attention of the Members of the House that we got a letter

4 days ago finally asking the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, which has total jurisdiction in this issue, for our advice and review.

Now it seems to me that this problem did not happen overnight, and all these good folks have to do is come to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and we will process the matter with the greatest dispatch.

In addition, I call to the gentleman's attention that it is not that simple. They also want to transfer all of the authority from General Services Administration to the Architect of the Capitol. Now that is rather a large order, and there will be no delay, I can tell the Members of this House, on these issues whatsoever. In fact it will probably get done quicker, and, therefore, with the greatest respect to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] I must insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ECKART). The Chair is prepared to rule.

Based on the reasons asserting by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], the point of order is sustained, and the paragraph is stricken.

The Clerk will report the next paragraph in dispute. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, beginning on line 13,

CHAPTER X

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

None of the funds made available by this or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used by the General Services Administration to obligate or expend any funds for the award of contracts for the construction of the Northern Virginia Naval Systems Command Headquarters project without advance approval in writing of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. ROE. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the provision of title II, chapter X, entitled "General Services Administration" beginning on page 28, lines 14 through 21. That provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it again is recommending legislation in an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the provision entitled "General Services Administration" be modified by inserting in line 21, after the word "the," the words, "House Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the."

If I may explain, the reason for this is there has been a discrepancy with regard to the cost of this building. GSA came in at one figure, and then the Senate came in at another figure, and in the closing hours there was not any time to go back and look at it. I sent a letter to the GSA and asked them, based on the specification of the Navy

and the GSA, how much would it cost for the building to be built? They are now analyzing that. That report is expected maybe as early as tomorrow.

Second, because there were conflicting statements and wild swings in figures, I have asked GSA to again look at the figures. They have gone back and have contracted out with an expert to look at the specifications of the Navy to see what those costs would be.

Third, I have asked the inspector general of the GSA to look at all the data and make an analysis.

Lastly, I have written today, or will be sending a letter out by the end of the day; I am writing the inspector general of the Department of the Navy asking them to look at this, whereby the Congress will have the ability to look at GAO's figures, GAO's experts, the IG from the GSA, GAO's figures and the IG from Navy, and then the Congress and the American people can be confident that whatever figure is appropriated is the appropriate figure.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 19, 1990.

Mr. CHARLES A. BOWSER,
Comptroller General, General Accounting Office,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BOWSER: I am writing to request that you perform an accounting review of the request by the General Services Administration (GSA) for appropriated funds to consolidate the Naval Systems Commands (NSC) of the Department of the Navy.

As a member of the House Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government subcommittee, I have serious concerns about the discrepancies between dollar figures for the request, which consists of the first million square feet of a two million square foot project. Since the Administration first sought \$821,548,000 for a three million square foot NSC project in a budget amendment transmitted to Congress on March 29, 1990, there have been conflicting statements about the actual dollar amount needed to complete the project.

The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works has expressed interest in the project, and officials at the GSA and the Navy have offered cost estimates for the project that have varied by tens of millions of dollars, with swings in estimates of \$60 million overnight. The conference committee on H.R. 5241 appropriated the amount necessary to complete the first of the two million square feet, relying on the information provided by the career federal employees—and I emphasize career federal employees who are immune from political pressure—that have worked on the consolidation project over the last several years. The committee provided a level of funding intended to avoid future cost overruns.

My concern is that the legitimacy of the competitive procurement process for the NSC project be preserved, in order to ensure that the federal funds are obligated in a manner that reflects the best interests of the American people. I would therefore request that the audit focus on the amount of money needed to deliver the first of two million square feet under the terms of the current procurement.

I also firmly believe that the Congress and the American people should be able to rely on the appropriateness and accuracy of the

dollar figures provided by executive agencies in appropriations requests. There were too many discrepancies in the figures provided, where good government demanded that there be clarity and fairness.

I have sent a letter to the Administrator of General Services requesting that he not obligate the funds for the project prior to your investigation of this matter. I would therefore respectfully request that you investigate the matter and report back to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 60 days of your receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,
Member of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] seeks unanimous consent to modify the language subject to the reservation of the point of order of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE].

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of chapter X, as modified, is as follows:

CHAPTER X

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

None of the funds made available by this or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used by the General Services Administration to obligate or expend any funds for the award of contracts for the construction of the Northern Virginia Naval Systems Command Headquarters project without advance approval in writing of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the House Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] insist on his point of order?

Mr. ROE. No, I do not, Mr. Chairman. I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] has a third point of order. The Clerk will report the paragraph.

The clerk read as follows:

SEC. 302. Section 310(c) of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991, is amended as follows: In section 310(c) delete the word "shall" after the word "Secretary"; in section 310(c)(1), insert the word "shall" before the word "provide"; in section 310(c)(2), insert the word "may" after "August 1, 1991"; and in section 310(c)(3), insert the word "shall" before "not distribute".

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 302 of the bill, beginning on page 32, line 15 through line 22. That provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI because it is legislation in an appropriation bill.

This is a monumental change. This is not a slight item here that we are dealing with. It would absolutely change the whole authorization and process in the law that we have on the transportation legislation, and for that reason it is more than making law. If my colleagues like an appropriation bill, it is literally taking away the authority of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], certainly in his request, and I want to notify the House that I will be putting in a table, which is an estimate of how States might be affected if section 302 of the emergency supplemental appropriation were adopted.

Mr. Chairman, I want to support our distinguished chairman in his request.

Mr. Chairman, the following table is an estimate of how States might be affected if section 302 of the dire emergency supplemental appropriations, as reported by the committee, were adopted. This provision would permit the Secretary of Transportation to hold back a redistribution of obligation authority on August 1, 1991, to States that have highway projects that are ready to go. This redistribution is now required by law. It is estimated that \$1 billion will be available for redistribution this August 1.

The following table is based on how much each State would lose if that \$1 billion were withheld, based on the relative portion of each State's redistribution in 1989. It is important to note that the formula for redistribution changes each year because priority is given to States having large unobligated balances of apportioned funds, and funds are only redistributed to States that have projects ready to go.

It is also important to emphasize that the States from which this authority is redistributed will not lose anything, since this is authority that they will not be able to use during this fiscal year.

	<i>In thousands</i>
Alabama	\$6,467
Alaska	13,500
Arizona	17,339
Arkansas	13,347
California	54,864
Colorado	8,906
Connecticut	6,453
Delaware	5,076
Florida	38,052
Georgia	19,467
Idaho	8,037
Illinois	64,611
Indiana	27,104
Iowa	29,453
Kansas	17,564
Kentucky	28,634
Louisiana	66,267
Maine	6,971
Maryland	12,798
Michigan	29,966
Minnesota	40,086
Mississippi	12,312
Missouri	26,303
Montana	12,785
Nebraska	8,033
Nevada	15,606
New Hampshire	11,043
New Jersey	7,718
New Mexico	29,165
New York	11,898
North Carolina	18,333

	<i>In thousands</i>
North Dakota	\$7,038
Ohio	22,091
Oklahoma	13,631
Oregon	10,949
Pennsylvania	33,624
Rhode Island	9,536
South Carolina	20,858
South Dakota	6,818
Tennessee	29,700
Texas	43,353
Utah	16,484
Vermont ¹	18,041
Virginia	50,535
Washington	18,041
West Virginia ¹	8,717
Wisconsin	11,903
Wyoming	207
Guam	8,190
Puerto Rico	27
Northern Marianas	27

¹These states did not receive redistribution in 1989, but would be eligible in 1991.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in the support of the point of order raised by the gentleman from New Jersey.

I have grave concerns with the provision in H.R. 1281 that would make the August redistribution of unused obligational authority discretionary rather than mandatory.

Current law provides that the Secretary of Transportation shall redistribute unused obligational authority to the States that have projects ready to go on August 1 of each fiscal year.

This is an important provision—one that this Congress has consistently supported—and on which the States have come to rely.

The August redistribution means that States can continue to advance critical and high cost projects. Additionally, this provision enables States to reduce high unobligated balances of funds.

Changing this policy—especially at this juncture—is a mistake. The Committee on Public Works and Transportation is currently in the process of drafting legislation to reauthorize the surface transportation programs which will expire on September 30 of this year.

Further, it would cause the unspent balances in the highway trust fund to rise significantly in 1 year. This erodes our position for expansion of the program and our justification for higher spending levels if States are not able to spend the authority granted them because of these types of artificial budgetary constraints.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly concur with the gentleman from New Jersey's point of order and I urge the Chair to support it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ECKART). Are there any Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the point of order is sustained for the reasons advanced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], and that paragraph is stricken.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to at this time explain the reason that I included the provision that was just deleted by a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has been very supporting of the highway program. In fact, the \$14.5 billion fiscal year 1991 obligation level which our committee recommended and the Con-

gress enacted represented a \$2.3 billion increase—almost 20 percent—over last year. The States will receive increased funding as a result of our action.

So, why did we include this provision? The provision was included as requested by the President to permit the Secretary to make the August 1, 1991, redistribution based upon the fiscal and programmatic situation as of that date. Nobody knows in advance what that situation is going to be. It may turn out that by reducing the program a small amount this year, we could increase it by a larger amount next year. It may turn out that the States would be able to obligate the entire \$14.5 billion. Their obligation rate is running 10-percent below last year's rates. It may turn out that the entire \$14.5 billion can and should be obligated. That is why we required the Secretary to consult with the committee prior to making any changes as a result of the language contained in the bill.

□ 1220

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Operations and administration" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$2,951,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for "Operations research, and facilities" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$2,775,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Scientific and technical research and services" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$1,610,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, \$4,633,000.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, \$3,103,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Oper-

ation Desert Storm, \$39,700,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be available notwithstanding section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Emergencies in diplomatic and consular service" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$9,300,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended.

RELATED AGENCY

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$6,800,000, of which \$1,400,000 is to be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in "Radio Construction" subject to the Department of Defense waiving reimbursement for transportation, personnel, and related costs for establishing a temporary medium-wave broadcast facility for the Voice of America in Bahrain.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM

ADDITIONAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Desert storm, \$338,600,000 is appropriated for transfer from the Defense Cooperation Account to the following accounts in not to exceed the following amounts:

Mr. WALKER, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have an amendment to offer at this point, but I just wanted to put in some kind of framework what we are doing here, because very often when we spend this amount of money, it is a little unclear to the American people about how that amount of spending will affect them. I think it is fascination to take a look at what each million or billion in spending actually means to the individual taxpayer and maybe reduce it to the bills we are presently considering.

This particular bill is \$4.1 billion. Most people in my district have no idea what a billion dollars means. Most people on this floor have no idea what a billion dollars really means. We talk about it a lot, but we do not really know. The fact is that \$4.1 billion means that every taxpayer is going to be charged something on the order of \$45 for this particular bill, so that every taxpaying family in the country is being charged \$45 for what we are doing here today.

I point that out only to assure that the priorities are such that the average family would think about that \$45 in the same terms they think about spending at the local store. For most families in my district, a \$45 expenditure is not a minor item. It is something that impacts heavily on their weekly budget. Before they go out and

spend \$45 in one expenditure, they probably think a good deal about it.

They also ought to be thinking about the way in which we spend money here, because today, as we enact this bill, we are spending \$45 of their money. I think that that makes it far clearer to the average family about what it is that we do, and I would hope that most Americans will take a look at this particular bill and try to decide whether or not the \$45 that is being spent on their behalf is spent on high priorities, items they would consider in what their budget should be. My guess is that they would find a number of items down in this bill that they do not regard as high priority items or that they do not regard as being worth their \$45. In other cases they would find items here that they would find very, very important and would think they are worthwhile.

In those terms, though, maybe we can begin to decide whether or not our spending is, in fact, justifiable; and I simply point that out because I think it is important for us to determine what we do, not only on the basis of the budgets we have in the Congress but on the basis of the budgets of the American families that these budgets impact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Missile procurement, Army", \$269,300,000.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of ammunition, Army", \$29,600,000.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$34,700,000.

GENERAL PROVISION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. (a) The transfer authority provided in the foregoing paragraphs is secondary to the authority provided in the "Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1991."

(b) The authority provided in this Act to transfer funds from the Defense Cooperation Account is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this or any other Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1991.

(c) Amounts transferred from the Defense Cooperation Account in this Act shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$3,565,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER IV

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development" to provide for additional costs resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm \$6,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1991, which shall be made available only for the costs of evacuating United States Government employees and Personal Services Contractors, their dependents, and for subsistence allowance payments: *Provided*, That such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672.

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For an additional amount for the "Economic Support Fund", \$650,000,000, to provide for additional costs resulting from the conflict in the Persian Gulf, which shall be made available only for Israel: *Provided*, That such sum shall be made available on a grant basis as a cash transfer and shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1991. *Provided further*, That such sum may be used by Israel for incremental costs associated with the conflict in the Persian Gulf, notwithstanding section 513(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VALENTINE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VALENTINE: Page 7, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 21.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to strike a portion of the dire emergency supplemental appropriations bill that would provide \$650 million to the State of Israel by creating an economic support fund.

On paper, Mr. Chairman, my amendment seems insignificant in its brevity, but its effect is very significant to the taxpayers who will be forced to pay the bills that we run up here today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the majority of Americans share the wish of this Congress to grant to the Israeli Government an additional appropriation of funds at a time when we are struggling under the weight of a recession and the first estimates of the huge cost of Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm.

Let me make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I believe that the Israeli nation is one of our best friends in the Middle East and in the world, and I value this important relationship. I have been and will continue to be a vigorous supporter of Israel. Few people have suffered as the Israelis have, and no one has achieved the success from such hardscrabble beginnings that they have.

They have made the desert bloom, and they have created a democracy unique in the Middle East. The Nation

of Israel is a shining example of the power of democracy, and it deserves our continued support.

However, I cannot understand how this Nation can afford to be so forthcoming with funds that we do not have. We simply cannot afford to continue to support the economies of other nations when our own economy is stagnant.

The primary target of this amendment is not Israel; it is a foreign aid policy that is hurting Americans. The task of reducing and streamlining the Foreign Aid Program is long overdue. This proposed aid to Israel offers an excellent opportunity to begin the process.

I do not want to be misunderstood. Our record clearly demonstrates that America is a generous Nation and that Americans recognize their responsibilities to the world. I am not suggesting that we turn our backs on those nations that need help; I am just suggesting that we inject some realism into our policies.

As stewards of the ship of state, we owe it to the citizens of this great Nation to remain ever vigilant with their money. By continuing to provide outrageously large amounts of foreign aid, we sacrifice our own future economic well-being and our ability to control our already enormous budget deficit. We must, Mr. Chairman, draw the line somehow and somewhere.

□ 1230

The unspeakable must be spoken. Mr. Chairman, this is that time, this is that place, and this is that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I do not delude myself. I do not know how many votes we will get for this proposition. I might leave the floor myself on a stretcher, figuratively speaking. But many Members of this House know in their heart that I am right.

I urge Members in the House to support the hard-working, taxpaying citizens who elected them, by supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, foreign aid is completely out of control, and an overwhelming majority of Americans are disgusted.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that this country feels so good right now about what has happened in the Persian Gulf is that after the country debated, and after the Congress debated, we came together. We supported the decision that was made, and so we came out of the war together, because we went into it together, and we prosecuted it together.

At the time of the vote in the House I gave a speech, and I said roughly the following. I said, do not vote to strike up the band today, unless you are willing to face the music afterwards.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is part of the music. The fact is that we have incurred in that war substantial financial obligations. We will have an obligation to support veterans benefits, and we will have an obligation to support war-related foreign assistance requests that come to us from the administration, assuming we think they are rational.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very frank and very blunt about this issue before us today. After the war was over there was a lot of talk in this town about whether or not there was going to be additional aid for Israel. The Israeli Government made an official request of the administration to provide \$910 million in additional assistance, which represented Israel's estimate of costs that they had incurred during the war with Iraq.

I told the administration, I told Secretary Baker, I thought those numbers were outlandish. I told the administration that I thought they ought to scrub those numbers.

I told the administration that if the administration concluded that we ought to have a reduced number, I would support that number, and if they concluded that we ought to provide no additional funding, I would support that decision also.

The administration negotiated with Israel on what should be provided, and they concluded that because Israel had undergone some 39 Scud attacks and had incurred a significant amount of additional expenditures, they concluded that because Turkey, Egypt, and, yes, even Jordan, had received some \$20 billion in outside help to deal with the costs of the war, that Israel should be compensated partially for the costs that they had incurred.

So they agreed to a package which contained two pieces. The administration agreed to a package which would provide \$650 million in assistance to Israel in this bill, and they also signed onto a package which indicated that there would be no additional attempts by anyone to provide any additional aid to Israel until after Labor Day.

Now, why is that important? It is important because there is another potential request pending for aid. That request is expected to come from the Israeli Government to the tune of \$10 billion in loan guarantees to support costs of absorbing the exodus of Soviet Jews from the Soviet Union to the State of Israel. That would amount to about \$2 billion a year in loan guarantee costs to Uncle Sam, if we were to undertake that obligation.

Now, in my view we have an obligation to try to help every Soviet Jew who wants to leave the Soviet Union, because of the past history of that society. But I also think that the State of Israel has an obligation to us. I think the entire Middle East has an obligation to us.

Right now, very frankly, I do not think we owe any party in the Middle East a dime. I think that every country in the Middle East owes us one whale of a lot. I think from the Arab world, we have a right to know that the Arab world is going to engage in conduct which will make tomorrow different than yesterday in the Middle East. I think that means that the Arab States have an obligation to recognize the necessity to deal directly with Israel on the appropriate issues at hand.

I think we also have a right to expect that the oil rich Arab States will provide an aid program in their own region for the poorest countries in their own region, to address the difference between the haves and the have nots in that part of the world. I think that is an Arab responsibility, not an American responsibility.

I think that Israel has an obligation to the United States to do two things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think Israel has an obligation, first of all, to make clear that they are willing to deal, and deal generously on the issue of the Palestinians. Because in my judgment, until that issue is dealt with, there will be no peace in the Middle East, and until that issue is dealt with, we will not have guaranteed that Americans will not again have to shed blood in the Middle East.

The second thing I think Israel has an obligation to do is to see to it that every Soviet Jew that is resettled in Israel, is resettled in an area which does not inflame the region. By that I mean I do not believe those additional refugees ought to be settled in what is now referred to as the occupied territories in the West Bank and Gaza.

Mr. Chairman, I say that, because so long as they are resettled in that area, any Arab radical in the region can use that issue to prevent us from finally sealing the opportunity that we have now to finally achieve some kind of peaceful resolution in the Middle East.

I think, therefore, that the administration request here today ought to be supported, because the agreement reached makes quite clear that there will be no additional requests that the Congress will consider—and that the administration will consider—until the administration has had sufficient time to put together its own approach for dealing with the Middle Eastern peace process and to put together its own approach to dealing with Middle Eastern security arrangements.

That is the way it ought to be. Everybody ought to stay off the administration's back while they try to put together this package. That means they need to know that there will be no end

runs in the Congress to try to appropriate money for any party in the Middle East until the administration has an opportunity to put together its peace package.

Therefore, I think what we ought to do is stay united this afternoon on this issue. The administration has submitted a formal budget request, which I now have in my hand. I have a letter from the President of the United States asking Congress to consider this a dire emergency and to support the amount contained in the bill. We are going to have to have the Congress and the administration walking together for a long time on the approach to the Middle East if we are to achieve peace in that region and to guarantee that Americans who died there did not die in vain.

Mr. Chairman, this is part of the price we have to pay for the actions that took place over the past month. We need to stay together with the administration. We also need to see to it that in the future there will be a policy of arms denial to the entire region, so that we do not have a situation like this ever develop again.

□ 1240

So I would urge Members to support this request by the administration. It was agreed to unanimously in the Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis.

If Members want to argue about what aid levels we ought to have for the Middle East, argue about it when the regular appropriation bill comes up. But this request deserves our unanimous support, and I urge Members to give it just that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. KLECZKA and by unanimous consent Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman from Wisconsin share with the House the precise Israeli costs which we will be reimbursing with this \$650 million?

Mr. OBEY. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. KLECZKA. We are appropriating today \$650 million. What are we reimbursing Israel for? Is this for gas masks, for building damage? What is it to be used for?

Mr. OBEY. I would not describe it as reimbursing Israel. What we are doing, what the administration is doing is recognizing that every state in the region incurred large expenses associated with the effort to contain and roll back Saddam Hussein, and that Israel felt that they were entitled to receive aid

from the outside world of approximately \$910 million.

The administration felt that a more accurate assessment of their needs was \$650 million.

Mr. KLECZKA. If the gentleman will yield further, are we buying armaments? Is this additional tanks, or Patriots, or what?

Mr. OBEY. No, we are not buying additional arms. We are simply helping Israel to pay for the costs associated with the necessity for them to stand in a constant state of readiness for well over a month as they were preparing for and then enduring the Scud attacks which came from Iraq.

Mr. KLECZKA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. Chairman, I think we need to look closely at what we are talking about here today. As we know, the bill provides dire emergency funds for events related to Desert Storm, and surely Israel, while not originally considered a front line state, became a front line state. Israel suffered the dire consequences of this war as keenly as any state in the engagement.

All of us heard the wailing sirens over Israel as the Scud attacks occurred, 30 of them. There were 200 casualties in the cities of Israel, thousands of homes were destroyed, and scores of people were left homeless.

The nation was forced to engage in an immediate civil defense activity to try to supply gas masks to each citizen, all of whom expected to experience a Scud attack with a chemical warhead attached in those terrorist attacks over the nation of Israel.

This is a formal request of the President of the United States, negotiated, as my friend from Wisconsin has said, between the Members on both sides of the aisle of the Appropriations Committee. It was adopted in a bipartisan, may I say unanimous, vote in the Appropriations Committee. And it ought to be adopted on that basis alone.

But we ought not to forget that the entire purpose of Saddam Hussein's attacks on the State of Israel was to try to draw Israel into a confrontation. He hoped this would upset the normal relationship existing in the area and inure to his benefit by breaking up the coalition which the President, the Secretary of State, and others in the world had so carefully crafted.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this is an appropriate amount that has been worked out by the administration and by the Congress, and I hope it will be adopted. I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina to strike these funds from the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me rise in opposition to this amendment and support what my chairman, Mr. OBEY, had to say, and the ranking member on the Republican side, Mr. MCDADE, who has explained in some detail what this is.

Let me also just suggest to Members that there has always been a cost associated with our trying to defend peace and freedom around the world. That has never been free to us. There has always been a cost, a price to pay.

We have a democracy in that region, one that has free elections, one that has representative government, one that cooperates with us on hundreds and hundreds of issues of common importance to the strategic interests of the United States, to the economic interests of the United States, to the social and cultural interests of the United States. We have a shared background, a shared religious belief, and there is no reason to misunderstand why the administration has requested this money.

They believe, as many of us on the Appropriations Committee obviously believed, and the President himself, having sent that letter to the Congress believes, that the cost that Israel has incurred as a result of our Desert Storm/Desert Shield operation is a cost that would not have been incurred otherwise and, therefore should be reimbursable.

If Members look at some of the other front line states, and one in particular, Jordan, which was not only involved in this war but took the side of Iraq and Saddam Hussein, they have been compensated. Over \$7 billion in cash has been paid out from a coordinated fund that the United States helps administer, funded by other countries, and that in fact has gone to pay Turkey over \$2 billion and Jordan over \$2 billion or close to \$3 billion, and to Syria between \$2 billion and \$3 billion, Syria, a state which just until recently we considered a haven for terrorists, which is still on our State Department's list of states that sponsor terrorism, a country which we still embargo arms to. And Jordan, a country who has now spit in our face while accepting our money. They have been reimbursed, and now we are here fighting over the one democracy, the country that stands beside us consistently, votes with us at the U.N. more than any other country in the world, supports our policies, and is one of the few hopes that we really have to bring peace in this region. Now somebody says they are not entitled to anything.

Let me tell Members, the gentleman from Wisconsin asked a valid question about what the money is for, and since we started this campaign and the war began, that country has had to mobilize their military. It is only a little over 4 million people. That means people in everyday walks of life, just like Americans, have had to go into the

military. But when you have 250 million people your economy does not feel it the same way as when you have less than 4 million. So the military mobilization has cost them a great deal.

In addition, they have had flying all of their Air Force, 24 hours a day, patrolling all parts of that country.

They have had to distribute gas masks to the total population.

All of these are military costs that are associated with what we were doing in that region, and it is only fair that we should help bear the cost. We are not bearing the full cost. Israel submitted a request and with documented evidence of over \$1 billion worth of costs, and this is not going to compensate them all the way. And perhaps we should not. They have an obligation for their own defense, and they have picked up that obligation considerably.

In the matter of fairness, in the matter of the importance of Israel to the strategic and best interests of the United States, this is something that we need to do.

And remember something else. Our Secretary of State, to his credit, for the first time is on his way to Israel to discuss with the Israelis, under a new approach that the State Department is taking, what they call parallelism, or what we might call a two-track approach to discuss not only the Palestinian issue, but how they can get the Arab States and Israel to sit down and finally try to work on some lasting peace arrangements.

Is there any more logical time than now for Saudi Arabia to undeclare, to revoke its declared war with Israel that has existed since 1967?

□ 1250

Is there a better time than this to try to get Syria, which has been in the coalition with us, to do the same? I think not.

All of our actions now and what we are doing here are calculated to try to make that work by keeping especially Israel an ally, strong and capable militarily of standing guard and holding to its line.

I urge the Members to defeat this amendment and any other amendment that will cut this money.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on the Valentine amendment, which would strike from the supplemental appropriation bill the amount of \$650 million for additional assistance for Israel.

First, let me say that as a Christian, as a Baptist preacher's son, I was brought up to love, adore, appreciate, and admire Israel, the Holy Land. In my office in the Rayburn Building, some of the favorite pictures in my office are pictures of my father, Dr. Carroll Hubbard, a Baptist minister for 51

years, and his preaching at the Mount of Olives, in Bethlehem, in Jerusalem. My father visited Israel on five different occasions during his lifetime.

We in the United States Congress already appropriate \$3 billion a year for Israel. I repeat, we in the Congress of the United States appropriate \$3 billion a year for Israel.

My colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH] was talking about why we need to give money to Israel, because we give aid to Syria and to Jordan.

Well, the great majority of my constituents in Kentucky are not for foreign aid to go to Syria and Jordan, and they have asked me during these 17 years I have served in Congress to vote no on money to countries such as Syria and Jordan. There are more "Noes" on the appropriation bills for foreign aid than there would be, because we include countries like Syria and Jordan.

I represent Fort Campbell, KY; 20,500 soldiers from the 101st Airborne Division at Fort Campbell are over in the Persian Gulf area right now. Think of the loss to Oak Grove and Hopkinsville, KY, the loss to Clarksville, TN, and the other towns near Fort Campbell during the many months that 20,500 soldiers have been in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm. The businesses in that area have suffered substantially because of the war and the fact that 20,500 soldiers from Fort Campbell are in the Middle East. Some of the area businesses have gone bankrupt. Many are closed at this point.

We should be considering a supplemental appropriation today for the businesses close to Fort Knox, KY, or Fort Campbell, KY, or Fort Stewart, GA, or the other places where our military has gone from.

What we have accomplished for Israel and the countries we work with and consider allies in the Middle East is that we have knocked out Iraq. We have defeated Iraq. We have caused Iraq to no longer be a threat to Israel.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE], the author of this amendment, said, he probably is in the minority on this issue, but there should be some who say today in this House of Representatives that we do not have the money to give another country an additional \$650 million.

Where are we going to get the money to pay for all of the successful operations in the Persian Gulf area as we have wiped out Iraq in a matter of weeks? We are still hoping Japan and Germany and other countries will come through with their financial commitments, but we cannot be certain each of these financial promises will be fulfilled.

The taxpayers of this country are going to be paying for a long time for Operation Desert Shield and Desert

Storm, and now we are being asked to give a country to which we give \$3 billion a year an additional \$650 million because of some of the sufferings and happenings there.

Indeed, our military, I am proud to say, has been in Israel seeing to it that we lessened the damage to that wonderful country. There is no way to guess how much damage would have been inflicted upon Israel by the madman dictator Saddam Hussein if it had not been for American soldiers and American weaponry, equipment, and Patriot missiles.

How can the Members of Congress go home this weekend and tell their mayors and county judges of their cities, towns, and counties that we do not have money for Federal revenue sharing for the cities, towns, and counties of the United States of America, but we do have an additional \$650 million for a country to which we are now sending \$3 billion a year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUBBARD] has expired.

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

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues before they vote yes or no on the Valentine amendment, to remember how much our national debt is, how much our continued Federal spending is, how much we are out of balance budgetwise.

Someone will ask: "Where is the money coming from for this extra \$650 million?" The answer: "Oh, just the same limitless, endless well from which we spend everything else as our Nation goes deeper, deeper in debt."

I close by saying that my constituents appreciate Israel. Most of my constituents consider it the Holy Land, but we also love the United States of America, and we know we are in deep financial trouble. As much as we have done for Israel and the Middle East by being in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm, my constituents would say to the Members, "We think \$3 billion in annual aid to Israel from the United States is enough."

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

Mr. Chairman, it is times like this when it is important to remember who your friends are.

The war in the gulf has shown us that nations that were purporting to be our friends turned out to be sympathetic to our adversaries. Nations that were our adversaries temporarily and for their own reasons became our friends, and our allies who kept us at arm's length and would not allow our troops within their borders allowed us to station our troops there when their very existence was at stake.

Mr. Chairman, there was only one nation before, during, and after this crisis

in the Middle East that was a staunch ally of the United States, and that is the State of Israel. That is the reason that we should be supporting this appropriation.

The gentleman from Kentucky indicates that the motivation for this appropriation is a sense of altruism or a nostalgic appreciation of Israel as the Holy Land. That is not it at all.

What we are talking about is the national self-interest of the United States. It was not in the interests of the State of Israel to refrain from striking back at Iraq when Iraq rained it with Scuds. It was in the interests of Israel to maintain its reputation as a fierce defender of its sovereignty, to exercise the right, which every sovereign nation has the right, of self-defense.

It was in the interests of Israel to retain its credibility as a strong country that would defend itself with its own arms.

It was in our interests, the interests of the United States, for Israel to refrain from striking back, and it was our interests that were served while they stood by and accepted the punishment that rained down on them from the State of Iraq.

I do believe it is in our interest to preserve and to sustain this country which is our only reliable ally in the region. As we have said many times, if we are fighting for freedom in the Middle East, if that is what our troops went there for, we should recall that it is Israel which is the only country which exercises political freedom in the sense that we understand it. It is the only nation in that region which is a model of democracy and civil liberties which this country stands for.

□ 1300

It is not out of a sense of obligation to another nation for altruistic reasons, but rather it is out of our own self-interest that this appropriation should be supported and this amendment should be defeated.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and to all other amendments to this bill which contemplate cutting aid to our closest Middle East ally, Israel.

Israel, remember, was a frontline state during the gulf war. She suffered 39 devastating attacks by Iraqi-Scud missiles. These attacks resulted in more than 200 casualties, including several deaths. They also resulted in the destruction of over 8,000 homes, leaving nearly 1,700 families homeless. During the war Israeli forces were forced to remain on the highest state of alert, resulting in huge costs to the Israeli defense forces.

My colleague asked before, where is this money going to go. It is going to go to ground force, air force, spare

parts, stockpiling of weapons, ammunition, civil defense measures. There were enormous costs associated with civil defense preparedness, including the distribution of 4 million gas masks to citizens of Israel. Further, the Israeli economy suffered substantial losses at a time when the burden of coping with huge numbers of Soviet refugees is already causing severe problems.

The simple fact is that the defense budget of our closest ally has been stretched to the limit in seeking to cope with the costs of the Persian Gulf war, and to defend against the ongoing threat from Arab States, which continue to reject Israel's right to exist.

Other frontline nations, including Turkey, Syria, Egypt, even Jordan, have received foreign assistance amounting to more than \$20 billion as a result of the war. On the other hand, Israel must look primarily to the United States for much needed assistance and aid.

Today, we are debating providing Israel with \$650 million in emergency assistance, less than 4 percent of the total pledges made by coalition members for postwar rebuilding. More than that, we are debating the importance of standing by one of our closest allies, the only democracy in the Middle East, in her time of urgent need.

Mr. Chairman, if not now, when? If not the United States, who? A strong and secure Israel is in our Nation's best interests. We must defeat this and other amendments to threaten Israel's security.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and to rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have to say very simply what I watched when the Scuds started hitting Israel, and I saw some of the damage and the effects on the population in Israel, and I was amazed over the next few weeks, and I guess months in this case, to see the amazing amount of restraint that the Israelis and the Israeli Government exercised in not immediately attacking, and in cooperating with the United States. There was a tremendous amount of public outpouring on the part of Americans because of what they saw with the Scud attacks, and because of the restraint that the Israeli Government exercised.

There is no question in my mind that this additional \$650 million is needed. We know what the costs have been to Israel. It is estimated that in terms of their military operations since the war began, that they have probably spent close to \$1 billion. They cannot afford it. I was in Israel about 18 months ago, and it was quite clear to me the amount of money, the amount of preparedness they spend for their defenses. Their economy is in particularly tough shape right now because of increased immigration and the housing and the

other benefits that they have to provide to the new arrivals.

It seems to me this is the minimum that we can do to one of our greatest friends, to one of the few democracies in the Middle East in that part of the world, and to a country that has consistently sided with the United States. I think this amendment is wrongly placed today. I am very much opposed to it, and I hope the rest of the Members of the House will also agree that we should support the supplemental appropriation.

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and to rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, during the past 8 weeks the world has witnessed the kind of terror that Israelis live with each and every day. During the past 8 weeks we in this body have watched from the safety and security of half a world away as Iraqi Scud missiles have rained down on innocent civilians in Israel.

Today still, half a world away, we are debating the price tag on our friendship with our only ally, our only true ally in that turbulent region, a friendship that has withstood the test of time.

Israel has played a pivotal role in the unique coalition against Saddam. She showed patient restraint. Her steely resolve spoiled Saddam's plans to tear the coalition apart. The world doubted neither the right nor the ability of Israel to defend herself against Saddam's attacks, yet Israel responded with great courage and valor and foresight.

However, the costs of her restraint were high. Saddam launched 39 Scuds toward Israel, causing over 200 casualties. Tragically, 14 deaths. Over 8,000 homes and apartments were destroyed, leaving 1,700 Israeli families homeless. Moreover, Israeli defense forces have been on 24-hour alert since Iraq first invaded Kuwait last August. Not only was the military mobilized, but Israel's civil defenses were activated as well, and 4 million gas masks were distributed.

Meanwhile, Jordan has received over \$500 million in assistance from Japan and Europe; Syria over \$200 million from Saudi Arabia and the Gulf States; and Egypt has received \$19 billion, including \$7 billion in debt forgiveness from the United States. Israel undoubtedly deserves these funds we propose today, as other nations on the front line have received funding. However, some in this body have already forgotten our debt of gratitude to the brave people of Israel.

I ask my colleagues, let Members not forget so quickly, the other heroes of the war in the Persian Gulf. Let Members not forget Israel.

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

words, and I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Many of the points have already been made and been made very well. Let Members remember that today's New York Times documented this, that during the war Israel was very eager to respond on her own and eliminate the threats of Scuds. As the newspaper articles revealed today, she had a plan. The plan was to bring in helicopters and commandos, and with soldiers on the ground, chase down these Scud launchers and destroy them. No doubt, they would be destroyed had Israel done that. No doubt Israel would have suffered casualties, and that always is what Israel has been willing to do.

The Israelis do not want America to fight for them. The Israelis simply want the wherewithal to defend themselves, as the rest of the world turns against them, as the rest of the world will sell whatever it takes to Iraq and to Syria and to so many other countries. However, this time was indeed different because the United States, our country, asked Israel not to respond, not to respond so that the coalition between the United States and Arab nations including Syria, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf States, all of those states in a war with Israel, they are, right now, in a permanent state of war with Israel. Also, they might not leave the coalition. Israel would have preferred to go in on her own, unlike my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky said. Israel did not want the United States to make this fight. However, the United States asked to.

What an irony it would be, ladies and gentlemen, if Israel's forbearance, her forbearance for her ally and friend, the United States of America, kept the coalition together that then proceeded to try and dismember the State of Israel. That, in my opinion, ladies and gentlemen, was the fallacy of the President's remarks last night. We are not going to be able to move to a quick settlement in the Middle East until one thing is done: until Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and all the Syrians and all the Arab States, once and for all, end their state of war with Israel, and recognize her right to exist. Administration after administration has tried to get them to do that, but Our President and our country have untold leverage to do it now.

□ 1310

That ought to be the first step to peace, but until that happens, then we must, it is in our own interests as well as what is right and what is moral and what is humanitarian, to give Israel the aid she needs.

Syria, Israel's mortal enemy, has gotten \$2 billion in aid for being an ally. Syria did not suffer the damages Israel did. Syria did not play much of a role in the fighting, and yet she has gotten \$2 billion.

Jordan, the state of Jordan, King Hussein who was Saddam Hussein's ally, also on Israel's border in a state of war with Israel, has gotten \$500 million in aid from Japan and the European community, and Israel who has suffered damage, the destruction in Tel Aviv would be proportionate to losing a city in America the size of Cleveland, has not gotten any help. Her economy was shut down by the war. Citrus could not be picked. Tourism was gone. People had to stay in their houses, all because our country asked Israel not to respond, to keep the alliance together.

It is only fair, it is only right, it is only in America's interest to repay that debt of gratitude and do what is right and what is in our own interest, and that is to support the \$650 million that the Appropriations Committee in a bipartisan way has wisely added to this emergency appropriation and to defeat both the Valentine and the subsequent Traficant amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the chairman of the entire committee. I agree with Chairman OBEY. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], and I agree with everybody who has risen today and said that Israel has a legitimate claim. They certainly do, and it should be sent to the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, if Iraq is going to make reparations to Kuwait, Iraq should be held to make reparations to Israel.

Now, we are going to be questioned here today about micromanagement. Mr. Chairman, when you find in my opinion mismanagement, it is appropriate to have some micromanagement.

Let us talk a little business. I say that today Israel is in a lot better shape than they were a year ago. Their major threat in the region, Saddam Hussein, has been destroyed. He has been dismantled. In fact, if America has a great concern, there will be a power vacuum filled by some fundamentalists from Iran that may be more troublesome for us than for anybody else.

While you evaluate this, at the end of the last Congress there was \$400 million in housing guarantees for Israel. It was widely reported that Israel wanted \$1 billion for damages due to the attacks from Scud missiles.

It was also widely reported that the administration was trying to settle on a figure of \$400 million, but they were concerned that if they did not come to an agreement of \$650 million, that figure could even be higher.

So as a result now we have an appropriation that was not budgeted for at the end of last year, even though we almost shut this Government down. We

bring this appropriation as emergency spending, and I do not think it is emergency spending.

What are we going to do next, Mr. Chairman, to accomplish goals? Will we take the deficit and the debt off budget?

Now, \$3.1 billion on a regular basis, \$400 million in housing guarantees last year, the President, a conservative Republican, asked this Congress in a dire supplemental to give him about \$600,000 for housing and programs for housing and for poor people, people who never owned a home. Now, we may not totally agree with all the elements of that policy, but I give the President a lot of credit. I do not know of anybody who will say it, but will somebody, some day, say that maybe Congress found the money and the time to consider supplemental aid for Israel, but did not take the time nor find the money to provide any supplemental aid for the homeless, for the poor in our own country.

Now, let us tell it like it is. It has gotten to the point when it comes down to a vote on Israel, everybody gets concerned. The dear gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] said that he does not know if he is going to be carried out on a stretcher, but he is going to ask for a vote. Now, why would he be concerned about being carried out on a stretcher? When you talk about votes for Israel, there are those reporters who say that there exists in this Congress an Amen Corner. I say here today to the Congress, if there is such a thing as an Amen Corner, then it is time for Congress to say Amen.

Now, I am not an enemy or opponent of Israel, but \$3.5 billion last year, while we were raising premiums on Medicare for mom and dad, raising taxes, makes no sound management to me at all.

Now, I am going to support the gentleman's amendment and I would hope before it is over that we would at least consider finding some money within this pool that maybe the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] might be able to have some little funds to have their measure appropriated for some money for housing in our country.

We responded with a coalition. That coalition is well now after it is over and faces a financial responsibility. Everybody should be coming up with a piece of that money. I do not deny Israel's claims. Let them send them to the United Nations.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong opposition to the Valentine amendment striking the \$650 million supplemental appropriation to AID's economic support fund that has been

earmarked for Israel, and in opposition to the Traficant amendment cutting \$250 million from the fund.

The entire world, and most of all our allies in the coalition, all lauded Israel's restraint when as a noncombatant nation it was ruthlessly attacked by Iraqi missiles, inflicting severe casualties and wreaking havoc on Israel's residential area. This AID funding is only a token payment, a token payment try to help the State of Israel reconstruct its damaged cities and to assist the Israeli economy in recovering from its significant losses that resulted from the Persian Gulf hostilities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the funding and to defeat both the Valentine and the Traficant amendments.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have stood on this floor and argued vigorously for reductions in foreign aid in the past, I have worked to cut aid to specific countries and to reduce foreign aid dollars in general, and I will continue to do that when that aid does not further our own national interests.

There are ambassadors from countries all over the world and more than a few people in our own State Department who will tell you that MICKEY EDWARDS is not a great friend of foreign aid, but this amendment, this attempt to bash foreign aid when it is being offered to help ensure our own security is really a very, very serious mistake.

We are all delighted by our success in putting together a coalition which included a number of Arab States. It was a great step forward, both in enhancing American influence and in moving toward the basis for peace in the Middle East, but the world has not yet changed. Israel remains our constant ally in a part of the world which is bristling with weapons and still unfortunately harbors great hostilities. Some countries in that region continue to be armed by the Soviets. Most countries in that region remain in a state of war with Israel. Israel's security, Israel's strength, are essential to peace in the Middle East.

□ 1320

This attempt to cut foreign aid may look good at home, but we are elected to protect the interests and security of America and its essential allies. Both this amendment and the one to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio are serious, serious mistakes, and a Congress which is dedicated to insuring peace in the Middle East should reject these amendments and reject them very soundly.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma. I think he has made a very eloquent persuasive speech.

Mr. Chairman, the administration supports this appropriation. The administration is very much aware of the contribution that Israel made in helping keep the coalition intact during the hectic and bloody days of the war. I think the administration is to be commended for having provided the funds to Israel to compensate in measure for the great damage that was done to Israel in restraining itself from having participated in the war.

I join the gentleman in his statement and I urge that the following amendment be defeated.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

I say not only does the President realize the contribution that Israel made but, I think, all the Americans who were glued to their television sets watching Scud missiles tear up housing developments in Tel Aviv realized what a sacrifice the Israelis made by not responding to that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe no one who takes this well—I am sure no one who takes this well—today in the debate has anything but the utmost respect for Israel as a nation and for the Israeli people as a people. They have shown, as has been said often, admirable and quite remarkable restraint in the face of the attacks by Scud missiles against them in this recent war. The people have shown courage and resourcefulness that are really examples for all the world.

So any discussion on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina and the other amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is not meant in any way to be disrespectful to the people of that land.

But while I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, the amendment offered by my friend from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE], I think he is to be commended, as is the gentleman from Ohio, in bringing up the subject, the subject of foreign aid which could be another round of rearmament in an area of the world which has already suffered for so many years because of the ratcheting-up of the arms race.

Also, I commend my friend for bringing up this issue because it does deal with the question of how much money should go into foreign aid, however apparently needful, when we have so many domestic problems, housing problems, homelessness problems, food

service problems, health care problems, that we are not nearly meeting.

I think, in bringing up this issue and in our talking about it today, we are opening up a new era of debate on these questions. The debate, again, is on the extent of foreign aid and the nature of it.

I was not on the floor when my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin Mr. OBEY spoke, but I am told he made a very eloquent statement on what he sees to be the future of the foreign aid program. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance, he is in a position to have an influence on that.

I believe that my friend in his remarks said, to the general effect, that this \$650 million allocation for Israel, since requested by the administration and spoken to just last night by the President in a spot just behind me, is going to be supported by him, but it may well be the last support such aid receives until there is some evidence that there is a peace, or some movement toward peace, in that area.

Secretary Baker is soon, perhaps today, to be leaving on that mission to seek a lasting peace. It would be awkward, at best, were he to go into the area to try to pursue a peace and sue for a peace and find that somehow he does not have the tools at his disposal to accomplish the mission.

So I do intend to support the \$650 million allocation which is in the bill before us, offered by the distinguished chairman from Mississippi. But I think we have to take into consideration carefully what this really means. If I understand from talking with staff, this money, the \$650 million, could very well be used by Israel to purchase weapons. It may not be, it probably won't be, but it could be.

There is, so far as I know, no limitation on the use of these moneys, which brings me to something that I said in this House earlier this week referencing an article in the Wall Street Journal about the U.S. arms manufacturers which already are salivating over the prospect of selling the very newest weapons technology to nations in the Middle East, the very technology that allowed us to win this war so readily and with so few casualties on our side.

So it seems to me we have reached the point where we have to give very careful consideration to moving away from rearmament of that area. I, therefore, will support the current allocation, the current request before us, but I am happy that my friend from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], is going to move this House into debate and discussion of issues affecting the Middle East; where we go, how we get there, what opportunities we have of securing a lasting peace. We do need to move back from this arms race which has led us to nothing but turmoil in the area.

I would say one last thing: Last night the President showed, I think, rare courage in discussing what he called "territory for peace." I am not sure any American President has ever uttered this phrase in such a public setting. But I believe that is the key element of finding peace in the Middle East.

I earnestly hope that the President can pursue peace and does see that to a conclusion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment that would strike \$650 million in aid to Israel to help cover its costs during the Persian Gulf war.

Israel was indeed a front line state in the war. In spite of its willingness at the request of the United States to remain directly out of the crisis, it was drawn into the conflict through dozens of Scud missile attacks. The Israeli Government should be praised for the restraint it showed in the face of these vicious attacks on their civilian population.

The economy of Israel has been burdened severely by the war. The already strained housing supply in Israel has been further reduced. Gas masks had to be issued to every person in Israel. Fortunately, the effectiveness of these masks were never tested by a chemical or biological attack by the Iraqi Government. The Israeli army was forced to remain at a high state of readiness throughout the course of both Desert Shield and Desert Storm. These are tremendous costs for the economy of a small nation such as Israel to bear.

Let us not forget that Israel is our strongest democratic ally in the region. They have a freely elected government. They support our policies in the Middle East. They have stood strong with the United States and the rest of our allies in the face of the defeated threat from Saddam Hussein.

Again, I commend this emergency appropriation of \$650 million to the Government of Israel to pay for only a portion of the total costs they bore during the war. This aid is desperately needed by Israel to maintain its economic and military strength. The emergency appropriation of \$650 million is clearly in the interest of the United States.

□ 1330

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I have studied various religious beliefs of the Middle East region since August, mostly because I have always been interested in history and wanted to better understand the area. I feared from the start that this war might become a religious war and a very long-term war like the one between the folks in Ireland and England. This did not occur.

The President made a wonderful presentation last night, and I was glad everybody appreciated it. He deserves a world of credit, but we should not forget that this war will cost 40 or 50 billions of dollars.

After the war an agreement has been reached with Israel. This is an agreement between the executive branch of this Government and Israel. I am afraid that this situation could still spread to more issues and countries. It has not. We better be wary of that for the next month or two, if not for the next year or two.

So this is not foreign aid in the true sense of the word. It is a special agreement. Like my colleagues, I have thought for so many years now, that if we quit paying premiums to somebody for exporting things and premiums to those who receive it, we might hold our trade problems in line. But this agreement is far more than that. This is a commitment that has been made by our Government with the Israel Government at a time when the whole Middle East region is in turmoil.

Mr. Chairman, I say, "It's highly risky to take any action at this time that is inconsistent with the executive branch agreement."

The bill we have before us reflects the results of what the State Department may have promised and agreed to. We don't know the details that Mr. Baker may have said to these groups that have had big differences for thousands of years. He brought them together. Until I know what those details are, I am not going to take a step that might stir up this whole situation again.

They say history repeats itself, and I think that the complete history of this conflict has not been written as of now. The fighting is over for the moment. Let us not do anything now that upsets the agreement that our President has made. I have no knowledge of any details, but the presentation made to us was that the damages were around a billion dollars and that this is an agreement for far less than that.

An agreement has been made and we need to underwrite it.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi very much for yielding. I want to associate myself completely with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I was in Israel a week and a half ago, and I can tell the very distinguished chairman of the committee and our colleagues in the House that in fact Israel has incurred additional expenditures because of the war in the gulf.

As a result of Saddam Hussein's unprovoked and vicious Scud attacks, Israel suffered extensive property damage, as thousands of homes were

ruined. The virtual shutdown of business activity in the country's large cities inflicted serious financial damage to an already overburdened economy. The red-alert status of the Israeli Defense Forces, which included 24-hour Air Force flights, constituted another major drain on the country's financial resources. But of course, while all of these costs in treasure were significant, it is impossible to put a price on the Israeli blood that was shed during a war that they valiantly chose not to enter. I am convinced that if Israel had not shown such admirable restraint, the coalition might have fractured and it would have been much more difficult to achieve such a dramatic and decisive victory over Iraq in the war.

As much as I respect the author of this amendment, I must say that it is a perfectly dreadful proposal. This is a very bad idea for two reasons. First, because Israel desperately needs this money to help make up for what was lost in the war. But second, this proposal comes at the very moment when we are asking Israel to make compromises and concessions in the effort to get a resolution of the conflict between Israel and the Arabs. I don't see how the United States can credibly ask Israel to take steps which some Israelis believe might jeopardize their security and at the same time pull the plug on an emergency appropriation of funds. The adoption of this amendment would enormously complicate our efforts to move toward a just and lasting peace in the region.

If I could, Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude with a personal observation. While in Israel, I was present for four Scud attacks. During one of them I was awakened at 4:30 in the morning in the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. I proceeded to the sealed room in the hotel, put on my gas mask, and sat there for several hours together with a number of others, including elderly people and a baby in a plastic-enclosed crib. It struck me then, as it does now, that it is a moral obscenity that the people of Israel, of all people, must be forced to sit in darkened rooms worried about a gas attack. That the people who lost 6 million of their own in our lifetime—many to gas—should endure such a trauma at the hands of Saddam Hussein is almost inconceivable.

This emergency appropriation will help Israel recover from the damage inflicted during the war. Removing these funds with this amendment, however, may deprive Israel of what it really needs—the opportunity to finally live in peace.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding, and I want to indicate my strong opposition to this amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I close with this observation:

Our troops have not been brought home as yet. This area is in turmoil.

We better not do anything to stir it up further.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, Israel deserves support for injuries suffered during the Persian Gulf war.

Her restraint under incredible pressure was truly remarkable; her people were brave and innocent.

Saddam Hussein's cynical attempt to bring Israel into the war failed miserably because Israel understood how important it was to remain outside the conflict.

Peace is a noble goal and let us work for a just and lasting peace for Israel and the entire region.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, less than 24 hours ago we sat in this Chamber and applauded the American people, our troops and ourselves for the magnificent job we did in winning the war against Iraq.

And we had a right to be proud.

We pulled together, we worked together, we supported each other, and we supported our friends in need.

Israel is one of those friends. Israel is one of our closest allies and was a frontline state in a war it did not start and in a war it did not enter.

Most of us sat by our television screens and watched as Scud after Scud slammed into Israel's cities. We watched as children were forced to put on gas masks, as infants were sealed in gas proof tents, and as the elderly were made homeless.

And we also watched as Israel's leaders anguished, daily, over whether or not to retaliate to unprovoked attacks on civilian neighborhoods.

Israel trusted us during this crisis to guard its safety. She was prepared to defend herself, but we persuaded her not to retaliate not to risk breaking up the coalition. We sent Patriot missiles to protect Israel and that no doubt saved many lives. But lives were lost, injuries were caused, and damage was done.

The Israeli public was for a policy of restraint, confident that our promises to them would be kept. They were against retaliating for the missile attacks, foregoing a policy Israel has always—without fail—used to guarantee its security, because we asked them not to.

Can we say now that their very real sacrifices, their living in constant fear of the crash of Scuds, is not worth us helping them recover from this war?

Israel has been asked to make very real sacrifices and we have a very real responsibility to help her recover from her losses.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the pending amendment which seeks to eliminate \$650 million in aid for Israel.

The gulf crisis took a toll on Israel. It deprived Israel of tourist dollars and required it to maintain a high state of military readiness. Further, and most importantly, Israel, in not responding to Iraqi Scud attacks, demonstrated unprecedented restraint in this conflict and sacrificed many of its immediate security concerns for the sake of the allied position.

For these reasons, I support the provision of additional aid to Israel. I also extend to the Israeli people my admiration for their bravery and fortitude during the Persian Gulf crisis.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the Valentine amendment to eliminate the \$650 million in aid to Israel as provided in H.R. 1281.

Israel is our strongest ally in the Middle East. It is the only true democracy in a sea of totalitarian dictatorships. It is the only country in the region that has a free press. It is the only country in the region with an independent judiciary. While we welcome the new efforts at cooperation between the United States and Arab countries in the Middle East, we must not lose sight of the fact that Israel has been our only consistent democratic ally in that region for over four decades.

It is important for us to remember how much the people of Israel have suffered during the war. Although not a member of the coalition against Iraq, Israel was directly attacked with 39 Iraqi Scud missiles, which resulted in numerous injuries and even the loss of life and created an atmosphere of terror among Israeli citizens. The property damage from these unprovoked attacks has been horrendous—over 8,000 homes and apartments have been damaged or destroyed, leaving some 1,700 Israeli families homeless.

Israel has also incurred tremendous additional financial burdens because of this war. Military and civil defense expenditures have risen to cover costs associated with the necessary heightened state of readiness. The entire economy of Israel has suffered because of the loss of economic output, the rise in energy prices, and the cost of rebuilding communities and the infrastructure.

Throughout this nightmare, Israel has displayed remarkable restraint. At the urging of the United States, Israel did not respond to Iraq's vicious attacks against its civilian population. Israel has been a true friend.

Now it is time for us to show our gratitude. I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and to authorize for Israel the \$650 million requested by President Bush and supported unanimously by the Appropriations Committee. It is small help for the great debt our country owes to Israel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 24, noes 397, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—24

Arney	Hayes (IL)	Stenholm
Bryant	Hubbard	Stump
Combest	Klecza	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Perkins	Trafficant
Dymally	Petri	Valentine
Gradison	Roberts	Walker
Hancock	Savage	Washington
Hansen	Sensenbrenner	Williams

NOES—397

Abercrombie	Alexander	Anderson
Ackerman	Allard	Andrews (NJ)

Andrews (TX)	Engel	Lehman (FL)
Annunzio	English	Lent
Anthony	Erdreich	Levin (MI)
Applegate	Espy	Lewis (CA)
Archer	Evans	Lewis (FL)
Aspin	Fascell	Lewis (GA)
Atkins	Fawell	Lightfoot
AuCoin	Fazio	Lipinski
Bacchus	Feighan	Livingston
Baker	Fields	Lloyd
Ballenger	Fish	Long
Barnard	Flake	Lowery (CA)
Barrett	Foglietta	Lowery (NY)
Bartlett	Ford (MI)	Luken
Barton	Ford (TN)	Machtley
Bateman	Frank (MA)	Manton
Beilenson	Franks (CT)	Markey
Bennett	Frost	Marlenee
Bentley	Galleghy	Martin
Beruter	Gallo	Martinez
Berman	Gaydos	Matsui
Bevill	Gejdenson	Mavroules
Bilbray	Gekas	Mazzoli
Bilirakis	Gephardt	McCandless
Bliley	Geren	McCloskey
Boehlert	Gibbons	McCollum
Boehner	Gilchrest	McCrery
Bonior	Gillmor	McCurdy
Borski	Gilman	McDade
Boucher	Gingrich	McEwen
Boxer	Glickman	McGrath
Brewster	Gonzalez	McHugh
Brooks	Gordon	McMillan (NC)
Broomfield	Goss	McMillen (MD)
Browder	Grandy	McNulty
Brown	Gray	Meyers
Bruce	Green	Mfume
Bunning	Guarini	Michel
Burton	Gunderson	Miller (CA)
Bustamante	Hall (OH)	Miller (WA)
Byron	Hall (TX)	Mineta
Callahan	Hamilton	Mink
Camp	Hammerschmidt	Moakley
Campbell (CA)	Harris	Molinari
Campbell (CO)	Hastert	Mollohan
Cardin	Hatcher	Montgomery
Carper	Hayes (LA)	Moody
Carr	Hefley	Moorhead
Chandler	Hefner	Moran
Chapman	Henry	Morella
Clay	Herger	Morrison
Clement	Hertel	Mrazek
Clinger	Hoagland	Murphy
Coble	Hobson	Murtha
Coleman (MO)	Hochbrueckner	Myers
Coleman (TX)	Holloway	Nagle
Collins (IL)	Hopkins	Natcher
Collins (MI)	Horn	Neal (MA)
Condit	Horton	Neal (NC)
Conyers	Houghton	Nichols
Cooper	Hoyer	Nowak
Costello	Huckaby	Nussle
Coughlin	Hughes	Oakar
Cox (CA)	Hutto	Oberstar
Cox (IL)	Hyde	Obey
Coyne	Inhofe	Olin
Cramer	Ireland	Ortiz
Crane	Jacobs	Orton
Cunningham	James	Owens (NY)
Dannemeyer	Jefferson	Owens (UT)
Darden	Jenkins	Oxley
Davis	Johnson (CT)	Packard
de la Garza	Johnson (SD)	Pallone
DeFazio	Johnston	Panetta
DeLauro	Jones (GA)	Parker
Dellums	Jones (NC)	Patterson
Derrick	Jontz	Paxon
Dickinson	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)
Dicks	Kaptur	Payne (VA)
Dingell	Kasich	Pease
Dixon	Kennedy	Pelosi
Dooley	Kennelly	Penny
Doollittle	Kildee	Peterson (FL)
Dorgan (ND)	Klug	Peterson (MN)
Dorman (CA)	Kolbe	Pickett
Downey	Kopetski	Pickle
Dreier	Kostmayer	Porter
Duncan	Kyl	Poshard
Durbin	LaFalce	Price
Dwyer	Lagomarsino	Pursell
Early	Lancaster	Quillen
Eckart	Lantos	Rahall
Edwards (CA)	LaRocco	Ramstad
Edwards (OK)	Laughlin	Rangel
Edwards (TX)	Leach	Ravenel
Emerson	Lehman (CA)	Ray

Reed	Shays	Thomas (GA)
Regula	Shuster	Thomas (WY)
Rhodes	Sikorski	Thornton
Richardson	Sisisky	Torres
Ridge	Skaggs	Torricelli
Riggs	Skeen	Towns
Rinaldo	Skelton	Traxler
Ritter	Slattery	Unsoeld
Roe	Slaughter (NY)	Upton
Roemer	Slaughter (VA)	Vander Jagt
Rogers	Smith (FL)	Vento
Rohrabacher	Smith (IA)	Visclosky
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Volkmer
Rose	Smith (OR)	Vucanovich
Rostenkowski	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Roth	Snowe	Walters
Roussima	Solarz	Waxman
Rowland	Solomon	Weber
Roybal	Spence	Weiss
Russo	Spratt	Weldon
Sabo	Staggers	Wheat
Sanders	Stallings	Whitten
Santorum	Stark	Wise
Sarpalius	Stearns	Wolf
Sawyer	Stokes	Wolpe
Saxton	Studds	Wyden
Schaefer	Sundquist	Wylie
Scheuer	Sweet	Yates
Schiff	Swift	Yatron
Schroeder	Synar	Young (AK)
Schulze	Tallon	Young (FL)
Schumer	Tanner	Zeliff
Serrano	Tauzin	Zimmer
Sharp	Taylor (NC)	
Shaw	Thomas (CA)	

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews (ME)	Kolter	Miller (OH)
Donnelly	Levine (CA)	Sangmeister
Goodling	Madigan	Udall
Hunter	McDermott	Wilson

□ 1354

Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. RINALDO changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Mr. PERKINS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have entered into the RECORD a statement explaining the fact that I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 30, and I would have voted "no." I ask that this be entered into the RECORD after the rollcall vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 30 on the Valentine amendment on H.R. 1281 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 7, line 11, strike "\$650,000,000" and insert "\$400,000,000".

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] would have struck all the money in the dire supplemental for Israel. Let me say that again: The previous amendment would have struck all of the money in the account for Israel, some \$650 million. I think every Member in the House knew that that had absolutely no shot.

Now, while maybe someone might pay some attention, I think that is exactly what is wrong with the country. We are willing not to really pay much attention to matters like this. We are just willing to go ahead and put in our little card, that real expensive credit card, because you do not want any complications from this vote.

□ 1400

Nobody in politics wants any complications. But I think if this vote was cast on a secret ballot it would have a real good shot.

But here is why I am bringing the amendment. I did not bring an amendment to cut it all because I believe Israel is a friend and they took some undue punishment and hardship, and they showed restraint, and America appreciates that restraint. It converted into saving the lives of many of our young people, and we can be proud of that.

But what I do want to address, Mr. Chairman, is that my amendment leaves \$400 million in this dire supplemental that really is outside of our budget that was passed at the end of the last session, and has come in here under the guise of emergency spending. My amendment still leaves in that appropriation account \$400 million.

Let me say this, it was not just Uncle Sam that took on the cause of freedom. There was an allied force, and that allied force should be subject to some of the costs instrumental to this Operation Desert Storm.

In addition, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, if it is prudent to hold Iraq accountable for reparations to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, why is it that our Government should not be a part of a U.N. resolution holding Iraq accountable for damages perpetrated against Israel, but it is coming up under a dire emergency basis?

For those of us who are tired of hearing it, I would like to place it on the record. We had 727,000 individual bankruptcies in America last year, the biggest year for such a record in America's history. Last year we had a record corporation bankruptcies. We have a higher infant mortality rate in Cleveland than in Ethiopia.

That is what I think the problem is with the Congress. We find ways to spend money everywhere where there is some steam behind it.

The word is that Israel wants \$10 billion. They asked for \$1 billion and the President said \$400 million originally, concerned that that account might be as high as \$1 billion, and the administration did request \$650 million. I think it is prudent for the Congress in looking at this matter and understanding the problems that we face in our own country to reduce that appropriated account by \$250 million, which still leaves \$400 million for Israel.

Let me say one last thing, ladies and gentlemen. I have had a lot of Members come up to me and say, "You're not going to ask for a vote, are you, because I would really like to vote for it? Don't ask for a vote."

I have several amendments after this and I will be asking for a vote on this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take very long. Let me simply make two points.

We are voting on this issue today, we are voting to provide this money because the President of the United States has concluded that it is necessary to do so. If he had not done so, I would not be supporting the appropriation of the money.

This country made a decision. It decided to go to war. It now has an obligation to pay the cost associated with that war and this is one of those costs.

Right now as we talk, Secretary Baker is preparing to go to the Middle East to discuss the future of that region with a lot of countries, including Israel. Israel needs to know, as does every other country in the region, that Secretary Baker speaks not just for the administration but for the entire Government. Every country in that region needs to know that if the administration supports funding they will get it, and if the administration does not support funding they will not get it. If they do not have that understanding, the administration will not have the leverage necessary to try to bring peace in the Middle East.

So it seems to me it is important for us to stick together and pay for this cost today.

I would make one additional point. For Members who feel as I do that we do not owe any country in the region anything at this point, that contrary to that they owe us, and owe us quite a bit—for those who feel that way and want to draw a line and say: No More, let me suggest that this is the wrong place to do that. Let me tell you where I think you ought to start.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last of the cleanup costs which we are expected to pay, on the first round, to deal with the immediate costs of the war. Our subcommittee held hearings last week on what ought to happen next in the region. Every single witness, all 10 of them, regardless of their political or philosophical view, made the point that we needed to start in our future dealings with the region with arms limitations and in fact arms denial. And they traced the history of arms sales to the region, arms deliveries to the region, and they made the case that if we want tomorrow to be different than yesterday in the Middle East that we have to have a policy of arms denial.

If you really want to be constructive, if you want to see to it that the sac-

rifices made by Americans were not in vain in that region, then you need to use your personal influence to help bring about arms limitation in the region. And I would suggest, frankly, that we ought to start with Egypt. Members will remember just a few months ago the administration asked Congress to approve—and they pushed through the Congress—a proposal to provide debt relief for Egypt. The administration then proceeded to forgive Egypt's remaining military debts to the United States.

But we are now in the process of beginning to put each of those countries right back into the debt hole, because the administration is sending down to us a request that we approve a large number of F-16's for sale to Egypt. The fact is Egypt does not have the money to pay for those airplanes. We are going to have to appropriate money to Egypt before they can repay us for those airplanes.

□ 1410

If this new sale is approved, and I expect it will be, if this new sale is approved, it will mean that we will be locked in for 5 years in terms of our inability to reduce what we provide to Egypt, because they will need that much money to pay us back.

We will see numerous requests from countries in the region, Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, you name it, for arms sales and foreign aid to facilitate arms deliveries to the region.

If you want to be constructive in contrast to this amendment today, if you want to be constructive, that is where you will draw the line. You will insist that the administration has a plan to deal with the region in a way that prevents tomorrow from being like yesterday. You will use your influence to see to it that we start with arms limitation in the region.

The money in this bill today does not provide any military aid to Israel. It simply helps to reimburse them for the cost that they incurred in enduring the Scud attacks and in remaining at a constant state of readiness. That is a legitimate cost.

I would suggest you draw the line here, support the President in this request today, and then ask for a higher standard of performance from every country in the region before we provide any additional funding.

I would urge that we vote down the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I do not intend to take but a fraction of the time if the Members will listen to me.

I have no desire to assume, as we say, to flog a dead mule. I do not expect this vote to be that much different from the one that has preceded it.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to my brothers and sisters here that the House and the Senate, the other body, and the President will have to come to grips sooner or later, and I believe sooner, with the absurd situation, the ridiculous condition of giving away overseas millions and billions of dollars that we do not have.

If Members want to look around and think of something that causes this institution to rank somewhere down close to, and, well, I will not name anybody, but way down the line in institutions that have the respect of the American people, it is because that the Congress year after year closes its eyes and its ears to the attitudes of the American people on the question of foreign aid.

I respect and admire that state of Israel. I do not want to do anything here that would cause them any difficulty, but the State of Israel needs to come to a time when it can stand alone.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will repeat what I said awhile ago. Traditional foreign aid is open to real question. Traditional foreign aid involves our serious trade problems.

If we did something about the profits of those who export and the profits of those who receive, we could handle it and get more support for foreign aid, but involved here is a different issue.

This whole area of the Middle East is in turmoil—tremendous turmoil. The question, as I see it, is: Are we going to support the agreement that has been reached by the executive branch? Right now we have got all sorts of potential troubles over there that could spread.

I still do not see how, if one studies history, the Secretary of State and others were able to bring together so many folks with thousands of years of differences, religious and otherwise, but they did.

I think, by all means, we need to go along with this agreement at this time. Traditional foreign aid is a different thing. This agreement is not that type of situation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat the speech that I gave a few minutes ago, but I just want to say to my colleagues that the issue that is before us in the Traficant amendment is the same issue that we just disposed of in the Valentine amendment.

This is not an issue of just giving money away for foreign aid. I have repeatedly sought to cut foreign aid on this floor, but this is an issue that really goes to the heart of our national security and of maintaining peace in the Middle East.

It would be a very, very serious mistake to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it ought to be pointed out that in the last 5 years the foreign aid budget for the United States has been cut by approximately 30 percent under our committee, and in the last 4 years we have moved \$6 billion in administration requests for foreign aid out of foreign aid into domestic budgets for education, health, rural development, and other items here at home.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct, and that is why for those people who really want to bash foreign aid, they are going to get many, many chances to do it, but this is not the place. This really hurts American security, and I urge my colleagues to vote no.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to raise some questions about some strange logic that I just heard spotted on this floor. It was said that we need to support the administration so that when it pledges funds or does not pledge funds, his word will be accepted in the Middle East.

Since when should Democrats abdicate their right to differ with the President?

Second, when it was suggested that we need arms limitation, and I agree with that, but it was also said that we should start with Egypt. Strange. Why Egypt? Why not start with Israel?

We give Israel \$1.8 billion a year for military assistance. That is more than we give anywhere else in the world combined. So why not start where we put the money? We give \$1.8 billion, as we did last year, to Israel, and the year before, and if we want an arms limitation, start there. Let us start banning the arms. After all, the most armed nation in the Middle East is Israel. The only one suspected of having nuclear capacity for arms is Israel.

It was said that we cut foreign aid 30 percent. Well, why not tell the whole story? We did not cut Israel one dime. We gave Israel \$3 billion of the \$14 billion that we give in foreign aid all over the world, and as I said, \$1.8 billion of that \$3 billion was military assistance.

More than that, the best way to cut foreign aid, and I can tell you how you can have some reduction in arms, if you do not give Israel this \$650 million and they take it out of the \$1.8 billion that we gave them for military aid, they would have the \$650 million they need to repair the damages and would reduce arms at the same time.

So if you want to reduce foreign aid, if you want to limit arms, do not give them an extra \$650 million. Tell them

to take it out of the \$1.8 billion that we already gave them.

Mr. Chairman, I say this in conclusion: This amendment is not even suggesting that we take it all. This is just saying that we cut it back to a level that the President even considers acceptable to \$400 million.

After all, a few months ago in addition to the \$3 billion, we also gave a \$400 million housing loan guarantee on the presumption or the implied agreement, or perhaps an actual agreement, from Israel that it would not use this money to build housing in the occupied territories, the West Bank, and the Gaza strip. Yet, that promise has not been kept.

One of the reasons for the problems in the Middle East is the lack of credibility of our Nation's foreign policy, because it has not been evenhanded.

□ 1420

We must not tie our foreign policy completely to every request from Israel or any other nation. We need to think what is best, and what is the need in our country.

I can tell Members, rather than \$650 million to go to Israel, we need that in the State of Illinois and the city of Chicago, and the Second Congressional District. Let Members start at home with our generosity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 7, line 11, strike "\$650,000,000" and insert "\$600,000,000."

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this would cut \$50 million and leave \$600 million in an account for a nation that is technically in chapter 11, and we are presiding as trustees over it.

I do not know if we can even get a recorded vote because no Member wants to put their little ticket here, their little credit card on this issue. Therefore, I probably will not be able to get a vote, and I did not hassle Members, but I am dramatizing the point. If we took as much time as a bulldog to tenaciously look after the interests of America as we do Israel, we would be a hell of a lot stronger today.

I have gone through it. I have nothing against the State of Israel. But please tell me, we had a conservative Republican President that asked for \$600 million for housing in this dire supplemental, and we did not give them a dime. However, Members, we had, in fact, a bill brought to the floor that found \$650 million for Israel.

Now listen: Israel is in better shape today than they were a year ago. Their major threat has been dismantled. Now, we tried to cut this account.

There is an amendment coming on this floor that will ask for some money for housing. Where the hell are we going to get it? Are we to imply from the basis of our actions here today that we are more willing to make sure that the housing in Israel is absolutely up to date, and the housing for poor people in America is not as important?

I keep listening to this rap about "This isn't the time." I agree with Members, I agree with Members on foreign aid and some points, but this is not the time. Let me tell Members, there is no time in this House because there is not enough guts to face the issue, because every Member is more worried about reelection than they are running this damn country.

Now, I certainly do not get a whole lot of money, and I don't expect to get any, but this amendment would cut \$50 million. I would leave \$600 million, and I would like for Members to give me a vote when it is over.

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

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

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I was only going to ask my dear colleague, and I think the gentleman just answered my question, but let me ask it anyway so that he can repeat his answer. Does the gentleman think the American people should know where Members of Congress stand on this issue; and does the gentleman plan to ask for a recorded vote in this matter at this point?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Members of Congress want to get away with a voice vote so they do not have to face this issue.

Mr. SAVAGE. But will the gentleman ask for a recorded vote?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I will ask for a recorded vote on this particular bill.

I will say this: The allies were a part of this. Uncle Sam seems to be the one carrying the tab again. There is nothing wrong with this.

If the Committee on Appropriations could conjure up a program and promulgate a policy to let Iraq come up with some money, and let Iraq make these reparations. Dammit, they illegally attacked Israel. They should be held accountable for that.

Second of all, what about the United Nations and all the other countries? This would leave \$600 million in addition to \$3.1 billion last year, another \$400 million, \$3.1 billion coming in about 3 months, and they are going to be asking for \$10 billion. Meanwhile, New York and Philadelphia are under threat of maybe bankruptcy. Chicago, Los Angeles and my town, hell, a person in my hometown cannot even buy rustproof paint. I want someone on the Committee on Appropriations to find some money for America this year. Everything else seems to be nongermane.

I would like a vote. I would appreciate if Members would at least give me the courtesy of a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused. So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 7, line 11, strike "\$650,000,000" and insert "\$637,000,000."

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would leave \$637 million in the account for Israel, and it would cut \$13 million of that account, leaving 98 percent of the account in there.

The reason I bring it up is basically one reason: When we have an issue that is dealing basically with a foreign account, and the Congress becomes so impulsive, it does bring cause perhaps to question that.

In a Washington Post article it was reported that the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee told Members of the other body that if they tampered with the amount of money that they wanted, they would not support their campaigns. Now listen to this: We have a lobby representing the interests of a foreign nation that told the upper body in the U.S. Congress that if they tampered with all with this aid, or questioned it, they would cut back on their political contributions.

Are we that afraid of this issue? Any wonder why we have \$4.1 trillion debt, and we keep hearing about the small comparison, the GNP? Members, remember what we did. We took \$3 billion in revenue sharing funds, that my cities and my hometown were paying for police protection and fire protection, and in the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLIGATE'S] community as well, in Chicago, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, but Members know what was said, that \$3 billion was too much. Three billion was just too much, that we had to stop that, although it was returning American taxpayers' dollars to the cities where it originated, and the counties where it originated, who were getting their butts tore up.

Now, Members come to the floor, cut \$13 million, and just \$13 million of that might go toward a homeless program. Just \$13 million.

□ 1430

Israel would still get 98 percent, \$637 million, after \$3.5 billion last year and \$3.1 billion in the cooker.

It says to me that anybody or anyone can reach in and influence the potential outcome of a vote in the Congress, that makes me question my national security more than any damn Scud missile, knowing that you probably

will not even get a vote on this, but this would be more embarrassing if you went home with this one, if you voted no to this cut, what an embarrassment that would be.

So I am going to come before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Chairman. I do not know about anybody else, but I want help for my district that has been bombed by economic policies for 20 years, and I keep getting the runaround; so I am asking the committee nice, and I would like some Members in the House who feel this way to maybe join forces so that we could get something for our own communities.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, now, sir, we had a vote and the vote was pretty lopsided. The gentleman saw me stand and give the gentleman a vote.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I appreciate it.

Mr. RAVENEL. Because I would vote against the gentleman, that is why I wanted the vote.

The gentleman and I are friends, we are old buddies and we get along fine. We disagree on a lot of things, but we are friends.

But does the gentleman not think that given the lopsidedness of the original vote, does the gentleman not think that maybe the American people through their Congress, 435 of us, or whoever is left here, it must be pretty close to that, that they want to give the State of Israel \$650 million?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, I believe the American people may have supported the Congress when all \$650 million was being stricken, but when a measure comes before this House that might leave \$50 million or just \$13 million for some housing, I think the American people would vote yes on this amendment overwhelmingly.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAFICANT was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAVENEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman probably got a letter from our former colleague, Mr. Kemp, asking us to support an amendment for additional housing, which I fully intend to support; so I mean, should not this relatively small amount of money for the State of Israel to help them defray the damages that they suffered, the actual damages they suffered, is not this kind of a salute to them from the American people for exercising the great restraint that they exercised? I think that is a small amount of money, and I think the gentleman ought to

kind of take a look at the vote that was cast as an indication of what the American people through their Congress want.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I will say the only area where I disagree, and I think the gentleman from South Carolina is a great gentleman and I respect the gentleman, but no, I cannot reconcile many of the votes in here with the American people, to be quite honest. I think there are a lot of votes that the American people would cast differently, personally.

Let me say this. I support the amendments of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

I am glad to see that the Secretary has tried at least to get some money in this bill for some housing, and hopefully the Congress will vote for that amendment to provide some housing for areas like ours who have been devastated and need a little bit of help.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, to the Members of the body, I think we have got to be loyal to but one master, and when any lobby can start taking names and license plate numbers, it is not a good sign for Old Glory.

What I am talking about now is not money. I am talking about the fibers of our freedom which made America what it really is.

This is no big drama speech. I do not make them.

We have got to keep our eyes on the prize and that is America. I think we get taken off the prize a little bit around here, and I think one of the areas we do is when it develops around Israel, and that is a shame, because I think aid pacts are going to end up hurting Israel, and the American people are getting fed up and I am fed up.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendments to strike the funding to Israel.

There is a price we pay as Americans for being the world's premier democracy. We have paid heavy prices in wars passed around the world throughout our history. Our men and women have traveled across the globe to fight for what is right and just. And today the idea of democracy stands as strong as it ever has.

One thing I think many Members in this body may be taking for granted is that we are surrounded by water on two sides, and friendly allies on two other sides. Our borders are secure. We are in an ideal location to promote the ideals of democracy.

Now take a look at Israel. Like us they have fought to preserve democracy and their right to exist. There is a slight difference. They are surrounded by nations that have been in a constant state of war with them for over 40 years. Do we not have an interest, even an obligation to support our only democratic ally in the very crucial region of the Mideast.

Another comment I heard today was with regard to the front lines, and who was on them. When dozens and dozens of deadly Scud missiles come crashing into your neighborhood on

a nightly basis, certainly I think that can be considered the front lines. And for Israel to hold back and restrain from striking back at Iraq, because we asked them to, that took a strength and resolve that not many nations could muster.

The fact that the nations of Syria and Jordan are receiving \$2½ billion in aid for their involvement in Desert Storm I think only should strengthen our resolve in assisting our ally Israel.

I agree with Mr. TRAFICANT that Iraq should pay for damage done to Israel. But until that time comes it is in our best national interest to help out our friends in Israel as they once again try to pay the price for living on the front lines in a war zone.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SAVAGE] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER V
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
JOINT ITEMS
CAPITOL POLICE BOARD
CAPITOL POLICE
SALARIES

For an additional amount for "Capitol Police Board, Salaries", to provide for additional costs associated with Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$6,164,000, of which \$3,130,000 is appropriated to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House, and \$3,034,000 is appropriated to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Capitol Police Board, General expenses", to provide for additional costs associated with Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$978,000, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

CHAPTER VI

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION
PANAMA CANAL REVOLVING FUND

The fiscal year 1991 obligation limitation on non-administrative and capital programs, as set forth in Public Law 101-516, is increased by \$60,000,000 to meet the unexpectedly high traffic from disruptions in world markets caused by the Middle East crisis.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, AND FIREARMS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" to provide for additional costs

associated with Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$2,028,000.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses" to provide for additional costs associated with Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$4,906,000.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
VETERANS HEALTH SERVICE AND RESEARCH
ADMINISTRATION
MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care" to provide for unbudgeted medical expenses resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$46,000,000.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses" to provide for unbudgeted Veterans Benefits Administration costs associated with Operation Desert Shield/Operation Desert Storm, \$12,000,000.

TITLE II—SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER I
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES
(BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from Periodic Censuses and Programs.

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVOLVING FUND
(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances in the Economic Development Revolving Fund, \$9,600,000 are rescinded.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Operations and administration", \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL
ACTIVITIES
(BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, General Legal Activities", \$3,180,000, to be derived by transfer from Federal Prison System, Salaries and Expenses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES
ATTORNEYS
(BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys", \$1,903,000, to be derived by transfer from Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES
MARSHALS SERVICE
(BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service", \$1,025,000, to be derived by transfer from Federal Prison System, Salaries and Expenses.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of witnesses", \$9,203,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Section 524(c)(9) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(E) Subject to the notification procedures contained in section 606 of Public Law 101-515, any unobligated balances in excess of \$15,000,000 remaining in the Fund on September 30, 1991, and on September 30, 1992, may be transferred by the Attorney General, to remain available until expended, as follows—

"(i) the first \$25,000,000 of such unobligated balances to the Office of Justice Programs for grants authorized by section 515(a)(1) of chapter B of subpart 2 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3760 et seq.), and

"(ii) such sums as are available to the Salaries and Expenses appropriations of the Drug Enforcement Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to enhance training and to procure vehicles and equipment."

SEC. 102. Notwithstanding 28 U.S.C. 1821, no funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in fiscal year 1991 or any prior fiscal year shall be obligated or expended to pay a fact witness fee to a person who is incarcerated testifying as a fact witness pursuant to a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum in a court of the United States, as defined in paragraph (a)(2) of section 1821, 28 United States Code: *Provided*, That the one exception to the preceding prohibition is the fact witness fee decided in United States Supreme Court case No. 89-5916, Richard Demarest, Petitioner v. James Manspeaker et al. on January 8, 1991.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101-515 shall be available to procure special purpose motor vehicles without regard to any price limitation established by law.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

For an additional amount for "International fisheries commissions", \$100,000, notwithstanding section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of California) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1440

DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSEQUENCES OF OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM, FOOD STAMPS, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION, VETERANS COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS, AND OTHER URGENT NEEDS ACT OF 1991

The CHAIRMAN. The committee resumed its sitting.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$54,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$51,000.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$36,000.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$69,520,000, of which \$48,520,000 shall remain available until expended.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", \$5,600,000, to remain available until expended.

COURT SECURITY

For an additional amount for "Court security", \$530,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,450,000.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,633,000.

Related agencies

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING GRANTS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Grants and expenses", as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2877, \$8,000,000 to remain available until expended.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,000,000.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For an additional amount for "Payment to the Legal Services Corporation", \$1,000,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,000,000. In addition, any offsetting receipts deposited into the general fund of the Treasury under section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 between October 1, 1990, and the November 5, 1990, enactment date of Public Law 101-515 shall be recorded as an offsetting collection and be available for obligation and expenditure by the Securities and Exchange Commission in accordance with the provisions governing the obligation and expenditure of offsetting collections under the above heading in Public Law 101-515.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES (BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the Disaster Loan Fund.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$110,400,000.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MYERS of Indiana: On page 17 of the bill:

On line 12, strike "\$110,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,220,000";

On line 15, strike "\$240,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$173,880,000";

On line 18, strike "\$4,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,000,000";

On line 21, strike "\$114,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$76,400,000".

On page 22 of the bill:

On line 4, strike "\$482,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$603,000,000".

Mr. MYERS. of Indiana (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I want to inquire of the maker of the motion with regard to the amendments that would be offered en bloc. If I may inquire of the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS],

and I believe I am prepared to support his amendment, I want to be certain about the effect of the amendments. It is my understanding this amendment would provide some \$263 million for the Rocky Flats plant, an increase of \$120.5 million over the committee's recommendation and a reduction of \$20 million from the administration's request of \$283 million. The \$263 million would be provided for the Rocky Flats plant for the purpose of performing essential weapons programs and production support, environment, safety and health, safeguards and security, plant engineering, utilities and maintenance, and management and administration activities in fiscal year 1991 and 1992.

I further understand that these funds would provide for activities to be performed in preparation for resumption of operations in buildings 559 and 707 and for those limited operations in other buildings, including building 771, specifically needed in support of activities in buildings 559 and 707. These funds also provide for essential activities, such as plant-wide health and safety activities and removal of plutonium from ducts, that need to be undertaken in other buildings whether or not operations in those buildings resume.

By not providing the \$20 million that the administration had requested, the amendment would not be providing any additional funds for activities in buildings 776, 777, 779, and 371, other than, first, essential activities that needs to be undertaken whether or not production operations in those buildings are to resume, and, second, activities essential to support preparation of resumption of activities in buildings 559 to 707. The reason for this decision is to allow the committee and the Congress to review, during their deliberations of the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill, the need for resumption of production activities in buildings other than 559 and 707.

I would like to inquire of Mr. MYERS if this is his understanding as well.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado has provided a colloquy, and it is my understanding that what he has provided here is essentially what the committee is attempting to do, to keep work going on there. It is very vital to the gentleman's area. We all realize it is in his congressional district, and this committee has always made every attempt to help a Member in his district and to abide by those rules. However, this is a national facility which is 40 years old. Much of the problem was created long before the gentleman ever came to Congress. So I

think we can have agreement with what the gentleman is discussing here.

Mr. SKAGGS. Continuing my reservation of objection, and I certainly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for his willingness to reach an understanding about this matter; I wonder if I might also yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL], the chairman of our subcommittee, as to the chairman's understanding as well.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BEVILL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I agree with the statements that have been made by each of these gentlemen.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I further ask unanimous consent that the question not be subject to a division.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unnecessary to debate this any further. We have discussed this on several occasions. I think the membership is well aware that there has been an ongoing problem for a long time. The Department of Energy is trying to do some work there that is absolutely essential. So I think everyone fully understands it. It is a matter of taking money that the committee did give to the Defense Committee and reappropriate it for this purpose. I think it does not need any further debate. I urge all Members to support this amendment.

The letter referred to follows:

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, March 4, 1991.

Hon. JOHN T. MYERS,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MYERS: I am writing to express my deep concern with the action taken by the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, to reduce the supplemental appropriation we had requested for resumption of safe operations at the Rocky Flats Plant.

Specifically, after careful deliberation by the Administration on possible sources of funds in light of the Deficit Reduction Act, the President requested a supplemental appropriation of \$283 million to provide for efforts to address nuclear safety issues and facility safety and health upgrades for buildings necessary to resume plutonium pit fab-

rication at the Rocky Flats Plant. The action by the House Appropriations Subcommittee, taken on February 28, 1991, reduces the requested funding level by \$140.5 million to a recommended level of \$142.5 million. Without the restoration of these monies, it will not be possible to bring Rocky Flats into compliance with Federal, State, and local laws and regulations in a timely manner. Further, without the restoration of these dollars, we will not be able to meet nuclear weapons stockpile requirements in Fiscal Year 1992. Some may argue that we can await action on the Fiscal Year 1992 budget for restoration of these dollars. I do not agree. A deficit reduction precedent stemming from last year's budget agreement makes it highly unlikely that additional funds will be able to be dedicated for the necessary Rocky Flats safety upgrades and production mission.

This reduction in requested funding will require the Department of Energy to severely curtail operations later this year and result in substantial layoffs of personnel at the Rocky Flats Plant (estimated at about 2,000 people), inability to produce plutonium components for nuclear weapons in FY 1992, and failure to meet the President's requirements for delivery of nuclear weapons to the Department of Defense. This curtailment is also likely to prevent our meeting nuclear weapons requirements in FY 1993 and beyond as well.

I should point out that the Rocky Flats Plant is the only production facility available which will enable us to meet these weapons requirements. I need to emphasize that the long neglect of this plant, including the training of personnel, the development of satisfactory safety documentation and procedures, and the upgrading of facilities and necessary plant maintenance, has resulted in this substantial need for funding so that I can be assured of safe and secure operations at Rocky Flats in order to meet the Nation's national security requirements.

Accordingly, because of the national security implications of this potential failure to provide the necessary funding, I request your urgent attention to this matter so that the Department of Energy can move to fulfill its obligations for weapons deliveries while, at the same time, assure the health and safety of our workers and the public and protection of the environment.

I would be most appreciative of your early action on this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. WATKINS,
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired).

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 6, 1991.

Hon. JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDADE: The President's supplemental budget request included \$283 million for the Department of Energy's facility at Rocky Flats, Colorado. Unfortunately, the House Appropriations Committee reduced this request by \$140.5 million.

It is essential that these funds be reinstated and the full \$283 million appropriated. Rocky Flats is the only facility which can produce particular components needed to meet our nuclear weapons requirements. Failure to appropriate the full DOE supplemental request will make it impossible for necessary health and safety improvements at Rocky Flats to be completed on schedule, and for the department to meet its important national security obligations.

I appreciate your consideration of this important issue.

Sincerely,

BRENT SCOWCROFT.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, March 7, 1991.

HON. JOHN T. MYERS,
House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee
on Energy and Water Development, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MYERS: I strongly support funding the Department of Energy FY 1991 Supplemental Appropriation as requested by the President. The \$283 million supplemental is urgently needed to ensure that the Rocky Flats Plant can once again produce the plutonium pits necessary for modern, safe nuclear weapons for our nuclear deterrent forces.

Sincerely,

DICK CHENEY.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and to be heard on the amendment.

I thank the chairman.

As the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has indicated, we have reached agreement on this. But I think it is important to recognize, nonetheless, the fundamental issue involved here. As originally proposed to Congress by the administration, the supplemental request would have set us on course for some decisions about the resumption of production at the Rocky Flats plant that we are, in my opinion, simply not in a position to make yet, particularly with regard to the future of some of the buildings at the plant.

Those are decisions that would ultimately cost this country some hundreds of millions of dollars, and which Congress should examine closely.

By adopting this amendment with the constraints that I've twisted on and which have been agreed to, we basically reserve judgment on those issues until the full committee and subcommittee have had an opportunity to examine them with greater care in the context of the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill.

The funding that is provided allows us to meet national defense needs. It is quite sufficient to fund activities needed to resume operations in the 559 laboratory building and the 707 fabrication building, needed to resume warhead safety improvements and for production of W88 warheads for Trident II missiles. The funding is also more than sufficient to proceed with safety, health, security, and environmental improvement required plant-wide, regardless of whether operations in some buildings ever resume.

At the same time, the restrictions prevent DOE from starting down the path toward spending hundreds of millions of tax dollars on buildings at the plant that may never again be needed for defense.

Mr. Chairman, it is astonishing to me that some have called these restrictions micromanagement. In fact, the opposite is true. What I've tried to do

is reserve for Congress some say in setting policy for the future of Rocky Flats and the nuclear weapons complex; to reserve some say for Congress on basic decisions about defense, health and safety, and environmental needs. That's hardly micromanagement—that's a fundamental congressional responsibility. Given the size of our Federal deficit, it's also wise fiscal management.

Simply opening the Federal wallet and handing over the \$283 million that DOE requested would commit us to a course of action at Rocky Flats and elsewhere that could cost the taxpayer many hundreds of millions of dollars. Under DOE's current plans, huge sums could be squandered on facilities at Rocky Flats that DOE's own studies confirm may never be needed or used.

For example, DOE's February 1991 reconfiguration study admits that buildings 771 and 776 at Rocky Flats may never be needed for defense work. At the same time, DOE plans to spend tens of millions of dollars to restart operations at these two buildings alone. That's why the restrictions I've insisted on—and which this amendment adopts—are so vital. They address DOE's costly policy contradictions. Clearly, Congress should not abdicate its vital oversight role here.

We should take a moment to remind ourselves of the consequences when Congress failed to provide adequate oversight of the nuclear weapons complex in the past. The bequest to the Nation from DOE and its predecessor agencies in managing Rocky Flats and other sites is a \$150 billion cleanup bill. The awful legacy of most of the last 40 years—when Congress deferred too readily when the words "national security" were incanted, and a curtain of secrecy descended to conceal rampant mismanagement—is a set of facilities that were run into the ground and largely shut down for safety failings. Congress then defaulted too quickly in its responsibility. Now we're paying the bills. We should learn from these multibillion-dollar mistakes, not repeat them.

Even under the current leadership of the very able Secretary of Energy, James Watkins, who has made real improvements in operations at the Department, Congress still has a vital responsibility to oversee and provide guidance on these programs. There are broad policy issues Congress must address—such as how big a nuclear weapons arsenal, and how large a nuclear weapons production complex is needed to deter a rapidly changing Soviet Union. And since the Department continues to suffer from bad management in particular areas, it's vital that Congress review large spending requests very closely.

This spending request for Rocky Flats should be no exception. Hourly and salaried workers at the plant have

told me extremely troubling stories of waste associated with restart efforts to date. Last winter and spring, millions of dollars were probably wasted on poor quality safety and training programs and on operations procedures that simply didn't work.

Part of the reason for that waste was that DOE pushed the contractor to rush to restart as quickly as possible. In the end, DOE realized its mistake, called off the rush, and then rebuked the contractor for poor quality control systems. Today, DOE is again asking its contractor at Rocky Flats for an aggressive restart program. Given past wasteful spending, it's clear we shouldn't stop our strict oversight today. And I certainly don't plan to.

During the February 1, 1991, meeting of the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Nuclear Facility Safety, members questioned the need to pump so much money into Rocky Flats restart when other options exist. One member stated, "There is conceivably a much better alternative to spending another half billion or \$800 million to keep a facility that is not likely to be as safe as several others that already exist and are operational."

This amendment, while it doesn't do everything I'd like, does offer us a chance to look at these alternatives before we go too far or spend too much. And so I am supporting it.

□ 1450

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I will not try to extend this any longer. I agree with the gentleman on the oversight issue. Those of us in Colorado cannot be aggressive enough, I think, in oversight because of the long track record.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Myers amendment which seeks to provide \$263 million in supplemental appropriations for the Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant, 15 miles uphill and upwind from the center of Denver. This money was requested to expedite restart of plutonium processing operations at Rocky Flats; such operations have been halted for nearly a year and a half.

I had a lot of trouble supporting the committee reported level of \$142.5 million either. I wanted to oppose any supplemental for Rocky Flats for three reasons:

First, we should not restart the plant. Rocky Flats is a sorry mess. There are pounds of plutonium in the ducts, which the Department of Energy [DOE] hasn't figured how to move. The machinery is old and unsafe. Many of the buildings are firetraps. There is a new contractor, EG&G, which is changing many of the operating procedures: indeed not all of the new procedures have been written. And, the staff has not yet been adequately trained on these new procedures. It is not safe to restart Rocky Flats now or anytime in the next few years, regardless of how much money we throw at it.

Second, we should be forcing DOE to move the plutonium processing activity out of a metropolitan area promptly. The recently released reconfiguration study documented the need to move Rocky Flats. But the final version deleted any reference to a date. It DOE restarts Rocky Flats, any urgency to move will be eliminated. Our first priority should be to move the plutonium processing function out of Rocky Flats.

Third, national security will not be harmed if Rocky Flats is not restarted. Rocky Flats produces plutonium pits, which serve as the triggers for nuclear weapons. These pits don't wear out. We have plenty of nukes which have to be retired, some because of arms control agreements, others because they are obsolete. It would be a simple matter to design new warheads to use old pits. In that way, we could recycle pits, save the taxpayer money, and not restart a terribly dangerous plant. I suppose this is too simple for DOE.

The workers at Rocky Flats are a highly skilled and hard working group. We need them kept on the payroll and trained to decontaminate and decommission the plant. Environmental restoration at Rocky Flats will involve new science and new technology. The talented Rocky Flats work force are who should do that.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman for working out this agreement with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS]. I understand his sensitivity. We in the State of Washington have Hanford. We have had our problems in terms of oversight. We share his concern about appropriate cleanup, and we understand the magnitude of the costs.

However, Mr. Chairman, I also would suggest to my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] that he is right in his other comment that there are some very crucial defense and national security programs at stake here, including the triggers and pits required for our Trident submarine warheads, and we are in a situation where we are going to have the submarines built and the body of the missile built, but not have the warheads.

So, trying to work out compromises here, trying to get the plants fixed and safe to operate is really crucially important, and I commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] for the approach that he is taking to this problem.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] and, as he knows, we have, I think, preserved the capability to deal particularly with the W-88 Trident program in the approach that is being taken.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

During deliberations on the fiscal year 1991 supplemental, the subcommittee considered the request from the Department of Energy for \$283,000,000 for the resumption of operations at the Rocky Flats plant in Colorado. On the basis of information showing that only a portion of the funds could be fully utilized in fiscal year 1991, the subcommittee provided \$142,500,000 for this activity, a decrease of \$140,500,000 from the administration's request.

Further discussions with the administration have shown a need for additional funding in fiscal year 1991 to meet the urgent national security needs of the country. A total of \$263,000,000 could be used to continue to address nuclear safety issues and facility safety and health upgrades for buildings necessary to resume activities at the Rocky Flats plant.

Based on assurances from the administration that these additional funds are essential to the national security in fiscal year 1991, I am supporting the effort by my good friend from Indiana, JOHN MYERS, to provide this funding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$240,600,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$4,200,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$114,800,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", \$58,000,000 for development of a Patriot Missile Quick Response Program, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Restrictions provided under subsection (b)(2) of section 301d of title 37, United States Code, as authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for 1991 shall not apply in the case of flag or general officers serving as practicing physicians.

SEC. 202. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1991 for the account "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", the amount of \$987,936,000 provided for the F-14 remanufactured program shall be obligated for the twelve F-14 aircraft not later than thirty days after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used for advance procurement of material and other efforts associated with the industrial availability of the U.S.S. Kennedy other than the service life extension program for the U.S.S. Kennedy at the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: on page 18, line 21, strike lines 21 and all that follows through line 2 on page 19 and renumber the sections accordingly.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about the deficit which could approach \$315 to \$350 billion this year, and toward that end this amendment, which I am proposing, will save somewhere between \$310 million and \$700 million.

Last year I understand the Defense Department asked that the U.S.S. Kennedy undergo what is called service life extension program or a complete overhaul of that ship which would cost at that time \$810 million. This year they estimate the cost to be \$1.2 billion. But the Defense Department, the Department of the Navy, as I understand it, has revised their view of this situation, and they want to have a different kind of overhaul, which is called a regular overhaul, which would cost only \$500 million.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand why the language is in section 203 as it is because what it means, this language, is that we are going to have to have the service life extension overhaul, which is \$1.2 billion, when the Navy is only requesting a regular overhaul, which would cost \$500 million.

So, the amendment I propose will save \$700 million, and I think it is something that everybody in this body ought to embrace.

I do not understand, and maybe the people who support this section of the bill, maybe they can explain why they want to have the service life extension program on the U.S.S. Kennedy rather than the regular overhaul, and, if somebody is there that can explain it to me, I would appreciate it.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, when we thought about this particular program, one of the problems is the Navy, in trying to avoid short-term costs, is going to increase long-term costs substantially. For instance, a SLEP will cost around \$1 billion. But it will extend the life of the U.S.S. Kennedy by 15 years. If you put the normal overhaul into place, you only get 5 years out of it. You would have to have major overhauls every 5 years and the ship could be out of action three times as long.

So, Mr. Chairman, we think it is really not cost effective to save money in the short term in order to get by for a couple years when we would be so much better off doing the complete SLEP up front.

So, what do they do in a SLEP? They completely rework the entire inside of the ship. It is an entirely different procedure for a SLEP versus an overhaul. An overhaul is kind of a temporary thing that takes about 9 or 10 months.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman from Pennsylvania explain to me why the Department of the Navy is only asking for a regular overhaul? They are obviously aware of the same situation he is and the same circumstances.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, we run into that problem all the time. In order to get by for a couple of years they ask for less money, and we think that is a mistake in this case. We try not to micromanage their business, but in this case we believe the overhaul will cost substantially more money in the long run and the Navy will get less use out of that ship.

So, we are saying to them, "SLEP this ship, which means the ship systems will last longer, three times as long, the ship will be out of service a lot less time and the ship will be more capable."

We have had a lot of experience in dealing with the Navy, and they come in with short-term budgets, they try to fit as much as they can into that budget. It is more important than ever for us to make sure that we get our money's worth, even if we have to spend a little bit more in the short term.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's position, but it is in fact micromanaging the issue, and the Navy Department has only requested \$500 million for a regular overhaul. The Defense Department is under severe budgetary constraints, as is this whole government, and it seems to me that we ought to try to work with the Navy as much as possible in keeping the defense budget under control while providing for the best possible defense for this Nation, and the Defense Department has asked for \$500 million for a regular overhaul, and I submit to my colleagues that we should not try to micromanage to this degree, thus costing us about \$700 million more at a time when we can ill afford to do it.

Mr. Chairman, this country this year is going to face at least a \$315 billion deficit, and for my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], who I am sure has a very great interest in this project, to suggest that we should spend an extra \$700 million for a project when the Navy is only requesting less than half that much I think is fiscally irresponsible. So, with all due respect to my colleague, I think

that we should cut this section out of the bill and do what the Navy has requested, and that is only spend \$500 million for a regular overhaul.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. Chairman, let me just reiterate the position that the committee takes on this particular issue. We believe that in this particular instance that even though the Navy in the short run would avoid a certain cost, not save money, but avoid the cost of the SLEP. In the long run it is going to cost them a lot more money, and it is not only going to cost them a lot more money for the normal overhaul but the ship will be out of action for a longer period of time. We believe it is extremely important for them to spend the money up front and get the maximum use of that money for a one-time SLEP and put this ship back into action as quickly as we can. We do not think it is good, effective cost management to spend less money now, and then down the road have to spend substantially more money.

When they first asked for this SLEP they estimated it would cost \$810 million. Now it has gone up, and my colleagues can bet that when they run into an overhaul, sometimes those things are double the cost they expect. So, the best way to do it is to do it right the first time. A SLEP is the right way to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Member of this Committee to vote this amendment down.

□ 1500

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, after the presence of a quorum is established.

Since the Chair had already announced the absence of a quorum, the first action will be to establish a quorum, and the second vote, reduced to 5 minutes, will be on the question of the gentleman's amendment.

The Chair cannot vacate the announcement of the absence of a quorum even by unanimous consent.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie | Duncan | Kaptur |
| Alexander | Durbin | Kasich |
| Allard | Dwyer | Kennedy |
| Anderson | Dymally | Kennelly |
| Andrews (ME) | Early | Kildee |
| Andrews (NJ) | Eckart | Klug |
| Andrews (TX) | Edwards (CA) | Kolbe |
| Annunzio | Edwards (OK) | Kolter |
| Anthony | Edwards (TX) | Kopetaki |
| Applegate | Emerson | Kostmayer |
| Arney | Engel | Kyl |
| Aspin | English | LaFalce |
| Atkins | Erdreich | Lagomarsino |
| AuCoin | Espy | Lancaster |
| Bacchus | Evans | Lantos |
| Baker | Fascell | LaRocco |
| Ballenger | Fawell | Laughlin |
| Barnard | Fazio | Leach |
| Barrett | Feighan | Lehman (CA) |
| Barton | Fields | Lehman (FL) |
| Bateman | Fish | Lent |
| Bellenson | Flake | Levin (MI) |
| Bennett | Foglietta | Lewis (CA) |
| Bentley | Ford (MI) | Lewis (FL) |
| Bereuter | Ford (TN) | Lewis (GA) |
| Berman | Franks (CT) | Lightfoot |
| Bevill | Frost | Lipinski |
| Billbray | Galleghy | Livingston |
| Billirakis | Gallo | Lloyd |
| Bliley | Gaydos | Long |
| Boehlert | Gejdenson | Lowery (CA) |
| Boehner | Gekas | Lowey (NY) |
| Bonior | Gephardt | Luken |
| Borski | Geren | Machtley |
| Boucher | Gibbons | Manton |
| Boxer | Gilchrest | Markey |
| Brewster | Gillmor | Marlenee |
| Brooks | Gilman | Matsui |
| Broomfield | Gingrich | Mavroules |
| Browder | Glickman | Mazzoli |
| Brown | Gonzalez | McCandless |
| Bruce | Goodling | McCollum |
| Bryant | Gordon | McCreery |
| Bunning | Goss | McCurdy |
| Burton | Gradison | McDade |
| Bustamante | Grandy | McDermott |
| Byron | Gray | McEwen |
| Callahan | Green | McGrath |
| Camp | Guarini | McHugh |
| Campbell (CA) | Gunderson | McMillan (NC) |
| Campbell (CO) | Hall (OH) | McMillen (MD) |
| Cardin | Hall (TX) | McNulty |
| Carper | Hamilton | Meyers |
| Carr | Hammerschmidt | Mfume |
| Chandler | Hancock | Michel |
| Chapman | Hansen | Miller (CA) |
| Clay | Harris | Miller (WA) |
| Clement | Hastert | Mineta |
| Clinger | Hatcher | Mink |
| Coble | Hayes (IL) | Moakley |
| Coleman (MO) | Hayes (LA) | Molinari |
| Coleman (TX) | Hefley | Mollohan |
| Collins (IL) | Hefner | Montgomery |
| Collins (MI) | Henry | Moody |
| Combest | Herger | Moorhead |
| Condit | Hertel | Moran |
| Conyers | Hoagland | Morella |
| Cooper | Hobson | Morrison |
| Costello | Hochbrueckner | Mrazek |
| Coughlin | Holloway | Murtha |
| Cox (CA) | Hopkins | Myers |
| Cox (IL) | Horn | Nagle |
| Coyne | Horton | Natcher |
| Cramer | Houghton | Neal (MA) |
| Crane | Hoyer | Neal (NC) |
| Cunningham | Hubbard | Nichols |
| Dannemeyer | Huckaby | Nowak |
| Darden | Hughes | Nusle |
| Davis | Hunter | Oakar |
| de la Garza | Hutto | Oberstar |
| DeFazio | Hyde | Olin |
| DeLauro | Inhofe | Ortiz |
| DeLay | Ireland | Orton |
| Dellums | Jacobs | Owens (UT) |
| Derrick | James | Oxley |
| Dickinson | Jefferson | Packard |
| Dicks | Jenkins | Pallone |
| Dixon | Johnson (CT) | Panetta |
| Dooley | Johnson (SD) | Parker |
| Doollittle | Johnston | Patterson |
| Dorgan (ND) | Jones (GA) | Paxon |
| Dornan (CA) | Jones (NC) | Payne (NJ) |
| Downey | Jontz | Payne (VA) |
| Dreier | Kanjorski | Pease |

Pelosi	Sawyer	Tallon	Roth	Smith (OR)	Upton	Schulze	Stallings	Valentine
Penny	Saxton	Tanner	Roukema	Spence	Vander Jagt	Schumer	Stark	Vento
Perkins	Schaefer	Tauzin	Schaefer	Stearns	Viscosky	Serrano	Stokes	Volkmer
Peterson (FL)	Schiff	Taylor (MS)	Sensenbrenner	Stenholm	Walker	Shuster	Studds	Vucanovich
Peterson (MN)	Schroeder	Taylor (NC)	Sharp	Stump	Walsh	Sikorski	Swett	Waters
Petri	Schulze	Thomas (CA)	Shaw	Sundquist	Washington	Siskys	Swift	Waxman
Pickett	Schumer	Thomas (GA)	Shays	Taylor (NC)	Wylie	Skaggs	Synar	Weber
Pickle	Sensenbrenner	Thomas (WY)	Slattery	Thomas (WY)	Zimmer	Skeen	Tallon	Weldon
Porter	Serrano	Thornton				Skelton	Tanner	Wheat
Poshard	Sharp	Torres				Slaughter (NY)	Tauzin	Whitten
Price	Shaw	Torricelli				Slaughter (VA)	Taylor (MS)	Williams
Pursell	Shays	Towns	Abercrombie	Feighan	Mavroules	Smith (FL)	Thomas (CA)	Wise
Quillen	Shuster	Trafcant	Alexander	Flah	Mazzoli	Smith (IA)	Thomas (GA)	Wolf
Rahall	Sikorski	Traxler	Anderson	Flake	McCloskey	Smith (NJ)	Thornton	Wolpe
Ramstad	Siskys	Unsoeld	Andrews (ME)	Foglietta	McCrery	Smith (TX)	Torres	Wyden
Rangel	Skaggs	Upton	Andrews (NJ)	Ford (MI)	McCurdy		Torrice	Yates
Ravenel	Skeen	Valentine	Andrews (TX)	Ford (TN)	McDade	Snowe	Towns	Yatron
Ray	Skelton	Vander Jagt	Annunzio	Frank (MA)	McDermott	Solarz	Trafcant	Young (AK)
Reed	Slattery	Vento	Anthony	Franks (CT)	McGrath	Solomon	Traxler	Young (FL)
Regula	Slaughter (NY)	Viscosky	Applegate	Frost	McHugh	Spratt	Unsoeld	Zeliff
Rhodes	Slaughter (VA)	Volkmer	Aspin	Gallo	McMillen (MD)	Stagers		
Richardson	Smith (FL)	Vucanovich	Atkins	Gaydos	McNulty			
Ridge	Smith (IA)	Walker	AuCoin	Gejdenson	Mfume			
Riggs	Smith (NJ)	Walsh	Bacchus	Gephardt	Michel	Ackerman	Madigan	Udall
Rinaldo	Smith (OR)	Waters	Barnard	Geren	Miller (CA)	Bartlett	Miller (OH)	Weiss
Ritter	Smith (TX)	Waxman	Bellenson	Gibbons	Mineta	Dingell	Murphy	Wilson
Roberts	Snowe	Weber	Bennett	Gilchrist	Mink	Donnelly	Riggs	
Roe	Solarz	Weiss	Bentley	Gingrich	Moakley	Levine (CA)	Sangmeister	
Roemer	Solomon	Weldon	Berman	Gonzalez	Molinar			
Rogers	Spence	Wheat	Bevill	Gordon	Mollohan			
Rohrabacher	Spratt	Whitten	Bilbray	Gray	Montgomery			
Ros-Lehtinen	Stagers	Williams	Bliley	Green	Moody			
Rose	Stallings	Wise	Boehert	Guarini	Moorhead			
Rostenkowski	Stark	Wolf	Bonior	Hall (OH)	Moran			
Roth	Stearns	Wolpe	Borski	Hall (TX)	Morrison			
Roukema	Stenholm	Wyden	Boucher	Hamilton	Mrazek			
Rowland	Stokes	Wylie	Boxer	Hammerschmidt	Murtha			
Roybal	Studds	Yates	Brewster	Harris	Myers			
Russo	Stump	Yatron	Brooks	Hatcher	Nagle			
Sabo	Sundquist	Young (AK)	Browder	Hayes (IL)	Natcher			
Santorum	Swett	Young (FL)	Brown	Hayes (LA)	Neal (MA)			
Sarpallius	Swift	Zeliff	Bruce	Hefner	Neal (NC)			
Savage	Synar	Zimmer	Bryant	Henry	Nichols			
			Bustamante	Hertel	Nowak			
			Byron	Hoagland	Oakar			
			Campbell (CO)	Hochbrueckner	Oberstar			
			Cardin	Horn	Obey			
			Carper	Horton	Olin			
			Carr	Houghton	Ortiz			
			Chandler	Hoyer	Orton			
			Chapman	Huckaby	Owens (NY)			
			Clay	Hughes	Owens (UT)			
			Clement	Hunter	Packard			
			Clinger	Hutto	Pallone			
			Coble	Ireland	Panetta			
			Coleman (MO)	Jefferson	Parker			
			Coleman (TX)	Jenkins	Payne (NJ)			
			Collins (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Payne (VA)			
			Collins (MI)	Johnson (SD)	Pease			
			Conyers	Johnston	Pelosi			
			Costello	Jones (GA)	Penny			
			Coughlin	Jones (NC)	Perkins			
			Cox (IL)	Jontz	Peterson (FL)			
			Coyne	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)			
			Cramer	Kaptur	Pickett			
			Cunningham	Kennedy	Pickle			
			Darden	Kennelly	Poshard			
			Davis	Kildee	Price			
			de la Garza	Klecza	Pursell			
			DeFazio	Klug	Quillen			
			DeLauro	Kolbe	Rahall			
			DeLay	Kolter	Rangel			
			Dellums	Kopetski	Ravenel			
			Derrick	Kostmayer	Ray			
			Dicks	LaFalce	Reed			
			Dixon	Lancaster	Regula			
			Dooley	Lantos	Richardson			
			Doolittle	LaRocco	Ridge			
			Dorgan (ND)	Laughlin	Rinaldo			
			Dornan (CA)	Lehman (CA)	Roe			
			Downey	Lehman (FL)	Roemer			
			Durbin	Lent	Rose			
			Dwyer	Levin (MI)	Rostenkowski			
			Dymally	Lewis (CA)	Rowland			
			Eckart	Lewis (GA)	Roybal			
			Edwards (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Russo			
			Edwards (OK)	Lightfoot	Sabo			
			Edwards (TX)	Lipinski	Sanders			
			Emerson	Livingston	Santorum			
			Engel	Lloyd	Sarpallius			
			English	Long	Savage			
			Erdreich	Lowery (CA)	Sawyer			
			Espy	Lowe (NY)	Saxton			
			Evans	Machtley	Scheuer			
			Fascell	Manton	Schiff			
			Fazio	Markey	Schroeder			
				Matsui				

NOES—315

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1530

Messrs. ENGLISH, SKEEN, and TANNER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mrs. ROUKEMA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 204. Of the funds appropriated in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 100-463) for fiscal year 1989 under the heading, "Aircraft Procurement, Navy", \$200,000,000 shall be made available to the Department of the Navy and shall be obligated for the V-22 Osprey tilt rotor aircraft program: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, these funds shall remain available until such time as they are expended for the V-22 Osprey tilt rotor program.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 205. Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall make the following transfer of funds: *Provided*, That the amounts transferred shall be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred, and for the same time period of the appropriation from which transferred: *Provided, further*, That funds shall be transferred between the following appropriations in the amounts specified:

From:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1991/1995";

AOE combat support ship program, \$237,000,000;

To:

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1987/1991";

AOE combat support ship program, \$77,000,000;

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1989/1993";

AOE combat support ship program, \$79,000,000;

Under the heading, "Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1990/1994";

AOE combat support ship program, \$81,000,000.

□ 1521

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and eleven Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for a recorded vote.

Five minutes will be allowed for the vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 315, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

AYES—105

Allard	Fawell	Lagomarsino
Archer	Fields	Leach
Armey	Galleghy	Lewis (FL)
Baker	Gekas	Luken
Ballenger	Gillmor	Marlenee
Barrett	Gilman	Martin
Barton	Glickman	Martinez
Bateman	Goodling	McCandless
Bereuter	Goss	McCullum
Billrakis	Gradison	McEwen
Boehner	Grandy	McMillan (NC)
Broomfield	Gunderson	Meyers
Bunning	Hancock	Miller (WA)
Burton	Hansen	Morella
Callahan	Hastert	Nussle
Camp	Hefley	Oxley
Campbell (CA)	Herger	Patterson
Combest	Hobson	Paxon
Condit	Holloway	Petri
Cooper	Hopkins	Porter
Cox (CA)	Hubbard	Ramstad
Crane	Hyde	Rhodes
Dannemeyer	Inhofe	Ritter
Dickinson	Jacobs	Roberts
Dreier	James	Rogers
Duncan	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Early	Kyl	Ros-Lehtinen

CHAPTER III
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" to provide for essential public safety, health and other municipal services in the face of a severe financial crisis, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], and I appreciate the willingness of the gentleman to discuss this matter with me.

Mr. Chairman, the thousands of sorties flown in Operation Desert Storm have demonstrated the importance of a strong naval air program. This legislation makes available approximately \$897 million for the upgrading of 12 Navy F-14A fighters to the D configuration.

The F-14 provided valuable fighter escort for the ground-attack missions performed by our A-6's and A-7's.

Mr. Chairman, the F/A-18 aircraft, built by McDonnell Douglas Corp., made a significant contribution to the Desert Storm victory.

The President's budget request includes funds for upgrading further the F/A-18's capability to perform the ground attack role of the aging A-6. In making funds available for the F-14 in this supplemental, it is my understanding that it is the Congress' intent to upgrade our navy's fighter program. It is also my understanding that this funding does not suggest in any way that the effort to upgrade the F/A-18 will be altered, compromised or assigned to another program, or that funding of the F-14 will prejudice in any way that of the F/A-18.

Is that the understanding of the Chairman?

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HORN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, we visited the Marine F/A-18 squadrons in Bahrain. Each of the marine pilots had flown about 50 missions, and they had not lost 1 airplane, one of the most modern airplanes in the world and doing an outstanding job in Desert Storm. So we intend to fund it fully at the Navy request. It is a good airplane, and the F-14 funding would not affect it at all.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the time. I rise in strong support of the appropriation for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental appropriation for the District of Colum-

bia that is part of the package under consideration here today.

The District of Columbia is facing a budget shortfall of \$316 million—a shortfall that threatens the city's ability to provide basic services to the Federal Government and to our 18 million constituents who will visit the city this year. This budget deficit is in no small measure the result of past neglect in city management. However, I firmly believe that the current leadership of the District is taking the appropriate steps to correct the problems of the city.

Mayor Dixon and Chairman Wilson deserve not only the credit for taking responsibility for resolving the city's fiscal problems, but also our support. Mayor Dixon is eliminating two-thirds of the budget deficit through fiscal discipline: the budget cuts which she is implementing include an across-the-board cut of \$137 million, elimination of over 2,000 full-time positions, furloughs for school teachers and staff, and rejection of \$63 million in pay raises for city employees. The Mayor has also proposed managerial and programmatic reform based upon the recommendations of the Rivlin Commission. If the new administration is to succeed in these efforts, it will require the cooperation of the Congress in overcoming the immediate budget crisis.

The District's budget problems have been intensified, in part, by developments that were neither foreseeable nor controllable by the city or its leadership. While I strongly support President Bush and the leadership he provided in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, one result of those operations was an increase of public demonstrations here in the District—demonstrations which required the expenditure of substantial District resources for public safety. Because the District is the Federal City, it frequently bears the financial burden of the exercise of freedom of speech and assembly. It should not be left to bear the cost alone.

In this respect, it should also be noted that the District bears many costs associated with being the seat of the Federal Government. Last night, when the President came to speak in this Chamber, additional costs were passed on to the city. Every time the President, Vice President, and visiting heads of state make a move, there are additional costs to the city. So too, the resolution which I supported and which was passed by this House yesterday disapproving a District Council Act authorizing a building project in excess of Federal height limitations points-up one of the many restraints that the Federal Government imposes on the District's ability to raise revenue.

This supplemental appropriation will in part make up for the failure of the Congress to make any significant increase in the Federal payment to the District since 1985, even though the cost of the services which the District provides to the Federal Government have increased in that time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER IV
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Funds appropriated for "General investigations" in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991, Public Law 101-514, for the initiation of preconstruction engineering and design for the Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbors, California, project may be used for completion of the feasibility study for that project: *Provided*, That within funds appropriated for "General investigations" in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1991, Public Law 101-514, not less than \$5,800,000 shall be available only for the Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey, project.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Construction program" to meet the emergency needs for areas stricken by drought, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I sought this time for the purposes of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. Chairman, this will not take long, but I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] a couple of questions.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to clarify one point about drought-related activities to be funded by this legislation. Is it the gentleman's intention that only those activities previously authorized by law be undertaken?

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Yes. The report to accompany this legislation states that "only authorized activities are to be undertaken." It is our intention that the Department shall not undertake any activity with these funds that are not already authorized.

Mr. MILLER of California. The committee report accompanying this bill indicates that the Bureau may undertake project modifications to assure water deliveries as one example of the activities that might be undertaken with these funds. I just want to make sure that we are not authorizing the Bureau to undertake new construction projects. What construction activities do you anticipate the Bureau will undertake?

Mr. FAZIO. Only those project modifications which are presently authorized will be undertaken. If Congress authorizes additional activities in separate legislation, these activities would be eligible for these funds, but only after drought legislation is enacted into law.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is it the understanding of the gentleman that

drilling wells and purchasing water for wildlife refuges is an authorized activity and may be undertaken right away?

Mr. FAZIO. That is my understanding.

Mr. MILLER of California. The Interior Committee will markup emergency drought legislation on March 13. This bill will contain additional authorities for the Department of the Interior to respond to the drought. In your view, does this appropriations legislation authorize the Bureau to implement the provisions of the drought bill now under consideration by the Interior Committee?

Mr. FAZIO. No; the Department may not undertake any activities not already authorized. This measure can in no way substitute for the important bill the gentlemen's committee is about to mark up. That bill is essential to an effective Federal response to the dire drought conditions facing much of the West. I commend the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and for his commitment to expeditiously bring before his committee and this House a comprehensive drought authorization bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Atomic energy defense activities", \$482,500,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$39,000.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$39,000.

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "State unemployment insurance and employment service operations", \$200,000,000, which shall be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, to fund activities under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504).

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION FUND

In the appropriations language under this heading in the Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1991, delete the word "contractual" and the words "for legal and financial services".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Program operations" for a targeted initiative to combat infant mortality, \$25,000,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the "Supplemental Security Income Program", \$232,000,000, for payment to the Social Security trust funds for administrative expenses, to remain available until September 30, 1993.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on Administrative Expenses", \$232,000,000 from any one or all of the Social Security trust funds as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, to remain available until September 30, 1993: *Provided*, That Public Law 101-517 is amended under this heading by striking "\$150,000,000" and inserting in its place "\$47,530,000".

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

Funds appropriated in Public Law 101-517 for grants to tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institutions shall become available for obligation on April 1, 1991.

CHAPTER VI

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Corinne L. Conte, widow of Silvio O. Conte, late a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, \$125,100.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Previously obligated funds appropriated to the account "Library of Congress, Books for the blind and physically handicapped, Salaries and expenses" in Legislative Branch Appropriations Acts for prior fiscal years shall be exempt, effective as of March 5, 1991, from the application of the provisions of section 1405 (b)(4) and (b)(6) of Public Law 101-510 (104 Stat. 1679) and section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended for the purposes for which originally obligated, in amounts as follows:

From amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1978 in Public Law 95-94, \$223,000.

From amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1980 in Public Law 96-86, \$393,000.

From amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1981 in Public Law 96-536, \$4,905,426.

From amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1982 in Public Law 97-51, \$1,960,000.

From amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1985 in Public Law 98-367, \$2,226,243.

From amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1989 in Public Law 100-458, \$1,391,280.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRALS)

Effective April 16, 1991, in order to provide for urgently needed military construction and family housing, the Congress disapproves the deferrals relating to the Department of Defense as set forth in the messages from the Comptroller General transmitted to the Congress on June 28, 1990 (H. Doc. 101-210), and February 5, 1991 (H. Doc. 102-40): *Provided*, That this section may not

apply to projects at installations recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to title XXIX of Public Law 101-510: *Provided further*, That the budget authority subject to the deferrals disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation effective April 16, 1991.

CHAPTER VIII

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", not to exceed \$13,000,000, to be derived from the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account, to be available to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For an additional amount for necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, \$8,000,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$46,900,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For an additional amount for making benefit payments to individuals under the Food Stamp Act, for unanticipated costs incurred for the current fiscal year, \$200,000,000, and in addition up to \$1,300,000,000 shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, for a specific dollar amount, is transmitted to the Congress: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available until September 30, 1992.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$14,500,000.

CHAPTER X

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

None of the funds made available by this or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used by the General Services Administration to obligate or expend any funds for the award of contracts for the construction of the Northern Virginia Naval Systems Command Headquarters project without advance approval in writing of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the House Committee on Appropriations.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$303,084,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this head in prior years for projects to be developed for the elderly and handicapped under section 202 of the United States Housing Act

of 1959, as amended, \$275,815,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE RENEWAL OF EXPIRING SECTION 8 SUBSIDY CONTRACTS

For an additional amount for "Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts", \$155,815,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the \$7,734,985,400 provided for use in connection with section 8 expiring contracts in the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-507), is increased by the foregoing appropriation to \$7,890,800,400, of which \$4,234,500,400 shall be for existing certificates, \$671,300,000 shall be for housing vouchers, and \$2,985,000,000 shall be for loan management and other project-based section 8 contracts.

PAYMENTS FOR OPERATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSING PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Payments for operation of low-income housing projects", \$75,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992: *Provided*, That these funds shall be used by the Secretary for fiscal year 1991 requirements in accordance with section 9(a), notwithstanding section 9(d) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

RENTAL REHABILITATION GRANTS

Notwithstanding section 289(c) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), the unexpended balances of the Rental rehabilitation grants program (account symbols 86/0182 and 86/0164), and any amounts recaptured under account symbol 86/0182 for such program, shall be added to and merged with the Revolving Fund (liquidating programs), established pursuant to title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701g-5), effective October 1, 1991.

REHABILITATION LOAN FUND

Notwithstanding section 289(c) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), the assets and liabilities of the revolving fund established by section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452b), and any collections, including repayments or recaptured amounts, of such fund shall be transferred to and merged with the Revolving Fund (liquidating programs), established pursuant to title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1955, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701g-5), effective October 1, 1991.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Of the amount made available under this head in Public Law 101-507, \$500,000 shall be made available for the National Commission on Manufactured Housing as authorized by section 943 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.—Section 811(k)(4) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 8013(k)(4)) is amended by striking "20 persons with disabilities" and inserting "24 persons with disabilities (or such higher number of persons as permitted under criteria that the Secretary shall prescribe)".

PREVIOUSLY OBLIGATED FUNDS

All previously obligated funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the head "Urban development action grants" for prior fiscal

years shall be exempt, effective as of March 5, 1991, from the application of the provisions of section 1405 (b)(4) and (b)(6) of Public Law 101-510 (104 Stat. 1679) and section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and shall remain available until expended for the purposes for which originally obligated.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title II through page 32, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to that portion of the bill?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, did I understand that all the remaining part of title II is open for amendment?

The gentleman from Arizona is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOLBE: Page 32, after line 10, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED HOUSING

Proposed Rescission (R91-20) Fiscal Year 1991

Of the funds made available under this head in Public Law 101-507, \$535,000,000, together with all uncommitted balances remaining in the Nehemiah Housing Opportunity revolving fund, are rescinded: *Provided*, That \$233,760,000 shall be inserted in lieu of \$733,760,000 for the development and acquisition cost of public housing: *Provided further*, That no funding shall be available for assistance under the Nehemiah housing opportunity program.

HOUSING

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PEOPLE EVERYWHERE GRANTS (HOPE GRANTS)

For the Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere Programs, as authorized under Title III of the United States House Act of 1937, and subtitles B and C of Title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), and the Hope for Elderly Independence demonstration program as authorized under section 803(k) of such Act, \$165,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SHELTER PLUS CARE: SECTION 202 RENTAL ASSISTANCE

For the Shelter Plus Care: Section 202 rental assistance program, as authorized under subtitle F, part IV, of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$18,000,000 to remain available until expended.

SHELTER PLUS CARE: SECTION 8 MODERATE REHABILITATION, SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY

For the Shelter Plus Care: Section 8 moderate rehabilitation, single room occupancy

program, as authorized under subtitle F, part III, of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$24,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program, to remain available until expended.

CONGREGATE SERVICES

All of the funds made available under this head in P.L. 101-507 are rescinded.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM

For the HOME investment partnership program as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625). \$500,000,000 to remain available until expended *Provided*, That for the purposes of the foregoing amount, such Act shall be construed as providing the following in section 216(3)(A), "\$750,000" both places it appears shall be "\$375,000" in section 217(b)(2)(A), "\$3,000,000" both places it appears shall be "\$750,000" in section 217(b)(2)(B), "\$500,000" both places it appears shall be "\$125,000" and in section 217(b)(3), "\$500,000" shall be "\$250,000".

SHELTER PLUS CARE: HOMELESS RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For the Shelter Plus Care: Homeless Rental Housing Assistance program, as authorized under subtitle F, part II, of title IV of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77), as amended, \$80,000,000 to remain available until expended.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACTION GRANTS

Proposed Rescission (R91-23) Fiscal Year 1991

Available funds under this head (including amounts deobligated in fiscal year 1991), except such amounts as may be necessary to comply with court orders of United States Courts which direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set aside funds for possible future approval of grants to carry out urban development action grant programs authorized in section 119 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended are rescinded.

RENTAL REHABILITATION GRANTS

Proposed Rescission (R91-24) Fiscal Year 1991

All of the funds made available under this head in P.L. 101-507 are rescinded.

REHABILITATION LOAN FUND

Proposed Rescission (R91-26) Fiscal Year 1991

Amounts made available for commitments for loans under this head in Public Law 101-507, other than amounts necessary for operating costs and the capitalization of delinquent interest on delinquent or defaulted loans, are rescinded.

URBAN HOMESTEADING

Proposed Rescission (R91-25) Fiscal Year 1991

All of the funds made available under this head in Public Law 101-507, together with available balances (including amounts deobligated in fiscal year 1991), are rescinded.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOME PROGRAM

Section 204 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended by deleting "through the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing FHA Commissioner of the Department of Housing and Urban Development,".

Implementation of the HOME Program in Fiscal Year 1991 with Interim Regulations

Section 206 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended to read as follows.

"Sec. 206. Regulations.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this act, the Secretary shall issue interim regulations to be effective on publication to implement the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall issue final regulations to implement the provisions of this title by October 1, 1991."

Streamlined Certification Under the HOME Program

Section 218(d) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended to read as follows.

"(d) Certification.—A participating jurisdiction shall provide to the Secretary, at such times and in such form as the Secretary shall determine certification that the jurisdiction shall use the funds made available under this title pursuant to the participating jurisdiction's approved housing strategy and in compliance with all requirements of this title."

Timing of Submission of Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy

Notwithstanding Section 216(5) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625), for fiscal year 1991, each jurisdiction that intends to participate under Title II of such Act shall submit to the Secretary its comprehensive housing affordability strategy in accordance with section 105 of such Act no later than 90 days after the date of publication in the Federal Register of the rule that specifies the requirements for the strategy.

HOME Repayments to Non-Participating Jurisdictions

Subsection (a) and (b) of section 219 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) are respectively amended by deleting "reallocated in accordance with section 217(d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "retained and invested by the jurisdiction for uses eligible under section 212(a)(1)".

Timing Requirements on Local Match

Section 220(a) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended by striking out "throughout a fiscal year," and by striking out "in that fiscal year" in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

Environmental Review Amendments

Section 288 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended by striking out "participating" in subsections (a), (b), and (c) thereof, and inserting in subsection (d) thereof immediately after "In the case of assistance to" the following: "units of general local government from".

Title III of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437aa) is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"Section 310. Environmental review.—The provisions and requirements of section 288 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act shall also apply to States and units of general local government that receive assistance under this title."

The Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended by adding immediately after section 431 the following new section:

"Section 432. Environmental Review.—The provisions and requirements of section 288 of

the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act shall also apply to States and units of general local government that receive assistance under this subtitle."

The Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended by adding immediately after section 448 the following new section:

"Section 449. Environmental review.—The provisions and requirements of section 288 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act shall also apply to States and units of general local government that receive assistance under this subtitle."

HOPE for Elderly Independence Demonstration Period

Section 803(a) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (Public Law 101-625) is amended by striking out the second sentence.

Timing of Operating Subsidy Regulations Changes

Section 9(a)(3)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended in the second sentence by inserting "and" immediately after "public housing agencies and their associations," and by deleting "prior to the start of any fiscal year to which it applies, and remain in effect for the duration of any such fiscal year without change."

Mr. KOLBE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1540

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] will be recognized for 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 15 minutes of my time be given to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] and that he may be entitled to yield time from that 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 15 minutes, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] has 15 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1281, the dire emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991.

The amendment would provide funds for the New Hope and the New Home Program as well as the Shelter-Plus Care Programs, all of which were authorized last year by the National Affordable Housing Act which this body adopted.

I would also like to take time to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] for lending his support to this important initiative. At the same time, I also want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] for the hard work that he and his subcommittee have done on these programs in the past, and I know the consideration that they are going to be giving to them in the future. I would also like to pay the same tribute to the ranking Republican, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Let me get to the point. Last session, this body overwhelmingly passed the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, by a vote of 378 to 43. The legislation authorized new and innovative approaches to expand home ownership and resident management, to expand housing assistance to the large numbers of unassisted households, and to begin an innovative new service-supported housing program for those homeless and most in need. What my amendment does today is very simple: It gets these three programs started. These programs were authorized late, too late to get any funding in fiscal year 1991, but HUD has worked very rapidly since last fall to write the regulations for those programs. The HOPE regulations were promulgated on February 4 of this year.

The HOME Program regulations, along with the forms, were given to Congress on February 28 of this year. So these programs are now ready to go. The Secretary and his team are ready to go. So why are we waiting?

The second point that I would make is that this amendment is revenue neutral. It does not add any dollars. It comes under the caps; it comes under the budget summit agreement. It takes money from the existing appropriation for new construction to begin the funding for these vital programs. If we were to fund these programs for the rehabilitation of housing units, we would lose about 6,500 units or roughly 6,500 new units over the next 5 years. In its place we would get in the next 1 or 2 years, 37,000 new units for those who need shelter in this country. And we do this as I suggested, with \$500 million reduction in public housing new construction.

Further funding would come from \$263 million in savings that come from consolidating five small categorical programs in 1991. These programs such as the Nehemiah grants, rental rehabilitation grants, urban home setting, all of these would be eligible for funding under the HOME Program which is the block grant program. So, no community can say that we are taking away those dollars. We are not going to be able to have those programs because all of them could be funded under that.

Let me make one final point. There has been some misinformation with re-

gard to Indian Programs, that they would be adversely affected by this amendment. That is not true. The set-aside for Indian Programs is still there. The 3,000 Indian housing units in fiscal year 1991 are not touched by this amendment. Voting to support this amendment is a vote to increase funding for the Indian areas because of the set-aside that would be in there as well.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment simply recognizes and says to the American people, says to those who need housing, Let's get on with the programs we said last fall were good programs. Let's get on with funding these programs. Let's get started. I hope that the Members of this body will do just that.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, I want to commend the gentleman for his initiative. I support it. The gentleman has anticipated my question regarding Indian housing, and I thank him very much for that assurance.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to 30 minutes under the rule.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. Let me make it very clear that in rejecting the request for the rescission of the existing program funds in order to transfer the funds to new programs, the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations did so without any prejudice to the funding of those new programs for fiscal year 1992. That is explicitly stated on page 44 of the report that accompanies this bill. I want to assure the gentleman that those programs will get every consideration as we look at the fiscal year 1992 funding cycle. We recognize that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs put an enormous amount of work into this bill. It is probably the most complicated new bill in the housing field since at least 1974, maybe since 1968.

We understand that the bill represents a mammoth amount of work on the part of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and we appreciate and express our thanks to the members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs for what they have done.

Let me also say that our decision not to fund these programs in fiscal year

1991 is no criticism of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I think the energy with which the Department drew up the regulations, the fact that it was able to complete them so quickly, shows the kind of leadership that our former colleague, Secretary Kemp, has been providing at HUD, and I want to pay tribute here and now to the very important job that Secretary Kemp is doing in that formerly troubled agency.

However, having said that, I still hope my colleagues will vote against this amendment. Let me explain why. If there is one basic theme that runs through the 1990 Housing Act, it is the devolution of responsibilities that previously rested with HUD upon State government, upon local government, upon nonprofit organizations throughout the country, which get increased responsibilities for operating many of the programs of which HUD was a direct operator in the past. While HUD has certainly done its part of the job in getting the regulations out quickly, the fact of the matter is, as the gentleman was candid enough to admit, one part of the regulations came out only a month ago. Another part was published in the Federal Register on a basis which gave State and local governments only 8 days to comment before the regulations took effect. The fact of the matter is that most of the communities that are going to have to operate these programs simply want more time to address the issues and to learn how the programs function. If they are to make these new programs work, I think they are entitled to have the time to do it.

That is why fully 44 agencies or groups representing those who are going to have to make these programs work at the State and local level are opposed to this amendment. They include groups like the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees; the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; the Mortgage Bankers Association; the National Association of Counties; the National Association of Home Builders; the National Association of Realtors; the National Council of Senior Citizens; the National League of Cities; the National Puerto Rican Coalition; the National Urban League; the Union of American Hebrew Congregations; the United Church of Christ; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; and the United Way of America. There is another list equally long that I could go through if time permitted.

□ 1550

In short, it is very clear that the members of the user community simply want more time to digest these massive regulations and these massive new programs that they are going to have to operate. I think they are entitled to that time.

Let me just give one instance where I think there are still a lot of problems to be worked out. Unlike the programs which HUD has been operating since 1974, most of which have not required local matches or matches by nonprofit sponsors in order to get the money from HUD, these programs generally require State, local or nonprofit organization matches.

Now, it is clear that the match does not have to be a cash match, but it is far from clear at this point what counts and what does not count as a match that entitles a city for example, to get its funds from HUD.

Thus it is expected that many cities may contribute a physical facility or a piece of land as their local match; however, there are real issues under this law as to whether, if that facility or if that land was acquired by a municipality through the use of federally tax exempt bonds, that facility or that land qualifies under the new law for the local match. As we all know, State and local governments by and large around this country are facing very severe fiscal problems. The issue of whether they are going to have to come up with fresh resources in order to meet the local matching requirements or whether there is some way that HUD can find to get around those problems is an absolutely critical one in terms of the ability of State and local governments to take on the additional fiscal load that is imposed on them under this legislation.

I suggest that we ought to have the opportunity to explore that issue in the course of our hearings on the fiscal year 1992 appropriations. There are authorizations for all these programs for fiscal year 1992 in the housing bill that we passed last year, so there is absolutely nothing prejudicial to those programs by our not acting at the present time.

In conclusion, I should like to point out that this is an emergency supplemental. We have dealt with the one true emergency that the Secretary sent up to us. The Secretary was concerned that HUD would not have adequate funds to deal with expiring section 8 subsidies. That would have meant people would be out on the street because HUD was unable to continue the funding that is enabling them to rent their apartments.

We put up the money that HUD requested for that purpose. What is being requested by HUD in the Kolbe-Moran amendment is not an emergency. There is time to wait until October 1 to fund these programs. They are authorized in fiscal year 1992, and I think it behooves all of us to give ourselves, and to give the State and local governments and the nonprofit organizations that are going to have to run these programs and that are asking us for more time, the additional time that they request

so that they can make these programs work.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain things that a freshman is not supposed to do, and certainly one of those is to question the judgment of the Appropriations Committee, not because they are all-powerful necessarily, but because the distinguished members that subcommittee chairs, such as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], the reason we do not question the judgment of the Appropriations Committee normally is primarily because the members work so conscientiously to reflect the will of their colleagues and the best interests of the American people.

I served as a staff member of the Senate Appropriations Committee under Senator Magnuson before being elected to office 12 years ago. I know the respect that the Appropriations Committee chairman ought to be accorded; but Mr. Chairman, my first duty is to my constituents and to my conscience. Both compel me to ask my colleagues to modify this supplemental appropriations request. The modification we propose would provide more than five times the number of housing units, over 36,000 units assisted versus the appropriations request. More than \$600 million in new and carryover funds would be preserved to continue the public housing construction program.

HUD reports that an \$18 billion backlog exists in public housing new construction funds from previous years, not counting the 10,000 new units appropriated for the present fiscal year.

HUD construction reports show that it takes more than 5 years to outlay new public housing construction, while the programs that we are suggesting be initiated this year generally can be implemented in less than 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, we are asking that \$500 million be made available to States and localities to implement the innovative ideas that we all agree make sense.

This amendment is undoubtedly going to fail, and one of the reasons is because it is being characterized as a Republican attempt to gut public housing. It is not.

The National Affordable Housing Act passed last year overwhelmingly, and all this does is to say that if it was a good idea last year to fund, it is still a good idea, and if it is a good idea to fund next year, as everyone has agreed it will be, it is a better idea to fund it this year. That is all we are talking about.

There is no ideological issue at stake here. We have agreed that the HOME Program makes sense, that the HOPE Program makes sense. All we are talking about is the timing.

We have a lot of public housing construction that has already been author-

ized and in fact appropriated for, but we have not appropriated money for these new initiatives, and they deserve a chance.

I have a number of constituents from Alexandria, and it is right across the river; if you do not believe me we will give you the addresses and you can ask them; they are residents of public housing; they believe that this can help them.

Alexandria had more public housing in 1940 than any jurisdiction in any suburb in the country on a per capita basis. In fact, we have maintained that commitment for 50 years, but public housing is not fulfilling the intent that it was authorized for 50 years to accomplish and that was not to give people permanent shelter. It was to give people the means to become more self-sufficient. It is not accomplishing that. These ideas will go further toward accomplishing that goal, particularly in the HOPE Program.

We are only talking about \$165 million. It deserves a chance to see if it is going to work.

The \$500 million simply funds the ideas that were authorized in the Authorization Act last year, but what it does is to give more discretion to States and localities to fashion the money according to their needs and based upon their existing resources. It gets more bang for the buck. I think we ought to support it.

I appreciate the amendment that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has offered and I certainly appreciate all the time and judgment and leadership that Chairman TRAXLER has provided in the housing area.

Mr. TRAXLER. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise in opposition to the amendment. The makers of the amendment, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], a former mayor and promising freshman of this body, certainly bring, I think, intelligence and rationality to a difficult issue. It is with some appreciation, indeed I even thank them for allowing us to discuss this important issue affecting so many of America's poor.

Having said this, obviously it is with some pain that I therefore rise in opposition to the Kolbe-Moran amendment. These amendments purport to shift approximately \$800 million for existing HUD programs and use it as an offset to finance new programs authorized in the 1990 Housing Act.

In addition, the amendment contains 10 administrative provisions, all except one modifying the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990.

□ 1600

Now, these administrative provisions are legislative matters which are, in my judgment, within the jurisdiction of and ought to be considered by the full Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, not on the House floor and not as an amendment to an appropriations bill.

Now, the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, which I have had the great honor of chairing, did not include funding for any new housing initiatives in its recommendations.

Now, this action, as Mr. GREEN has said, is taken without prejudice. We have not passed judgment on the relative merits of the provisions of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990.

We will unquestionably fund some of those programs in the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies. That bill will be coming before this body, hopefully, sometime in May or perhaps early June of this year.

Now, why did we not agree with these proposals? In our judgment, we ought not to be starting programs in the 1991 supplemental that we may not be able to fund again in the 1992 bill, the one we are going to be doing in just a matter of a few months.

On a comparable basis, there is over—and get this, it is very important—there is over \$4 billion more authorized in the 1992 Housing Act than we appropriated in the 1991 housing bill. So if we did the things that we did in 1991, we would need \$4 billion more to fully fund the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act.

I can tell you in all honesty and candor, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] did, that we do not believe, and I do not think anybody in this body believes, that the subcommittee will get that kind of a 602(b) allocation. I would be delighted if we did; I would be thrilled if that would happen. We would then be able to do many of the things that you have asked us to do.

Unfortunately, because of the financial situation of this Nation and because of the budget summit agreement of last fall and the domestic limitations under which we all have to live, that is not a possible scenario. I regret to advise you of that. And no one is more pained by that than I am.

Therefore, in our judgment, it would be premature to initiate funding for selected few housing programs and make those kinds of thrusts.

Now, in addition to that, I must tell you that we could not agree to any of the proposed rescissions. Therefore, if we could not agree to the rescissions of funds in the 1991 bill, we could not agree to the new initiatives that are proposed here, since that is where the money would come from.

The subcommittee will fund, I can assure you, such portions of the new housing initiatives as our 602(b) allocation will permit us to do. That is a great mystery and a great unknown out there, as I just explained just a moment ago. We will do that after we have had time to thoroughly review the smorgasbord of new programs that are in the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act. Candidly, and this is not meant as a criticism—I understand how the legislation came together, and I would have been doing the same things—candidly, we now have an exceptional number of programs in housing, and we will be unable, I can assure you again, to fund all in the 1992 bill. It is going to require very, very difficult choices. The committee would prefer not to be selecting among such a great number of programs. We wish that the legislation had focused on perhaps a fewer number of new initiatives. We appreciate the making of that stew and we know why it came out in the fashion it did. We will do our very best, in consultation with the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, to do what is right by way of these new housing programs.

The judgment of the committee is that now is not the time to begin these initiatives.

I might just add something on the public housing pipeline: You will recall there have been some comments on the floor and also in a letter from the Secretary on that subject. Let me say that the Secretary is a dear friend of mine, a graduate of the full Committee on Appropriations, where he served with great distinction and honor for a number of years. It is with some sadness that the committee took this action, certainly not out of disrespect for the Secretary of HUD, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Kemp.

We have assured him that this is done with no prejudice and that we will revisit this area in the 1992 bill.

Now, speaking to the pipeline question, the Department, I must say, though, has some responsibility for the pipeline backlog and jam.

The 1990 public housing units—and this is 1990, now—some 5,700 units are not yet committed because of the Agency's inaction.

Furthermore, the Department is withholding, not committing the funds for the 10,000 units that were provided for in 1991. The balance of the units represents, in my judgment, the normal pipeline backlog because this is a construction program.

Bearing that in mind, I urge my colleagues to say no to the amendment and vote it down.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished chairman of the sub-

committee for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kolbe amendment. I am very concerned about the fact that the largest chunk of the money that would be required to fund the new initiative would come out of the public housing development fund, a rather extensive sum of \$500 million, in order to fund one of these new initiatives.

I think it is important for us as we scrutinize the amendment here to recognize the fact that the compromise on the 1990 Housing Act, which was adopted overwhelmingly in the last Congress, is that the new HOPE and HOME Programs would be funded in fiscal year 1992. The compromise did not include funding these new programs in fiscal year 1991 at the expense of the public housing programs which were funded in the 1991 Appropriations Act at 10,000 units.

I think it is also important for us to recognize a couple of other things: One, that while the HOME Program may provide a predictable stream of funds to more than 300 cities and States, it cannot provide the deeply subsidized housing that those who are eligible for public housing so desperately need in this country.

The HOME Program is only a gap-financing program; it restricts the ability of a community to undertake new production.

Thirdly, the proposed definition of matching funds for HOME will preclude most localities from raising sufficient match to in fact take advantage of the HOME Program this year.

I appreciate the fact that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on which I sit has made it very clear that the subcommittee will fund some of these new housing initiatives in 1992. But we simply ought to have the opportunity to conduct some hearings and be able to review these programs, get the input of the members of the subcommittee along with the other Members and then be able to ascertain which of these programs should have a priority.

This is simply not the time to just initiate funding for these newly authorized programs. I would hope the Members of the House would give us the opportunity on the subcommittee to scrutinize carefully these programs and be able to ascertain the proper priorities and then fund them properly. But not to do this at the expense of the current public housing development program.

For that reason I urge the Members to vote "no" on the Kolbe amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

□ 1610

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I have the very highest regard for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN]. They do an excellent job in carrying out their responsibilities in this body and on their subcommittee. So it is with reluctance that I must disagree with the position they have taken today. I do so because I simply do not know of Members of this body who get out and look around as my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], the newest Member from Alexandria, does at the public housing situation in this country and conclude that the well-intentioned, but inefficient, programs of HUD are adequately meeting the public housing needs in this country. That is exactly why the Congress struggled, and labored, and sweated over an omnibus housing bill that was signed into law last year. That new initiative is enthusiastically supported by Members on both sides of the aisle, as evidenced in the vote on that bill. It is supported by the administration, and it makes an effort to chart a bold new course for housing policy in the United States.

In addition, it creates multiple opportunities for new innovation. The HOME Program empowers States and localities to address their particularly low housing needs with maximum flexibility. The HOPE Program empowers the poor to become home owners in their own right.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, the bill passed both bodies as close to unanimously as could be. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], my friend, rightly pointed out, as did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], my friend, that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has bent over backwards to get out the rules and regulations to cut through the bureaucracy to try to get these programs going.

My colleagues, it comes down to this for me. We have worked too long and too hard to establish a new policy for this country's housing. No more delays. No more reviews. No more rewrites. The Congress has spoken. The course has been charted. Now is the time to provide the funding.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kolbe-Moran amendment.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] now has a total of 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. My colleagues, most Members of this House are very familiar with pockets of poverty in their

own communities. We know precisely where low-income families live and struggle and have been living and struggling for decades in our communities. We also know in our heart of hearts that many of these public housing units are monuments, permanent monuments, and reminders that at one time we fashioned some well-intentioned social policies that have not worked. They have failed to address the needs of the people who live in them.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but think, if we all take a mental walk through most of those communities and housing projects, we would all conclude that we must continue to provide housing opportunities for the underprivileged and the low-income among us, but that we must do so in an entirely different way.

So, let us not talk about programs. Let us talk about people. Does public housing, new construction, and that is the primary source of these dollars which will be shifted to some of the new initiatives included in this amendment, do they help more people quicker, which is the best way in a time of fiscal restraint, budgetary considerations, to use the finite number of resources we have available? What is the best way?

In my judgment the best way is to allocate those resources to those programs that will house the greatest number of people in the quickest period of time.

Now let us take a look at the major component of this and specifically the transfer of the \$500 million from the public housing development program to the HOME block grant. I say to my colleagues, "If you care about people who are desperate for housing, if you care more about people than you do for preserving programs, then in my judgment you would approve of this transfer of funds because it would help 6 times as many households, and probably as many as 100 to 120,000 more people."

What is the best way, or in this comparison what is the better way, to use \$500 million? And I might add to those of my colleagues who are concerned therefore about the remaining dollars available for new construction that it does nothing to the 25,000 units of public housing new construction that are in the pipeline and takes years and years to build.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "If you care about people and not programs, if you want to maximize the number of shelters, or homes or opportunities that people in desperation and in need should have, then I would support the Kolbe-Moran amendment."

There is another very critical component to this particular amendment, and it is the transfer of funds to another program, another initiative, and it is not a demonstration initiative. I cannot help but comment with regard

to the transfer of some of these dollars into the HOME Program. This program has been out there for 3 or 4 years. The whole approach has been used in communities all across this country. It is not an experiment. It has been going on in our communities for over 3 years, and it works.

Let me just conclude with a quote from Robert Woodson, president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, talking about the HOPE tour in St. Louis:

We saw tenant power transform the reception and reality of public housing from blighted crime-ridden projects to attractive resident-managed developments poised for resident ownership and revitalized by aggressive economic development programs. We learned first-hand what extraordinary results can be achieved by ordinary people when given the financial support and technical assistance to take control of their lives. The challenge is not to do more with more. The challenge is to do more with the same amount of resources.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues, "Please support, if you are interested in people and not programs, the Kolbe-Moran amendment."

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and in support of the position advocated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. Chairman, I was very proud last year, in 1990, to vote for the housing bill and to support within it each of these components: the HOME Program, which allows local government to provide affordable housing to its people; the HOPE Program, which allows people to have an opportunity to acquire a home; and then the Shelter-Plus, which allows homeless people to have treatment if they have mental illness or drug abuse problems. I support those programs, and I support generous funding for them. However, Mr. Chairman, I do not support funding them today and in this way.

I have heard from the administrator of our housing programs in Louisville as recently as today, from Ms. Andrea Duncan, who has been the long-time director of the Louisville Housing Authority who feels that shifting these monies at this time from the critical programs of public housing in Louisville, and other cities like it, would be a very serious mistake. So, I hope we listen to the wisdom and advice offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], my friend, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], my friend, who say that there will be funding, that these programs will not be forgotten, that they will receive careful attention, but in due course, not now, not today, not in this way. If we act today, we will be making a mistake.

□ 1620

So, Mr. Chairman, let us save public housing today and move forward on HOPE, HOME, and Shelter-Plus tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 10 minutes remaining. The Chair would remind the gentleman from Michigan that he retains the right to close debate on this amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as the ranking member of the Housing Subcommittee to express my concern for the failure of the fiscal year 1991 supplemental appropriation to grant any funding for several new initiatives created in the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act enacted last year. And I might add, this can and should be done without zeroing out new construction!

Throughout the entire process of the formulation of this legislation, there had been a concerted effort to raise the profile and urgency of housing as a Federal priority and to pass a major housing initiative.

As one of the leaders in the effort to produce a housing bill, I felt S. 566 represented the most significant change in the direction of national housing policy since 1974. The changes enacted legitimately represented a new horizon for housing. It also represents the first housing conference report that the Banking Committee has been able to bring to the House since 1987.

S. 566 reversed a period of retrenchment in Federal housing attitudes and established a clear direction for national housing policy, including the introduction of several promising housing initiatives.

One of the most significant of these new horizons was the HOME initiative which is intended to provide new innovations and new directions in housing policy which would result in magnified benefits.

HOME would streamline housing assistance and maximize State and local flexibility. As a block grant, this type of assistance would promote homeownership or improve rental assistance by providing States and localities with money to acquire, construct, or rehabilitate real property. All funds would be contingent upon a comparative match from the local entities. Its greatest merit, however, is that it gives wide latitude to meet local needs whether by means of new construction, rehabilitation or rental assistance tailored to local requirements.

The HOME approach begins to move us away from narrow, inflexible, categorical housing programs which, by their very nature, cannot respond adequately to local housing requirements, which vary greatly from region to region. The HOME Program recognizes that what is needed in one section of the country may not be a priority in another, and it encourages local experimentation and innovation which are the genius of our federal system.

As one of the earliest proponents of this concept and coauthor of the Roukema-Rangle House version of the initiative, I felt such a program would provide a bold new approach to meeting the housing needs of our citizens.

HOPE

In addition to the important HOME initiative, one of the cornerstones of this legislation is the emphasis we placed on the principle of homeownership for all. This concept is embodied in title III of the new bill, Secretary Kemp's HOPE proposals.

I did not share the total commitment and dedication to this initiative as the Secretary, and felt that the housing needs of our population would be better served through HOME. Nevertheless, I do believe that public housing residents should have the opportunity to become homeowners although I support a more gradual, than Secretary Kemp's incremental funding of HOPE which would allow the Congress to evaluate its success and to assess its cost effectiveness.

In sum, the renewed commitment to housing embodied in our bill addressed the plight of both the low-income renter and the first-time home buyer. The housing bill was a step in the right direction.

I am distressed to know that the Appropriations Committee is suggesting that they may not be willing to fund these programs in fiscal year 1992. This is wrong-headed and short sighted.

I recognize the committee's problem with the fiscal year 1991 supplemental request. Perhaps I, too, cannot agree to all of HUD's recommendations for the supplemental. And I do not agree with this amendment in the dramatic infusion of funds. A more incremental funding could have been supported. However, I would have hoped that some funds would have been made available for HOME and that the committee would support that initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD and VA, not to close the door on HOME, HOPE or Shelter-Plus Care, so early in the process and I urge the subcommittee to provide some funding for these programs which the Housing Subcommittee found to be so important.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE], a member of the Committee on Appropriations and a former member of

the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Kolbe amendment. I do so not because I am opposed to the programs contained in the Kolbe amendment; in fact I strongly support these programs, especially the HOME initiative. But this amendment is an ill-timed attempt to shift funds in midstream. It threatens the balance and the explicit agreements reached last year in the Cranston-Gonzalez affordable housing bill.

As a member of the House Banking Committee last year, I worked hard to help create innovative programs that effectively leverage public and private dollars to reverse the decline of home ownership in this country. But I also worked hard to make certain that public housing was put on a more solid basis, by ensuring a greater economic and social mix in public housing. In both these efforts, I was joined by a strong bipartisan group of members and these measures prevailed.

I pushed these amendments because I believe the housing needs in this country require a multifaceted approach. Of course we must expand home ownership opportunities whenever we can, but we must also recognize that this is not an all-sufficient answer. In some areas and for many people, public housing and rental assistance offer the only hope for decent housing.

The bill that was passed by large majorities of both parties last year clearly recognized that fact. It authorized HOME, including my provision for soft second mortgage support which, when funded, will help many people achieve home ownership. But it also recognized the need to selectively expand and improve the supply of public housing. It is this balance we must continue to strive for in next year's appropriation bill, when we can look at these programs in a comprehensive, not piecemeal, fashion.

I urge my colleagues to not make this a partisan issue. It will do us no good. We have Chairman TRAXLER's commitment that he will work to fund these new initiatives. We should take him at his word and work with him to achieve this balance in the fiscal year 1992 VA-HUD appropriations bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I find myself drawn to the floor to speak in opposition to these supplemental appropriation bills, H.R. 1281 and H.R. 1282.

I am opposed to the precedent set by this legislation. If signed into law, this would be the first application of the provision in last fall's budget agreement which allows dire emergency spending requests to be moved off budget. Because this is the first instance, I believe we must all personally answer some questions that I have been asking around Capitol Hill and back in my district.

First, is every single item in this bill dire emergency or is this a way to circumvent the pay-as-you-go rules and provide for pork barrel items?

In my judgment, the spending contained in these appropriations are not all emergency spending situations. That is not to say that there are not many fine programs within these measures. I could support many of these measures if presented in a responsible manner. But, I cannot support off-budget spending that circumvents my pay-as-you-go principles.

Second, what is the difference between on budget and off budget?

The only difference I can find is that on budget we pay for and off budget is paid for by our children and grandchildren.

Third, when do we pay for off-budget items? And last, who pays for off-budget items?

I am the proud father of a new baby boy and a beautiful little girl. Are we going to continue to put off paying for off-budget items until they are taxpayers?

This morning I met with the National Young Leaders Council here on the floor of this House. I saw hope in the eyes of these 350 high school students, hope that one day they will be able to take our places here and lead this country. Unfortunately, it we don't take the responsibility of paying for these items, on budget, today, it will be our children—yours and mine, and tomorrow's leaders who will be answering my questions.

If we are willing to support spending then let us be equally willing to support the way we are to pay for that spending and not sweep it under the rug for another day.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise first of all to compliment my colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] and the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] for their leadership initiative on this most important and urgent initiative.

I find it somewhat ironic that we address this bill today within the context of a dire emergency supplemental appropriation. As one who comes directly to Congress from the private sector, one who has been very active in the field of housing development and who has served as board president of Habitat for Humanity of Sonoma County, let me say that in my home county I can fully attest to the fact that in fact there is a dire emergency in America today. There is a wide range of unmet housing needs in this country, and it is time that this Congress got on with the job of providing for those needs.

It appears to me that this is not just an appropriations bill. It is a policy bill. In fact, it is an endorsement of a new philosophy and a new direction at HUD and certainly one which I believe will extend to other programs in the administration as well. Now that Secretary Kemp has so ably rooted out the systemic problem of contract fraud at HUD, he is bringing to us a balanced housing opportunity program to meet

the needs of indigent and low-income Americans, including the working poor.

It is a program that provides opportunities across the entire housing spectrum: the Shelter-Plus Program, which acknowledges for the first time that those who are homeless face multiple barriers to finding productive employment and decent shelter in our society. The Shelter-Plus Program would also implement the holistic homeless concept, and the HOME Program would provide funds from the most innovative programs on the local level, programs conducted by local nonprofit builders and local government in a very flexible manner to meet the needs of those local communities in providing permanent low-cost rental and purchased units in communities across America. And lastly there is the HOPE Program, which would allow for the conversion of public housing units to tenant-owned and makes possible for the first time in the history of this country the American dream of home ownership for the working poor who have been living in slums and barrios across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the passage of the Kolbe-Moran amendment here and now today to address the dire emergency of unmet housing needs in this country.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], a distinguished member of the committee and the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with many of my colleagues who have expressed the desire to reexamine all of the housing programs of our Nation. I come from an urban district where there is an extensive number of public housing units.

□ 1630

I want to join with all Members who are concerned that in the 1990's we have to look at public housing in a new way. I want to commend the Secretary Mr. Kemp, who used to serve with me on the Committee on the Budget and on the Committee on Appropriations, for the programs he is talking about, the \$500 million for HOME, and also the HOPE Program that will get tenants involved in management and ownership. Those are ideas that I have been talking about for 20 years, because I was the founder of five nonprofit housing corporations.

We do need to get tenants involved in management. We do need to produce home ownership. Yes, I believe the HOPE Program is the way to go. However, after saying that, the question that I have got to face, coming from a district with literally thousands of public housing units, many of which

need rehabilitation, is whether or not I should rob Peter to pay Paul; whether I should take money out of the rehabilitation part in this supplemental and transfer it to a new program, which would mean a delay in some of the housing units that need rehabilitation right now.

Therefore, I would like to urge the chairman of the committee and the committee to include these programs in next year's agenda, because I think they can work, but not to take them out of rehabilitation money and other low-income housing money, because that will not serve the needs of the poor.

I am not tied to a program; I am tied to people. I believe that the Secretary is going the right way. However, I think what we have got to do is not take it out of existing rehabilitation money, but we have to come up with additional resources, which I believe we can do.

So I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] and also the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] on their efforts here. I support them. However, I think the time and the place is in next year's appropriation bill. Therefore, we would have the additional money, and not take it from the rehabilitation dollars.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, there are so many arguments here, but it all kind of boils down to two, as I see it. The gentleman that spoke previously from Kentucky, who was saying the administrators from housing projects are opposed to this amendment, of course they are opposed. They want to keep us into housing projects. They want to keep us at status quo. They want to keep housing projects. I will address keeping housing projects in a minute.

To the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY], who says we are taking moneys from rehabilitation, that is not the case at all. The moneys are not coming from rehabilitation, the moneys are coming from new construction. New construction. The moneys, \$500 million, are coming from public housing, new construction, leaving still 8,900 units in new construction. And we have a backup, a pipeline, of over 20,000 units to be built. So new construction cannot happen now. They cannot build them fast enough now.

The whole issue that has been argued here right now is that this is too early, that we should not do it now, that we should go through the process. Well, let me tell Members something: if you are for this sort of program, and over 300 Members said you were, because you voted for the authorization of these programs, if you are for these programs, then now is the only time to do

it, because the bill that you voted for is only a 2-year authorization. It is only a 2-year authorization. So if you wait for the process to go forward, if you wait to fund this program for 1992, then you might as well say you are against this sort of program, because you are only going to fund 1 year of it. Now you can fund 2 years of it and see it go through. You can see it happen. You can see people empowered with owning their own housing.

Mr. Chairman, vote for the Kolbe-Moran amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Member from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO], a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which represents a reversal of the administration's position, an unwillingness to abide by its commitments with regard to the agreements reached during the conference committee on the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990. A conference on which I served in the past Congress.

This request to eradicate currently functioning successful housing programs to initiate funding for untried sound-good programs—arbitrarily or purposefully—was roundly rejected and justifiably rejected by the Appropriations Committee, and indeed, was not supported by over 45 organizations representing the various housing constituencies from the Mortgage Bankers to the National Coalition for the Homeless.

This House would not be responsible if we signed off on the destruction of programs like the Congregate Housing Services Program or public housing development now, when in fact the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee purposefully maintained these programs in the comprehensive bill passed and signed into law just 3 short months ago.

This amendment is apparently just the start of the dog-eat-dog activity that may prevail in this House if we accept such logic. I would ask that my colleagues look deeper than the surface language presented here. For example, the Congregate Housing Services Program does end in 1992. What is not mentioned, is that the National Affordable Housing Act actually expanded this program that currently assists thousands of seniors in over 30 States across the country to all federally assisted housing and that the new authorization is in place through fiscal year 1992. What is not mentioned is that this is effectively spiriting away these funds, leaving seniors without such services and with the real prospect of forcing them into more expensive care and nursing home care facilities for the frail elderly. All the programs that the Kolbe amendment de-

funds are authorized most in the same Housing Act that was passed in 1990.

So I ask my colleagues to look at this amendment for what it is—basically a reneging on agreements between this Congress and the administration and between this Congress and people being served by the programs the administration chooses to cut mid-stream. These new programs, HOPE, HOME, and Shelter Plus, will have an opportunity to receive funding based on their merits in the 1992 appropriations process. The real problem is that the administration is suggesting that we not expand the size of the resources available, but simply rob from Peter to pay Paul.

Surely when Congress reauthorized and authorized new programs, we are endorsing the existing programs and some different approaches. We expected that more dollars would be available, not a short changing of housing overall that is even providing less for housing. At the very least we expected an orderly transition of funding rather than a slam dunk of programs that affect low income housing needs, and people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Kolbe-Moran amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to clear up this notion of us cutting rehabilitation monies. We are not cutting rehabilitation moneys. The \$500 million that is coming from public housing new construction is new construction because, under the National Affordable Housing Act, you can continue, if the States choose, to continue with the rehabilitation. They will have moneys for rehabilitation. So we are not taking moneys from rehabilitation, we are taking moneys from construction that cannot possibly be spent right now.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kolbe-Moran amendment. I rise in opposition, first of all, because I think we should respect the work of the Committee on Appropriations. Our esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER], has given considerable thought and put many hours into trying to allocate the meager resources of the Committee on Appropriations to the programs that are needed in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot fund everything. We must not rob Peter to pay Paul. We must not undo the existing programs for these new ideas that are untried and untrue.

Mr. Chairman, I know Mr. Jack Kemp. He is a friend of mine. I have the highest respect for some of his ideas and his desire to revolutionize the way we deal with housing for the poor.

However, I was not here for the debate and the vote on the comprehensive housing bill. I would have tried to create more debate, especially about the HOPE program.

In my district I have over eight public housing developments. Some of them you have heard about in the news. Those public housing developments are not ready for home ownership. Mr. Kemp knows this. Many Members who have experienced public housing developments know that people are not prepared to own those units.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask Members to vote no on this amendment, even if they are prepared to support it at a later date. This is not the time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment. Last year we passed a remarkable housing bill. It allows creative responses to today's problems.

All this bill does is to recognize the astounding leadership of Jack Kemp. He wrote the regulations fast. We ought to reward that kind of leadership, because this gives us the opportunity to take construction money that could not be spent, construction money that would go for very high costs, because we know the costs of building are very high today, and reuses that money to provide many, many more units.

Mr. Chairman, this is not robbing Peter to pay Paul; this is robbing Peter to pay Paul, all his brothers and sisters, all his aunts and uncles, and all his cousins and nieces. In my district this would allow sweat equity projects, that with a very little bit of money and people's own labor, we can create. We can rehabilitate housing for low affordable rents and ownership.

□ 1640

It is fantastic how much better we can spend the construction money and create tens of thousands of more units than we could create through new construction.

The time is now. Let us not let another day pass. Set new priorities like we did in the housing bill. Honor good executive branch leadership that wrote the regulations in a hurry. Let us carry through on the policies that we set last year. Let us recognize Jack's leadership, and let us get on with it so that we have a year and a half to look at when we come back rather than just a few months.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has the right to close debate.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the authorizing committee and the Housing Subcommittee.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, it was the day before Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait that this House passed the authorizing bill last summer, and in that bill we had this great compromise. And just in the last several hours, at this moment, the Rules Committee is continuing to debate the RTC funding measure where there is a great deal of dissension among members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. That August 1 agreement saw the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Housing indicate that if we were to have the regulations put forward from the Department of Housing and Urban Development that yes, we would proceed with funding for the HOPE Program, the HOME Block Grant Program, the Shelter Plus Program. We acknowledged through our authorization that it will play a major role in expanding the opportunities for us to meet that important goal of ensuring opportunities for those who are less advantaged than we.

That agreement was made. Some say this is a dire emergency supplemental and for that reason it should not be incorporated in here.

Mr. Chairman, we know full well that this will not cost an additional nickel. This is simply a transfer from those old, outdated, wasteful programs of the past to the kind of creative approach that President Bush was talking about as he stood right here last night. Let us not take this domestic reform agenda that the President desperately wants us to implement and, at the first chance to address it, the day after his speech, throw down the drain that great opportunity.

I am convinced that the chance to help those in need is before us. I hope that we will join in passage of this amendment.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the housing subcommittee, I rise today in adamant opposition to this amendment and would urge my colleagues not to support it.

We agreed last year that programs such as urban homesteading and Nehemiah would be phased out, but not until some later date. The Kolbe amendment to the supplemental, however, proposes to phase these programs out prior to that date.

Someone said earlier this is not new construction, this is rehab and vice versa. I do not care where it comes from. It is taking money that has been appropriated to help people out of one category and sticking it another. It is not really a commitment. So this can-

not be a situation of robbing Peter to pay Paul. This cannot be a shell game where through a sleight of hand we are going to do something mysterious.

If we are serious about housing in this country, we will start doing it with leadership and appropriating the moneys that ought to be appropriated. And we do not just need HOME and HOPE, we need help and we need help now on this issue by those Members who have expressed a desire to help the people of this country to own homes.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. HORN].

Ms. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I speak not as a member of the Housing Committee or the Appropriations Committee, but as someone who has worked in public housing and with community block grant funds and low-income housing for many years. I worked for the St. Louis Housing Authority.

Let me just bring to everyone's attention one fact that has not come out during this debate. What we are doing is not only taking from one program and putting to another, regardless of what programs, but what happens when these kinds of programs are affected is the very lowest income people are hurt. What happened in St. Louis is that the very lowest income people were forced out of public housing, and people live in public housing that now is tenant managed and who have more money and who can afford to do that.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of our time to close debate.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of closing our debate, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the minority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say I strongly urge a "yes" vote for this amendment. I would ask those who intend to vote "no" to really search their conscience.

It does not do a lot of good to have Secretary Kemp go across the country, arouse hope, encourage people to believe they are going to have greater control over their lives, encourage local communities to believe they are going to have greater opportunity, and then have the Congress strangle the program.

Let me just address two concerns. First of all in rehabilitation. There is \$2.5 billion in the budget for rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is not the issue here. The \$500 million from construction would go to local option, and consider what the people who are against the amendment are saying. They are saying that they do not trust the local communities to decide which program works best. They are saying on the one hand that we in the House have decided

what you will do, and we do not trust you to decide whether or not what we have told you to do is good enough.

All Secretary Kemp has been asking for is permission to allow the local communities to choose between construction, rehabilitation and vouchers.

We had the gentlewoman from Missouri who just rose, and she is from St. Louis, Bertha Gilkey of St. Louis is in many ways the mother of the whole proposition of tenant ownership and tenant management.

The fact is this is a fight between the bureaucracies of the housing authority and the people who live in public housing, and I think it would be tragic for this House today to say to Secretary Kemp: You can make all of the speeches you want, but we are going to strangle your program so it has no reality in the real world.

I urge everyone to give this new approach and this new program some hope. Give it a chance to be tried out. Do not kill it here on the floor of the House.

How can Members turn the President down when last night he came here and said please, give us a chance to be as effective here at home as we have been overseas?

I urge Members to vote "yes."

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BARTLETT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARTLETT moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I take this extraordinarily privileged motion and apologize to my colleagues for doing so. This will be the last time I speak in the well of the House, and I was detained for a few moments for closing arguments.

I leave the House this evening. My resignation will be effective on Monday. And I leave on this amendment in many ways as I began with many of you 8½ years ago advocating a housing policy that would directly empower individuals and families to obtain better housing, safer housing and housing in which individuals are allowed to make their own choices.

Housing policies have changed in the 1990's, and this is one of those changes. It seems to me on the amendment that was before the House that the choice is clear, a choice between the old status quo of involving only 6,800 units that may be built 5 years from now versus assisting directly some 37,000 families, effective immediately, assisting those families to live where they want to live, to live in better conditions, in garden apartments or high rises or single family homes, or live in those ways

in which they choose in desegregated, better, more choices and with home ownership opportunities.

□ 1650

I want to say to my colleagues as I leave the well that I feel some enormous gratitude for each one of you for the opportunity to have served with you in the last 8½ years.

It has been well reported that I plan to seek the mayor's job in Dallas and to implement many of the policies that you and I have talked about and worked on legislatively together in the last 8½ years.

I have an enormous amount of respect for every Member here, for the ability that this body has to form coalitions, to develop consensus of legislation in public policies as we move forward to try to empower people to control their own lives. I have a great deal of respect for the center aisle, but I have to say that that center aisle is not a barrier, and it should not be treated as a barrier. The center aisle between Republican and Democrat is a walkway. It is an opportunity to build that coalition.

I appreciate the support and the opportunity from my constituents, from a network of people all over the Nation who have volunteered information and assistance to me in developing this legislation, and I must say, to my own congressional staff, one of the most productive and professional staffs I have ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, as I leave, I would leave on a note that was given to me in terms of a lesson for Members of Congress by John Erlenborn, who had been in Congress for some 18 years before I got here. He sat down when I first got here and gave me a lesson which I have never forgotten. Succinctly, it would say get there early and stay late, do your homework, know more about the subject than anyone else, follow the rules including the written rules and the rules of courtesy and decency, and then if you believe you are right, never, ever, ever give up, and you can make a difference.

I thank each one of you for letting me be here to make that kind of a difference with you.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that in the course of these last several years, it has been a pleasure to have been associated with him, and that his arguments and his presentations have always been on the very highest level. He has raised the level of debate in this institution significantly, and whatever the future may hold for him, I wish to extend him on behalf of my side of the aisle the very best wishes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman for his kind words and his, also, high level of debate.

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

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I want my friend and colleague to know that he will be sorely missed in this House, as a Member who has added to the debate no matter which side he was on. Let me say if you were debating an issue in the well of the House, you always wanted the gentleman from Texas to be an ally, because he did know his subject. He did work through the complicated issues. He was always trying to form coalitions and hit the center.

We wish the gentleman all the success. We know he will be running a great city. We wish him great success. We will sorely miss your presence.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in wishing our friend all the best. I have had occasions when I have been debating on the same side as my colleague. Thus, I shall always remember his successful efforts to allow market forces to set FHA interest rates instead of having them set by administrative fiat which never worked, when I joined him in that effort.

We have been on opposite sides, too, as we are today, but the gentleman in the well has always been a gentleman and has always worked hard, and it has always been great to join the debate with him whether on the same side or on different sides. I wish him well.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that a gentleman gets to stand down there and take compliments for himself. But I also want to join with my colleagues in saying how much we are going to miss you. You have been one of my good friends, truly one of my closest friends in the House of Representatives, and a great deal of what I have learned in this body I learned from the gentleman: Courtesy, working to forge coalitions, finding solutions that are compromises and working with others.

We wish the gentleman well.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Texas who, as he well knows, has

agreed with me about as often with my particular philosophy, about as often as I have agreed with him, very rarely. But I can truly say he has been a gentleman. He has, indeed, raised the level of debate. He has always had a kind heart. He has known his issues. He is well-intentioned. I am sure that he is going to be an excellent product for the races and events he is going to face in this future, and certainly all of us here who have worked with him wish him nothing but the best in the future.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The secret of good public policy is to build those coalitions, to respect the views and the diversity of views, from all parts of this body and all parts of the country.

I thank those who have spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] seek 5 minutes to speak in opposition to the preferential motion?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I share in the plaudits to the gentleman from Texas who is very often perceptive, and the exception of today should not ruin his record.

I agree with him that the center aisle should be a walkway. I just do not want it to be a one-way street. This amendment today is kind of a one-way deal.

I do think that when we get to a full year in 1992, the HOPE Program should get some funding, and I will work on that, but to do it now in this way would be a very great mistake.

People ought to wonder that if this is such an empowerment of tenants why so few tenants are demanding to be empowered. This is not something that has had their overwhelming support.

In fact, those who want to sell public housing today ought to be very glad that there was nobody like them years ago that kept public housing from being built in the first place so they would have it to sell to anybody. What we are trying to do is keep a stream going. Yes, we want choices, but saying that we will not again build any or, and this is very important, acquire any, is a mistake.

We are now in a real estate slump in much of the country. The Committee on Appropriations bill tracking the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs bill this House passed would empower authorities not simply to have new construction but to buy

units. There are great buys out there now. It is not a case of waiting 5 years.

If we pass this amendment, we debar housing authorities all over the country, and local entities all over the country, from being able to go into one of the great bargain markets, buying some very good housing, cheap housing, housing that is vacant, housing that banks would like to get rid of, housing that realtors would like to see taken off the overhang. This is not the time to tell the housing authorities of this country not to acquire any housing.

When we get to 1992, yes, I would like to see some housing sold, and I would like to see some of that housing replaced so we do not have it all dwindle away.

The right way to deal with this very new program by funding it is not in a supplemental but to give it the serious consideration with all the safeguards that we can, and to pass the amendment now and to remove from housing authorities all over this country the right to acquire additional housing at a time when we can get bargains and the real estate market could use that infusion would be a mistake.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, would the Chair tell me how much of the 5 minutes remains?

The CHAIRMAN. There are 2 minutes remaining of the gentleman's 5 minutes, and 2 minutes remaining of his regular time.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Ms. HORN].

Ms. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I found out how short a time 30 seconds is.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1930's, this great country of ours made a commitment for safe and decent housing for all persons. Funding since then has very sporadic and inadequate in various ways.

In the last decade, funding has been terrifically slashed. We have authorized money which we have not approved. We have appropriated money that was not spent.

I just want to again, in these few seconds that remain to me, to remind everyone what we are doing. We are allowing those who are the lower middle income people, higher poor people, to own the housing at the expense of those who most need it who have the greatest needs, and the least ability to be able to own or take care of a home, if they own one, and the least ability to be able to fix it up, furnish it, go out and make any of those repairs.

The funding for all of these programs is inadequate.

I support those who would look to the next funding year to put more funds into all of these programs.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I will not speak to the substance of the privileged motion.

I will take this time, however, to come before the body and to wish my friend, the gentleman from Texas, well in his endeavors. We have served well together on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. We have not always agreed, but we have always had the concern of housing and the concern of people who live in that housing as paramount.

□ 1700

It has been a privilege serving here. I try to bring to this well the same kind of pride and passion that I learned from Sil Conte when it comes to waging a debate. It has been good over these last 5 years serving with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTLETT] on both sides of the debate, and I wish him well in his endeavor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have a great deal of admiration for the gentleman in the well and have enjoyed serving with him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER] is recognized for 2½ minutes for the purpose of closing debate.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, first let me get some facts straight. We are talking about rescinding rehabilitation money. The fact of the matter is that since the fiscal year 1987 appropriation bill of this subcommittee, public housing development funds that we have appropriated are indeed available for substantial rehabilitation as well as for new construction. Though this subcommittee did fund a substantial modernization appropriation, \$2.5 billion—and that sounds like a lot until we learn that there is about a \$20 billion backlog of rehabilitation to be done in public housing—when you know that \$2.5 billion does not sound like quite so much.

The rescissions in this amendment would also rescind the rental rehabilitation grants, the rehabilitation loan fund and urban homesteading, all of which are rehabilitation programs.

Mr. Chairman, as I close debate, I should like to return to the point that

I made before. The distinguished minority whip told Members that we should trust the local communities. He gave that as the reason for voting for the amendment. I give it as the reason for voting against the amendment, because all the local communities are telling Members that they want more time to get their acts together in order to run these programs right. That is why the National Association of Counties is opposing this amendment, the National League of Cities, the Conference of Mayors. The other players who have to make these programs function are also asking more time, including to home builders, the realtors, the mortgage bankers, the people who have to be sponsors like senior citizen organizations in the person of the National Council of Senior Citizens. They are opposing this amendment. They are not ready to go under the new program.

Mr. Chairman, the basic problem we face is that we have a situation where Jack Kemp, the quarterback, has dropped back in the pocket, he has the ball and he is ready to throw it down field. The only problem is that the people who have to be down field to catch it, the cities, the counties, the nonprofit groups, are not there to make the catch. They are still on the sidelines saying "Teach me the plays before you ask me to execute them. It just does not make a lot of sense to start these programs off on the wrong foot by trying to force feed them when the people who have the big responsibilities under these programs, the State governments, the local governments, the nonprofit organizations, are not ready to handle them. It just makes no sense to move these programs before the people who have to catch that ball are out there ready to catch it. When they are out there ready to catch it, and I know they will be soon, we shall be ready to see that the Secretary has the ball to throw them.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Kolbe amendment, which violates an agreement made last year between Congress and the administration during the consideration and passage of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.

Last year, as a member of the authorizing committee, I was party to the discussions which ended in an agreement by the administration and Congress to support both public housing construction and the Secretary's HOPE Program. This year, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am disappointed to see that the administration's first housing-related action is a violation of the carefully crafted agreement which has part of the accord facilitating the passage of last year's housing bill.

I would like to express my further disappointment in the administration's approach to housing in general. Last night, as the President publicly announced his domestic agenda, the major issues of health and housing were conspicuously absent from his list. Now, with

today's amendment, we see that he is more interested in maneuvering on his political agenda than he is on truly addressing the housing needs of the people of this Nation.

We all agree that every effort must and should be made to empower low- and moderate-income Americans. Everyone should have a chance to fulfill his or her own American dream, through education, through civil rights, through access to health care, through access to decent and affordable housing.

Like gimmicks contained in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget, however, the Kolbe amendment would make programmatic changes at the expense of already much needed programs. At a time when we are already facing a serious shortage in the stock of affordable housing, it makes no sense to take money away from a fund to construct new public housing. These housing units remain in the housing stock. What the administration proposes as an alternative to public housing, for those who opt not to purchase, is a soft, short-term subsidy, which they could effectively defund at any time.

The administration argues that new housing construction takes 4½ years to be developed, while their proposal would have more immediate effects. However, this argument ignores that cutting public housing construction also cuts money for the rehabilitation of existing units. The San Francisco Housing Authority informs me that rehabilitation funding provided through public housing construction, the major reconstruction of obsolete projects program, is one of the only mechanisms for the major rehabilitation of dilapidated housing.

Many of our public housing units are vacant. In fact, a HUD-commissioned study found that there is 18 to 22 billion dollars' worth of repair work necessary to bring public housing units nationwide up to standards. Why is the administration proposing to cut a program which facilitates not only construction, but also needed reconstruction and rehabilitation of already existing public housing? Isn't it more efficient and less expensive to encourage repair?

Mr. Chairman, Secretary Kemp and the administration had a congressional commitment for serious consideration of their funding request for home and hope for fiscal year 1992. There are indeed some aspects of their proposals which, when combined with our already proven housing programs, make sense. It does not make sense, however, to implement the rescissions proposed in the Kolbe amendment. This amendment violates the spirit of the agreement developed last year. It also signals that the administration is continuing politics as usual at the expense of really placing housing on the domestic agenda, where it belongs. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Kolbe amendment.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman I rise in strong support of the Moran-Kolbe amendment to H.R. 1281, a budget neutral amendment which will begin the long anticipated process of making home ownership for America's neediest families—a national priority.

I have long admired and supported Secretary Kemp's novel and businesslike initiatives, both while he was a distinguished Member of this body and as a dynamic visionary HUD Secretary.

It is high time we begin to put resources into programs that are successful, dollars where they work, and we begin to reward programs that are tried and proven—programs on the local level, programs that will help families in our cities and towns break the cycle of poverty. We have learned many lessons from the past.

Perhaps, the most valuable lesson is that public/private partnerships that focus on individual initiative, and restoring dignity and responsibility to the poor—work.

I believe in Project HOPE, I believe in the theme of empowerment, which this amendment embodies and supports.

As a local legislator, I have worked with nonprofit housing partnerships, in conjunction with the State and local governments and private sector forces.

We have built quality structures at below market rates, in blighted city neighborhoods, that have stood as anchors of stability and restored neighborhood pride—and most importantly given decent, American families a start at a new, dignified life.

The facts speak for themselves: Public housing is already experiencing a 27,000-unit backlog, new construction of public housing takes up to 5 years to complete and costs twice as much as other forms of housing assistance, and there are nearly 100,000 units of vacant public housing.

The days of warehousing our poor in large, impersonal projects is over.

I believe that it is time to put to work those most willing and capable of getting the job done right—our States, our cities, the nonprofit sector and resident management groups. It is time to act with immediacy—it is time to put Federal dollars to work at the local level.

We need new approaches, we need the courage to back new initiatives and I firmly believe that we need this amendment to begin to fight a real war on poverty. We can take valuable Federal resources and attack the root causes of the problems we see everyday on our streets and in our inner city neighborhoods.

This three-pronged concept of funding the HOME Housing Block Grant Program to expand housing assistance, coupled with Project HOPE to promote home ownership for low-income residents and the Shelter Plus Care Program will begin to end the institutionalization of human beings that deserve better.

This holistic approach puts real weight behind the themes of empowerment and opportunity and I believe gives up a tangible goals to reach for and achieve.

This funding is integral, and I want to thank both the honorable gentlemen; Congressmen MORAN and KOLBE for offering this important amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support home ownership and opportunity for people everywhere and vote in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the rule for this debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]

The question was taken; the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were—ayes 177, noes 240, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

AYES—177

Allard	Gunderson	Payne (VA)
Andrews (NJ)	Hall (TX)	Penny
Annunzio	Hancock	Petri
Archer	Hansen	Porter
Armey	Hastert	Pursell
Baker	Hayes (LA)	Ramstad
Ballenger	Hefley	Ravenel
Barnard	Henry	Regula
Barrett	Herger	Rhodes
Bartlett	Hobson	Ridge
Barton	Holloway	Riggs
Bateman	Hopkins	Rinaldo
Bentley	Horton	Ritter
Bereuter	Houghton	Roberts
Billrakis	Huckaby	Rogers
Bliley	Hunter	Rohrabacher
Boehmert	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Inhofe	Roth
Broomfield	James	Santorum
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Burton	Kasich	Schaefer
Callahan	Klug	Schiff
Camp	Kolbe	Schulze
Campbell (CA)	Kyl	Shaw
Chandler	Lagomarsino	Shays
Clement	Leach	Shuster
Clinger	Lent	Sisisky
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (FL)	Slattery
Combest	Lightfoot	Slaughter (VA)
Coughlin	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Cox (CA)	Livingston	Smith (OR)
Cunningham	Lowery (CA)	Smith (TX)
Dannemeyer	Machtley	Snowe
Davis	Marlenee	Solomon
DeLay	Martin	Spence
Dickinson	Martinez	Stallings
Doolittle	McCandless	Stearns
Dornan (CA)	McCollum	Stenholm
Dreier	McCreery	Stump
Duncan	McCurdy	Sundquist
Early	McDade	Swett
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Tauzin
Emerson	McGrath	Taylor (NC)
English	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Fawell	Meyers	Thomas (WY)
Fields	Miller (WA)	Upton
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Vander Jagt
Gallely	Moorhead	Vucanovich
Gallo	Moran	Walker
Gekas	Morrison	Walsh
Gilchrest	Murphy	Weber
Gillmor	Myers	Weldon
Gilman	Nichols	Wolf
Gingrich	Nussle	Wyllie
Goodling	Oxley	Young (AK)
Goss	Packard	Young (FL)
Gradison	Pallone	Zeliff
Grandy	Paxon	Zimmer

NOES—240

Abercrombie	Brooks	Cramer
Ackerman	Browder	Darden
Alexander	Brown	de la Garza
Anderson	Bruce	DeFazio
Andrews (ME)	Bryant	DeLauro
Andrews (TX)	Bustamante	Dellums
Anthony	Byron	Derrick
Applegate	Campbell (CO)	Dicks
Aspin	Cardin	Dingell
Atkins	Carper	Dixon
AuCoin	Carr	Dooley
Bacchus	Chapman	Dorgan (ND)
Bellenson	Clay	Downey
Bennett	Coleman (TX)	Durbin
Berman	Collins (IL)	Dwyer
Bevill	Collins (MI)	Dymally
Bilbray	Condit	Eckart
Bonior	Conyers	Edwards (CA)
Borski	Cooper	Edwards (TX)
Boucher	Costello	Engel
Boxer	Cox (IL)	Erdreich
Brewster	Coyne	Espy

Evans	Lehman (CA)	Richardson
Fascell	Lehman (FL)	Roe
Fazio	Levin (MI)	Roemer
Feighan	Lewis (GA)	Rose
Fish	Long	Rostenkowski
Flake	Lowe (NY)	Roukema
Foglietta	Luken	Rowland
Ford (MI)	Manton	Russo
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sabo
Frost	Matsui	Sanders
Gaydos	Mavroules	Sarpalius
Gedjenson	Mazzoli	Savage
Gephardt	McCloskey	Sawyer
Geren	McDermott	Scheuer
Gibbons	McHugh	Schroeder
Glickman	McMillen (MD)	Schumer
Gonzalez	McNulty	Serrano
Gordon	Mfume	Sharp
Gray	Miller (CA)	Sikorski
Green	Mineta	Skaggs
Guarini	Mink	Skelton
Hall (OH)	Moakley	Slaughter (NY)
Hamilton	Mollohan	Smith (FL)
Hammerschmidt	Montgomery	Smith (IA)
Harris	Moody	Solarz
Hatcher	Morella	Spratt
Hayes (IL)	Mrazek	Staggers
Hefner	Murtha	Stark
Hertel	Nagle	Stokes
Hoagland	Natcher	Studds
Hochbrueckner	Neal (MA)	Swift
Horn	Neal (NC)	Synar
Hoyer	Nowak	Tallon
Hubbard	Oakar	Tanner
Hughes	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Hutto	Obey	Thomas (GA)
Jacobs	Olin	Thornton
Jefferson	Orton	Torres
Jenkins	Owens (NY)	Torricelli
Johnson (SD)	Owens (UT)	Towns
Johnston	Panetta	Traffant
Jones (GA)	Parker	Traxler
Jones (NC)	Patterson	Unsoeld
Jontz	Payne (NJ)	Valentine
Kanjorski	Pease	Vento
Kaptur	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kennedy	Perkins	Volkmer
Kennelly	Peterson (FL)	Washington
Kildee	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Kleczka	Pickett	Waxman
Kolter	Pickle	Wheat
Kopetski	Poshard	Whitten
Kostmayer	Price	Williams
LaFalce	Quillen	Wise
Lancaster	Rahall	Wolpe
Lantos	Rangel	Wyden
LaRocco	Ray	Yates
Laughlin	Reed	Yatron

NOT VOTING—16

Crane	Madigan	Sensenbrenner
Donnelly	Michel	Udall
Ford (TN)	Miller (OH)	Weiss
Ireland	Ortiz	Wilson
Levine (CA)	Roybal	
Lloyd	Sangmeister	

□ 1723

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ireland for, with Mr. Weiss against.

Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. GUARINI changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CALLAHAN, HAYES of Louisiana, MORRISON, ENGLISH, and RINALDO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note with approval the inclusion of \$200 million in this bill to assist States in handling the increased workload in processing unemployment insurance benefit claims.

Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that workers who have lost their jobs, through no fault of their own, are provided with a helping hand while they strive to reenter the work force.

I am particularly concerned that this assistance be made available, without delay, to displaced workers struggling to provide for their families.

I am hopeful that the current system for projecting unemployment and appropriating the necessary administrative funds can be improved so that we might avoid an annual shortfall of this magnitude and the need to revisit this recurring problem.

In the meantime, I wish to compliment the efforts of Washington State Employment Security Commissioner Vernon Stoner—and those of his agency—in responding to the needs of Washington's displaced workers despite a \$4 million shortfall in administrative funds.

The challenge confronting us in my home State of Washington is made even more difficult by the mounting loss of timber-related jobs—jobs lost to a reduced timber supply on the one hand and a sluggish home construction industry on the other.

As we in Congress work on a solution to regional unemployment problems, such as ours in the Pacific Northwest, and look forward to a strengthening economy nationally, I am thankful for the unemployment insurance program and the assistance it offers those most severely affected: displaced workers and their families.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my support for the \$25 million to combat infant mortality.

Mr. Chairman, as cochairman of the Congressional Sun Belt Caucus Infant Mortality Task Force and a new member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, I strongly support the infant mortality initiative contained within the legislation before us today.

The appropriations bill allocates \$25 million in new money and it is anticipated that Federal funding for community and migrant health centers will remain untouched in 1991 and that funds from those programs will not be jeopardized.

The proposal also recognizes that infant mortality is just as serious in rural areas as it is in urban areas. Last year, members of the Infant Mortality Task Force met with Health and Human Services Secretary Louis Sullivan to discuss the problems in the southern region where infant mortality statistics are higher than any other region of the country. I have been pleased with the deep interest the administration and the House have taken in lowering our Nation's infant mortality rates, however, targeting 10 areas with high occurrence of infant mortality is only the tip of the iceberg.

Proposals as the one before us today are a good start but we must learn from these initiatives and use the knowledge gained to reach out to all areas that are suffering from high infant mortality.

Although there are areas in this supplemental that I disagree with, I support this funding for innocent young infants with problems not of their own making.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to register my support for the \$46 million supplemental funds for the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that this legislation includes \$46 million in supplemental funds for veterans medical care. The Department of Veterans Affairs has indicated that these additional funds would be used for dental care for new veterans, readjustment counseling, the establishment of eight post-traumatic stress disorder treatment units, and to cover replacement costs for VA staff employees who may have been reservists or National Guard members who were deployed to the Persian Gulf as part of Operation Desert Storm.

The coverage of replacement costs for VA medical and support staff who have been deployed to the Middle East is an especially important priority given the fact that many VA medical facilities, including the new VA hospital in the Twin Cities, are understaffed. This problem has led VA hospitals and clinics to turn away some prospective patients whose medical problems or disabilities are not service connected. There simply are not enough doctors, nurses, radiologists, physical therapists, dieticians, and other health care professionals to properly meet the demands placed upon them within the VA medical system. This problem is going to demand more of our attention in the future as our aging population of World War II and Korean war veterans require more medical care in future years.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to title II of the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 302. Section 332 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 is amended to delete the period at the end of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: *Provided further*, That for the purposes of this section, funds appropriated in this Act may be used to initiate a multiyear contract for the Medium Range Recovery Helicopter (HH-60J) program.

SEC. 303. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be expended by the Secretary of Labor to implement or administer the regulations published at 54 Federal Register 4234-44 (January 27, 1989) to be codified at 1.7(d), 5.2(n)(4), 5.5(a)(1)(ii)(A) and 5.5(a)(4)(iv) of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations or to implement or administer any other regulation that would have the same or similar effect. No funds shall be expended by the Secretary of Labor to implement or administer revisions to part 29 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations published at 55 Federal Register 34868-34876 (August 24, 1990) to the extent such revisions affect apprenticeship programs in the construction industry.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STENHOLM: page 33, strike out lines 6 through 19.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the first point I would like to make is I apologize to my colleagues for being here today; we should not be here. We should not be here taking the House's time at this particular moment.

You know, it is rather ironic because over the last 8 years I have been in this well time and time and time again asking and trying to reform the Davis-Bacon Act. We tried to do it on appropriations bills, and we have been held out of order because you should not legislate on appropriations bills. We have constantly held to that rule, at least the House has held me to that rule. But now we find that in an appropriations bill the Committee on Appropriations is legislating in an appropriations bill. They should not be doing that.

A little history of why we are here: In September 1982 there was an effort made to change the rules and regulations as they pertain to helpers in Federal contracts. There was an injunction filed in 1982 against this action, and it was held up in the courts until just recently when a judge finally made the proper decision in saying this should not be stopped, that the Department of Labor should be allowed to do as the Davis-Bacon Act, which was passed in 1931 and has not been amended by that body since 1935, that the Department of Labor should be able to promulgate regulations to administer the act as it was originally intended in 1931.

Now, lo and behold, we look at the appropriation bill and we find language that has been inserted that says, "No, the Department of Labor may not do that which the Davis-Bacon Act allows them to do."

□ 1730

Now the House is going to get a chance to vote on this. I do not want to take a lot of time because we ought not to be discussing this on an appropriation bill. I agree with the chairman and others who have constantly begged us not to do it, but, when members of the appropriation bill do it, then we got to take a little time.

Now we are talking money today, folks. We are talking real dollars. If this amendment is allowed to stand, or if I lose on this amendment, it will cost us \$600 million a year every year for the next umpteen years, as it has been costing us in the past. That is the bottom line.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment. Do as we have constantly said, and maybe we will get a little honesty from all of us. Let us not legislate on appropriation bills. Let us allow the Department of Labor to do the job they are supposed to do. Let us allow the consultation that has been going on between labor and the Department of Labor that is this close to an agreement. Let us allow that to happen.

Please join me in striking this. Support my amendment today that strikes this. It will save \$600 million a year for the next however many years until we bring this up. And to the appropriate committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, I say, "Please bring a bill out on the floor of the House soon so we may deal with this legislation in the proper way."

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], my colleague, for yielding.

I was looking at the merits of this. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations, so I am not here speaking on the procedure by which the gentleman makes the complaint about it being there, however the provision which he wants to strike, I think I am not sure if he realizes it does violence to some fledgling programs we have down in Texas by which individuals who otherwise would not be able to get apprenticeship training have been able to do it, and get training and move up to help with jobs that help our Federal responsive projects, and, if I understand his amendment correctly, if this motion to strike is adopted, then the DOE regulation, the Department of Labor regulation, go into effect, and that would prevent that from happening.

Is that right?

Mr. STENHOLM. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] is not correct, and this is one of the basic points of disagreement between some other information that is floating around. I am talking about letting the Department of Labor process continue on. I am talking about letting them promulgate the regulations. Nothing has been done as yet. What we are saying is, "Let the process of the law, as it was intended in 1931, proceed. Let the regulations be written. If it turns out that it is as negative as my colleagues suggest that it is, I suggest then that the committee bring legislation back to the floor and correct it legally and legislatively on this floor."

Mr. Chairman, it is not the intent of this author to do harm to any State rules and regulations. I have never intended that, and that is not the intent of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has expired.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I have this straight now.

As I understand, unless this amendment stays in, the Department of Labor regulation that has already been promulgated and already been printed in the Code of Federal Regulations will go into effect, and the only way to prevent that is by this provision of section 304.

Am I incorrect?

Mr. STENHOLM. If in fact it has absolutely totally been determined that these regulations, which it is my understanding they have not been finally decided, it is my understanding that it is still in the negotiating stages, and we are not nearly as far apart as it is being suggested today. If my amendment should lose, I can guarantee my colleagues, based on this language, that nothing will happen regarding Davis-Bacon, and we will spend \$600 million more this year in this area than we would have if my amendment passes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] for yielding.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief, but I would just like to say that, as the ranking member of the Labor Standards Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, that I oppose the Committee on Appropriations essentially legislating within the Committee on Education and Labor's jurisdiction. This dire emergency supplemental appropriation bill is not the appropriate vehicle for reversing regulatory policy, and, furthermore, the Labor Standards Subcommittee has not held any hearings on this issue, and to my knowledge this provision was adopted without consulting the chairman of the Labor Standards Subcommittee. I think this is an important policy issue here in this House of Representatives, especially for those of us who do serve on authorizing committees, and, if we do feel that we want an opportunity to do our job, we should be allowed the opportunity to do that rather than see the Committee on Appropriations usurp jurisdiction allegedly because there is some last-minute emergency.

Mr. Chairman, there is in fact not an emergency in this case. Labor unions, members of the Labor Department, have been working and have reached agreement on many of the issues that are supposed to be dealt with by this amendment, and, if they do not reach agreement and there is a problem, why we will have plenty of time to deal with it and in an appropriate fashion in the committee of jurisdiction.

So, I ask my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] so that we can practice good government here in the House and preserve the jurisdiction of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Education and Labor, and

other authorizing committees in this body.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM]. I rise as the ranking member on the House Committee on Armed Services that has fought for years to try to let defense dollars go for defense purposes, which this would tend to do.

While we tend to, in the past have tended to, decrease defense spending, what I am trying to do is say that those dollars that are intended for defense purposes should go for defense purposes.

This amendment would save \$600 million a year out of the defense budget. It will in fact be in favor of increased Federal contracting opportunities for small and minority business and in favor of allowing the Department of Labor to do, by regulation, what the courts have said for 5 years that it has the power to do in administering its own rules.

In rising in support of all these things, Mr. Chairman, I am asking my colleagues to strike out a portion of this supplemental appropriation that ought not to have been inserted in the first place. It has no business here.

Now some of our colleagues have expressed doubts that this domestic supplemental appropriation really is an emergency bill, and there are portions of it that should not be considered as emergency. But without a doubt the provisions in the Department of Labor's implementation of its final Davis-Bacon helper regulation does not belong on this floor today.

This provision is no emergency—except to the handful of large contractors and their work forces who specialize in following Davis-Bacon contracts around the country.

This provision is no emergency—except to the privileged few who benefit from \$600 million in excess, wasteful, construction spending every year.

This ban on Davis-Bacon helpers is no emergency, has no place in an appropriation, and is no good for the Federal budget.

If it had not been granted a waiver, it would be subject to a point of order because it does not belong here and is not good for the Federal budget. After 9 years of court cases and rewriting, the Department of Labor finally has issued a helper regulation that would wind up saving the \$600 million I am talking about when fully implemented. On top of spending the money in this bill, are we going to tell the Labor Department not to save money?

This is the wrong provision and the wrong bill, and certainly this is the wrong time, and I would urge a yes vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] to

strike this provision that has absolutely no validity in this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are very supportive of the amendment on this side of the aisle. The Stenholm amendment will delete from the bill the amendment introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] and which did not go through our Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and it has bypassed the authorizing committee.

□ 1740

Mr. Chairman, if the Murtha language is not removed, the taxpayers will lose approximately \$600 million. We think that the process is inappropriate and we recommend that the Members support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. Chairman, our new Secretary of Labor, former Congresswoman Lynn Martin, has written a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee opposing the Murtha amendment, and I submit that for inclusion in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, DC, March 6, 1991.

Hon. JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that the Rules Committee will be meeting this afternoon to consider the nature of the rule governing House debate on H.R. 1281, the "Dire Emergency Supplemental." This letter is to express the Administration's strong objection to a Murtha amendment which was accepted yesterday by the House Appropriations Committee in its consideration of H.R. 1281. The Murtha amendment would prohibit the Department of Labor from expending funds to administer regulations governing the use of semi-skilled helpers on federally financed and assisted construction contracts subject to the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA). (These regulations went into effect on February 4, 1991.) It would also enjoin the Department from promulgating final regulations pertaining to revisions to the apprenticeship programs in the construction industry.

I oppose this amendment and its purposes. I also oppose legislating substantive labor policy in an appropriations bill. An appropriations bill is not the appropriate vehicle for introducing significant reversals in established governmental policies. For these reasons, I am asking that the Committee agree to a rule that provides for an "up or down" consideration of the Murtha language on the House floor.

The issues underlying the DBRA regulations have been examined extensively over the past decade, and the Department's authority to implement them has been sustained through the courts. The objections to these regulations were considered in the courts and were rejected. The helper regulations reflect a longstanding position of the Executive Branch over the last decade.

These regulations set no government-imposed constraints or conditions on construction contractors or construction workers.

The employment of helpers is permitted *only* when their use is the prevailing practice in an area. The regulations do place limits on the ratio of helpers to journeymen to prevent abuses—their use is limited to two for every three journeymen.

Permitting the use of helpers, according to local industry practices, will:

Provide increased job opportunities for semi-skilled workers and encourage their use in a manner which provides training;

Update outmoded practices under Davis-Bacon to more accurately reflect widespread industry practices thereby enhancing private sector competition on Federal construction projects;

Save the Federal government a substantial amount in construction *labor costs* (estimates to be at least \$500 million in FY 1992).

The proposed revisions to the regulations governing the Department's registration of traditional apprenticeship programs were published after two years of research, review, and discussion in an open and public debate on the issues. The purpose was to streamline and update these regulations as part of an overall Departmental program to expand apprenticeship to additional occupations and industries and to maintain and improve the quality of all apprenticeship programs. These regulations would require State Apprenticeship Councils to promptly advise a sponsor of a proposed apprenticeship program of a decision on the sponsor's requests and furnish an explanation of the decision in the event of a denial. In addition, there would be the right of appeal to the Department of Labor if the request was denied.

The changes proposed in the revised regulations are intended to reduce subjectivity and the opportunity for bias in determining conditions for program registration and in the monitoring of programs. Background information on the helper regulations is enclosed.

When put in place, these revised regulations will:

Ensure that all registered programs meet consistent, *high quality standards*;

Ensure that all potential programs sponsors are treated fairly by setting up a Departmental appeal process;

Establish a uniform Federal standard for registering apprenticeship programs, with allowances for State flexibility for specific State purposes.

In addition, I would point out that these regulations are still in proposed form. We will keep the Congress informed as the rule-making proceeds.

For the foregoing reasons, the Administration asks that the Rules Committee would grant a rule which allows for the "up or down" consideration of the Murtha amendment.

The office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the transmittal of this letter from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely,

LYNN MARTIN,
Secretary of Labor.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. Chairman, the Stenholm amendment would delete from the pending supplemental appropriations bill the Murtha amendment, which prohibits the Secretary of Labor from implementing two sets of regulations threat-

ening to undermine important standards for the protection of workers in the building and construction trades throughout the Nation.

These prohibited regulations are, first, the newly effective Davis-Bacon regulations regarding helpers and, second, the proposed regulations making changes in the operation in the National Apprenticeship Program affecting the construction industry. Neither of these regulations, which the Murtha amendment as adopted by the Appropriations Committee would hold in abeyance, has been properly considered and approved in the legislative process.

As chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, I am strongly opposed to the administration's unilateral promulgation of such major regulations in the absence of legislation authorizing substantive changes in these programs.

The Davis-Bacon regulation, which took effect on February 4 of this year, would allow contractors carrying out federally assisted public works and construction projects subject to the Davis-Bacon Act to assign work previously performed by journeymen or laborers to a lower-wage classification of "helpers".

Collective bargaining agreements usually include within the classification of laborers those workers who perform helping or tending duties. Like other laborers, they receive prevailing wage rates and fringe benefits. The Labor Department's new regulations will allow prevailing wage determinations to be made separately for a newly recognized classification of helpers, who would not be covered by the prevailing wage rate and fringe benefit protections available to laborers.

The expanded helper regulation will have the effect of eliminating the longstanding requirement that has permitted Davis-Bacon contractors to pay reduced wages to unskilled workers only if they are registered as apprentices in a Federal apprenticeship and training program or an approved State apprenticeship program. Under the new regulations, helpers would not be assured of the training that they need to enhance safety and productivity on the work site.

The new Davis-Bacon regulations recognize a category of helpers who are not journeymen mechanics or laborers, and who are not apprentices or trainees, the classifications for which Davis-Bacon determinations have been made for half a century.

Under these regulations, contractors who employ workers in the helper category at lower wages and benefits, but do not register them as apprentices, will reduce their costs to the detriment of these workers and thereby have an unfair advantage in bidding for federally assisted public works and construction projects.

This kind of fundamental change in the program's framework should be addressed only in the context of Davis-Bacon authorization legislation.

The Education and Labor Committee reported out legislation in the 100th Congress which addressed a variety of Davis-Bacon issues, including the definition of helpers. That legislation was adopted on the House floor as a part of the Defense authorization bill. No Davis-Bacon amendments were finally agreed upon in the joint House-Senate conference.

Congress should insist that the administration recognize that authorizing legislation is the only appropriate vehicle for dealing with fundamental changes in the operation of the Davis-Bacon Act. I support the Murtha amendment because it protects the legislative prerogative in this important area.

The proposed regulations regarding programs under the National Apprenticeship Act are still under review in the administration, after an extensive public comment period. Nearly 60,000 comments opposing the regulations were received by the Department.

Although the Labor Department has not settled upon the final contents or an effective date for these regulations, there are disturbing provisions in the proposed regulations, which have been brought to the attention of many Members of Congress.

The major controversy concerns the Labor Department's proposal to provide interstate portability of apprenticeship program registration. The approval of an apprenticeship program in a State would automatically permit a sponsor to operate in another State for up to 6 months without obtaining approval from the second State where it would like to operate.

Employers with programs meeting lower standards in one State would be encouraged to operate in States where they would not meet higher apprenticeship standards. The need for this portability proposal is not clear, in view of the experience that many multi-State contractors are now meeting standards in each State in which they operate.

The construction industry apprenticeship program in this country has generally been highly effective, a model for the world. The Murtha amendment would simply prohibit the implementation of the proposed apprenticeship regulations as they affect the construction industry.

It is my position that those who advocate changes in the National Apprenticeship Program should demonstrate the need and justification for major operational changes in the proper legislative forum. The administration has not submitted a legislative proposal to the Education and Labor Committee. I believe that regulations arousing the controversy that these apprenticeship

regulations have stimulated should be withdrawn.

I support the Murtha amendment in this bill because it would assure that these Davis-Bacon and apprenticeship regulations will not be permitted to take or remain in effect, in the absence of the proper approval in the course of legislative consideration.

For these reasons, I ask that the Stenholm amendment be defeated and that the Murtha amendment be retained in this supplemental appropriations bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know that we all want to vote and we want to end the day and end the week and go home, but I think we have to understand exactly what is going on here this afternoon.

We have two sets of regulations. One set of regulations deals with Davis-Bacon, and the other set of regulations deals with apprenticeship. The Davis-Bacon regulations have been litigated in courts, and the courts have ruled that every one of those regulations is valid. I cannot help it if you do not like the ruling of the courts, but that is what has happened.

On the apprenticeship regulations, they have been in negotiation, and the fact is that last week organized labor in this country resolved almost every bit of the differences in the proposed regulations with the Department of Labor. We are all well aware that this week the Department of Labor has been up here meeting with congressional staff to further discuss those proposed regulations.

These are only proposed. This is the first phase, the public hearing phase, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor said, and this is the time for comment. But are we all going to decide here today that we are not going to allow the normal rulemaking process to go forward if there is by chance the possibility that there is something in those regulations that maybe we do not like? Is that the way we are going to legislate? Are we going to legislate that way in an appropriations bill?

This is the wrong provision. This amendment is in the wrong bill. It does not belong in an appropriations bill. If there are problems with Davis-Bacon and problems with the apprenticeship rules, then we should bring legislation up here to deal with them. But it is the wrong time. It is the wrong time because the regulations process is not complete. It is the wrong time because the Department of Labor has been bargaining in good faith with organized labor to resolve this, and now we are going to come in here and cut them off at the knees.

The fact is that we have regulations in here that are 17 years old. They have not been changed for 17 years. The

process of updating and modernizing those regulations makes all the sense in the world, and are we going to take a dire supplemental appropriations bill and use that as a tool because we know that train must go? Are we going to do something like this? That is not good public policy, and worse than that, it is not a good legislative process.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to respond to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor of a moment ago and again remind my colleagues that we are here today because these regulations that were proposed in 1982 were stopped by an injunction. The individuals who differ with whether the regulations ought to be written or not written today have had a judge look at them, and let me read what the judge has said regarding the Davis-Bacon item:

Vacating the injunction, Judge Harold H. Green stressed that the Davis-Bacon Act gives the Secretary of Labor authority to determine prevailing wages in the broadest terms imaginable. Accordingly, the court said a review of the Secretary's decisions should be only to ensure that regulations are consistent with the purpose of the statute and are not arbitrary.

The arguments the chairman was making have already been looked at by a judge, and it was said that the original intent of the act that has not been amended since 1935 is in fact still being carried out, but there are still protections in fact these regulations are arbitrary. And that is not anything my amendment is getting into.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has expired.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin be granted 3 additional minutes, and I will ask him to yield to me.

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object, but I would just like to try to see at this point if we can get a sense of how many more speakers there are on this issue and see whether or not we can agree on a limitation.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my sense is that we are at the end.

Mr. MCDADE. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the reason I am doing this is that my sense is that we are at the end of it.

Mr. MCDADE. Are there more speakers?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. If the gentleman pops up with one, one will pop up over here, but after that I think we are through.

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

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a request by unanimous consent. I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already one unanimous-consent request pending, that request being for the gentleman from Wisconsin to be granted 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, may I suggest, if we are close to a vote, that we get unanimous consent that all debate close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] withdraw his first unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. No, Mr. Chairman, I asked to get 3 additional minutes for the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will put the question again.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] be granted 3 additional minutes?

There was no objection.

□ 1750

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. The actual history the gentleman partially reported to Members is in 1981 the Reagan administration proposed the same regulation we are talking about here. The U.S. court held that that was an illegal attempt to, by regulation, amend the Davis-Bacon Act.

In 1982, the district court held that the helper rule violated the Davis-Bacon Act, and sent it back in 1983 to the Labor Department and said, go back to the drawing board and recognize the existence of the definitions in the act as we have interpreted them in the past, and rewrite it.

In 1987 the Labor Department issued a second proposed helper regulation. In 1989 the helper regulation was published as final and submitted to the U.S. district court for approval. In 1990, the U.S. district court lifted its injunction, that had been there ever since 1981, clearing the way for the Labor Department to implement the helper rule. However, that case is on appeal.

Now, I do not know if you want to have these things go to the courts, and then let the executive branch go forward. It does not show good faith to me on the part of the people over at the Labor Department. I have not had a chance to talk to the Secretary about

this. I do not think she will approve of it.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, two things: First of all, if you are concerned about regulations going to the courts, if you are concerned about the outcome of the courts, then let us take a good look next week at the civil rights bill, where we are opening up civil rights laws to the courts for the first time in the history of the country.

Second, and this is the argument that every Member on this floor, Republican or Democrat, ought to understand. Lynn Martin has been the Secretary of Labor for 1 week. One week. Now, do you think it is fair and proper conduct for this House of Representatives to come here and to undercut her ability to review these regulations and to propose final regulations, with only 1 week on the job? We are all fairer than that. We all apply to a higher standard of conduct than that.

Support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure we are closing debate. If not, I want to renew my unanimous consent that all debate end now.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I object. The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Stenholm amendment, which would eliminate the provision of the bill added in the Appropriations Committee by Mr. MURTHA, which prohibits the Department of Labor from expending any funds to implement proposed new regulations which would permit the expanded use of helpers on federally funded or federally assisted construction projects.

On August 24, 1990, the Labor Department published proposed new regulations which would lower the standards of all apprenticeship programs, including those in the construction industry. The Labor Department justifies these proposed new rules on the basis that they are intended to promote the development of apprenticeship programs in nontraditional industries and to serve the needs of apprentices. A closer reading of the proposed new rules, however, reveals that, in fact, they would serve wholly the convenience and benefit of contractors and not the apprentices enrolled in the program.

For example, the portability provision in the Department's proposed rules would allow a contractor from one State who meets the new proposed Federal standards to automatic certification in any other State for up to 6 months. While this change would obviously give contractors greater flexibility in moving apprentices across State lines, it does not necessarily serve the interests of the apprentices in training since there is no requirement that a contractor hire any local apprentices in another State which he enters and since there is no requirement that he retain those apprentices from his own State who he brings into work in another State.

Furthermore, the portability changes proposed in the new rules run roughshod over

State apprenticeship programs in Minnesota and many other States thus circumventing State efforts across the Nation. The proposed new rules will effectively preempt the ability of State apprenticeship agencies to establish program standards that are higher or are in any way different than a set of minimum Federal standards.

In Minnesota, we know from firsthand experience what can happen when an out-of-State contractor comes in from another State with very different labor standards and practices and runs roughshod over local workers and apprentices.

The proposed new rules also eliminate journeymen-to-apprentice ratios. This change will undoubtedly reduce the quality of the job-training component of all apprenticeship programs and will also adversely affect job safety.

The proposed elimination of the minimum 144 hours of annual instruction in the proposed rule will reduce construction program quality in the building trades and will also lower the level of training provided to apprentices in nonconstruction apprenticeship programs. Simply increasing the minimum term of an apprenticeship to 2 years, except for competency based programs where the term may be an even shorter duration of only 18 months doesn't suffice for the lost training requirements. How do such changes work to the benefit of apprentices who are promised a quality training experience? The answer is that they do not.

On October 19, 1990, I wrote to then-Secretary of Labor Elizabeth Dole, and was joined by 105 other Members of the House, expressing our opposition to these proposed changes and requesting that the proposed regulations be withdrawn. Indeed, it is my understanding that the Department of Labor has received thousands of comments criticizing these proposed new rules since they were first published in the Federal Register in August 1990.

On March 1, I hosted a congressional briefing at which Mr. Jim Van Erden, Administrator of the Office of Work-Based Learning, and Mr. Tony Swope, Director of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, responded to some of our concerns regarding these proposed regulations. At that time, these Labor Department officials indicated that they were aware of many of the concerns which have been expressed and that they were working with interested parties to revise the proposed rules. That being the case, there should be little objection to the provision included in committee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] which simply prohibits the Department from expending any funds to implement these regulations, which the Department concedes are flawed.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in rejecting the Stenholm amendment to delete the Murtha provision from the bill.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following letter from the AFL-CIO:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, March 7, 1991.

Hon. JOHN P. MURTHA,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MURTHA: The AFL-CIO supports your amendment to H.R. 2181, the Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for FY 1991 which forbids the Labor Department from expending funds to implement helper and apprenticeship regulations which adversely affect workers. For almost ten years, both the Congress and the courts have stood fast against these proposed regulations.

As you know, the Labor Department in 1981 proposed a new category of "helpers" designed to create a class of workers who, unlike laborers, would work with no formal training and no hope of advancement within the construction industry. The Davis-Bacon Act requires prevailing wages for "laborers and mechanics" on federal and federally-funded construction projects; "mechanics" are journeymen.

Under the regulations, "helpers" will receive no formal training and will become a permanent underclass of workers at very low wages. The result would be to severely reduce the level of employment for laborers, who are in large part minority workers. If the regulations were implemented, fully 40% of the Davis-Bacon work force would be eliminated just as the numbers of minorities and women are increasing in the industry, their wages would be slashed or their jobs eliminated.

In 1983, the U.S. Court of Appeals struck down the 1981 helper regulation, ruling in part that it undermined the Davis-Bacon purpose that Federal projects mirror local practices, and the court enjoined enforcement of the regulation.

The changes being brought about by the regulations are those that the Congress has repeatedly rejected. Moreover, Congress has both repeatedly extended the Davis-Bacon Act and refused to repeal or "water down" the statute.

The Labor Department has also proposed a regulation to disrupt the long-standing operation of apprenticeship programs. The regulation would abolish state apprenticeship councils of employer and employee groups which exist in 26 states and the District of Columbia.

Furthermore, the regulation would abolish ratio requirements of apprentices to journeymen, leaving an unenforceable apprenticeship system. The Labor Department cannot enforce every employer's apprenticeship program without an established ratio.

The regulation would also allow out-of-state contractors to disrupt local apprenticeship training programs by bringing in an unlimited number of out-of-state apprentices.

The AFL-CIO strongly supports your Amendment and we urge you and your colleagues to vote down any motion to strike it from the Supplemental Appropriation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. MCGLOTTEN,

Director, Department of Legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM]. He and I, and many others in this House, have long pushed for real reform of the outdated, obsolete Davis-Bacon Act. It is not fair to those of us who have invested much time and study in Davis-Bacon to be surprised by the revelation that a significant, nongermane legislative provision

was slipped in this appropriation bill in committee.

Despite previous consideration of Davis-Bacon in this House, this provision has never been openly debated. And every other significant Davis-Bacon provision to come to the floor in the last decade—whether already in a committee bill or in a floor amendment—and whether proposed by Davis-Bacon reformers or apologists—has come with an opportunity for full debate and an opportunity for the other side to offer an alternative.

This is a Davis-Bacon stealth attack Mr. Chairman. It has been carried out this way because some supporters of the old Davis-Bacon regime do not trust the outcome of this debate to the democratic process.

In 1988, we came within six votes of passing a Stenholm-Dickinson amendment significantly stronger than the Department of Labor regulation this bill blocks. In 1989 we lost by only 22 votes an attempt to defeat an expansion bill.

This is a close issue in the House, and I am disappointed that a few persons would rather attach a rider to a supplemental appropriation than revisit the issue in an open, deliberative manner.

I want to revisit the issue again, but I want to do it when we also have a chance to vote on repeal or reform of the archaic Davis-Bacon Act of 1931. I do not think it is fair, with virtually no notice, to be forced to fight a defensive action against a sneak attack to protect a regulation the Secretary of Labor has had every right to issue.

For these reasons, I ask that we adopt the Stenholm amendment today and set the stage for a real Davis-Bacon debate later in this Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM.

The House has openly debated the issue of Davis-Bacon reform in the last few years, usually as a part of the Department of Defense authorization bill. The debate has been thoughtful and the votes have been close. I believe it is proper to consider Davis-Bacon reform in the context of an authorization bill.

Unfortunately, this issue is now being debated because the Appropriations Committee attached a rider to the supplemental appropriations bill which would prevent the Department of Labor from implementing their modest regulations regarding construction helpers. The courts have held that the Department of Labor has the power to issue regulations which allow the use of semiskilled helpers on Federal construction projects. These regulations are consistent with the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. Chairman, these regulations do not need to be addressed through this rider on a supplemental appropriations bill. I encourage my colleagues to support the Stenholm amendment and delete the language in the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Stenholm Davis-Bacon amendment.

This proposal simply strikes a paragraph in the emergency supplemental that should not be there—a nongermane legislative provision in an appropriation bill that prevents the Department of Labor from proceeding with the new Davis-Bacon helper rule.

The House has debated Davis-Bacon issues several times over the last few years, resulting in several very close votes. Now, an attack has been launched, with a paragraph secretly attached to this appropriation bill that is actually substantial legislation.

The Department of Labor began the process of writing a Davis-Bacon helper rule in 1981. While none in Congress attempted to block it, labor took it to court in 1982. Our legal system cleared the way for a revised regulation in 1985. The Department has further refined the helper rule.

The helper rule has been tested in Federal court every step of the way, including a final determination about a month ago. There is no conceivable reason to hold it up.

There is another reason to support the Stenholm amendment. Simply put, this amendment saves the Federal Government \$600 million in wasteful spending. With the Federal deficit topping \$300 billion, it's about time we start cutting spending rather than looking for ways to spend more.

The helper ban in this bill amounts to a major and expensive rewrite of the Davis-Bacon Act. Tucking it away almost out of sight, hoping no one will notice, is not a responsible way—nor a fair way—to legislate.

I'm perfectly willing to debate all the issues surrounding the Davis-Bacon Act; unfortunately, this is not the time or the place. Join me in supporting the Stenholm amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the construction industry currently has a recognized category of workers who perform helper or tending duties. These are construction laborers. The so-called helper that the gentleman from Texas claims should now be utilized on Federal construction is nothing more and nothing less than a construction laborer—except that the new helper is untrained and receives no fringe benefits such as health care or pension contributions. The economics of replacing trained laborers who currently receive health benefits and a decent wage are quite questionable.

But let me also point out that construction laborers are the largely minority and female component of the construction work force. So if the new helper class is now used, what is the impact on the minority and female portion of the construction work force? It is simple. Their wages are cut and they lose health care coverage.

In 1989, the recognized and formal training programs of construction laborers were composed of 40 percent minority and female workers. The rate at which laborers are currently being trained demonstrates the manner in which the helper regulation will have a particular and immediate adverse impact on the employment of minority and female laborers. Under the auspices of the Laborers-Associated General Contractors education and training fund, a jointly sponsored labor management training fund, there were 31,913 con-

struction laborers who received formal training in 1989 from 73 local training funds throughout the United States. Forty percent of these laborer trainees were minorities and women.

It is these very workers who face a reduction in wages and fringe benefits if the helper rule goes into effect.

If contractors can now simply reclassify these minority and female laborers as helpers and cut their wages and eliminate their fringe benefits, what can possibly be gained from an economic point of view. Also, the social costs will be enormous. It is wrong headed and I urge you to vote against the motion to strike.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to be sure that Members understand how you save money under this regulation. There is no doubt you save it. You save it by the hundreds of thousands of dollars very quickly, and you save it one way. You reduce the wages of American workers. That is the only way that there is any money saved here.

Mr. Chairman, if you vote for the Stenholm amendment, you are voting to reduce the wages of American workers. Yes, that is a savings.

Now, there are other ways to get savings in this country besides reducing the standard of living of American workers. A vote for the Stenholm amendment reduces the standard of living for American workers building plants and equipment and designing material for the Government of the United States. A vote against the Stenholm amendment at least attempts to keep the standard of living for American workers where it is now.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to understand that for about 8 years now the Department of Labor has been trying as best they can to implement what all of the construction trades and private industry recognize, and that is when you have the classification of helper, you can (once in a while) pick up a tool, for instance, without having to be paid as though you were a journeyman. It is just that simple aspect that we really are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, as far as minorities are concerned, they wish to be able to get into the construction trades. The way to do that is to emulate the private sector. You come in as a helper. You help a carpenter or you help in painting, and you are able to pick up a hammer once in a while. You are paid a fairly good rate there as a laborer, but not as a journeyman.

Anyway, we are not even settling that issue here. We are saying to the Secretary of Labor, you can continue on this particular course. If some people have objections, they can file the objections. I suppose we can have liti-

gation for another 8 years. But the people of this country are recognizing that we are just blowing away \$600 million because we are not able to utilize the regulation process.

It makes no sense for this Congress to continue to be indifferent about saving money especially when you have Federal construction projects that can be operated on the prevailing wage rate in the locality and within the prevailing job classifications in the locality. That is what the Davis-Bacon Act is all about—to guarantee that the prevailing wage rate and the prevailing job classifications will prevail. Here we are fighting and fighting, so that we cannot intelligently address it, and we tell the new Secretary of Labor that she cannot continue on what has been an 8-year march. I think that is ridiculous.

Once again, the whole country is watching us as we are indifferent. We are not cutting wages. We are trying to open up the trades so that young people and minorities and others can learn the trades and learn how to be a plumber or a painter. We are not taking money out of peoples' mouths, we are giving them opportunities.

So I support the Stenholm amendment. It is common sense. The Secretary of Labor and the regulatory process hopefully someday will come to an end.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why in the world we cannot have a job classification recognized by Davis-Bacon, if it is a prevailing job classification in a locality where the construction is taking place. That is all we are talking about. A few unions do not like it. They want everybody who comes in, even if they are going to do helpers' work, to get paid as much as a plumber or a painter. That means any construction job which is federally funded or assisted with Federal funds, including local projects which are assisted with Federal funds, will cost millions and millions of dollars more.

Mr. Chairman, that is wasting the money of the taxpayer. I apprise Members once again the deficit this year will be \$318 billion, not counting what we borrow from trust funds.

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

I apologize to Members for speaking. I know the hour is late and we all want to move on. I cannot let myself let that last speech go unanswered.

Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the Apprenticeship Program. The Helper Program is in another area. I can truthfully say that this is a change in a policy that has basically controlled this program for 44 years. This is being done by the backdoor of regulation. It is not going through the appropriate channels. All that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] is attempting to do with this par-

ticular amendment is maintain the status quo. That status quo has given us an Apprenticeship Program that has a proper ratio of journeymen to apprentices of 2 to 1, that has a portability provision that prevents people from transferring from one section of the country to another and giving credit, despite the training they have received, that allows States to basically run their own programs, as 26 States have standards this will do away with.

□ 1800

So I seriously think that before Members are too misguided about what is going on today, they should realize that this is a change that is going through the back door, and what we are asking today is for a full and fair hearing through the appropriate jurisdiction, the Education and Labor Committee, to actually produce some sort of policy decision.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I was trying to get my friend from Illinois to yield and I think he forgot and sat down, but am I correct, like down in the State of Texas, specifically in Houston where I am from, we have had a hard time getting certain individuals to participate, to be able to get into these apprenticeship programs, and what I want to do, and the reason I oppose the Stenholm amendment, is the way I read it and the way I read what the regulations do is that they would allow companies from out of State to come in and circumvent the process we have set up by which 40 percent of the apprenticeship jobs are now being held by women and minorities, and bring in people from other States. Am I correct or incorrect?

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. Women and minorities would be deeply affected under this proposal.

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

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding for two reasons. I want to comment both to your statement and that of the gentleman from Texas.

It is our understanding that the proposed regulation will make it easier, not harder, but easier to enter the apprenticeship program. I think that we ought to review and understand that before we make this kind of a legislative change.

But I want to ask the gentleman from Kentucky, am I not correct that last week organized labor met in Baltimore with the Department of Labor and came to a general consensus on the regulations for the apprenticeship program?

Mr. PERKINS. I am not familiar with any sort of action that has taken place along those lines, so I truly cannot comment.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Chairman, as late as last Friday we had a meeting, I did, under the auspices of Chairman FORD with the Department of Labor and various staff. One hundred Members last year signed a letter, as the gentleman maybe knows, against the proposed regulations, and the Department of Labor representatives that were there, and the Labor people at that meeting gave no indication that there was any agreement at this time. There was agreement on some points, but the major provisions that were pointed out here with regard to portability and with regard to the number of apprentices for journeymen, there is no agreement.

The only way I believe, and that is why I oppose the Stenholm amendment and support the Murtha amendment, the only way we are going to get that issue resolved is if we prevent these from going into effect. I think while there may be general agreement down the road, I do not think we want it with a hammer at our head.

Mr. PERKINS. Reclaiming my time, that of course was my understanding as well. I was not familiar with any changes.

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

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

First of all, let everybody understand they are proposed regulations, they are not final, and they are in the public hearings process.

Second, it is still our understanding and the Department of Labor's understanding that there was an agreement in Baltimore on those regulations, and that is why I think many people are very upset with this section happening in this bill at this time when there has been negotiation in good faith, and it is the Department's understanding they have reached an agreement. If they have not over a couple of items, then we ought to go back and deal with that. If that all fails, legislatively we solve it later. But do not prevent the normal process from working, and that is what is happening this after-noon.

Mr. PERKINS. Reclaiming my time, as I say, I am not familiar with any agreement, nor as the gentleman from Minnesota indicated has our side understood there is such an agreement.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to correct something that was said just in the last debate and discussion. One would have thought that if the regulations go into effect, somehow minorities are going to be hurt by that. The opposite is positively true.

At the present time you can be denied an apprenticeship if they do not like the way you comb your hair, if they do not like the color of your skin, if they do not like anything about you and you cannot, you cannot appeal that decision. That is final.

The regulations would give them the opportunity, as a matter of fact, to appeal the decision that was made, which was probably a discriminatory decision in the first place.

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the full provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931. This famous act requires that the minimum wage rates paid to each separate classification of worker, on federally financed construction, repair, and alteration contracts, be those determined to be locally prevailing by the Department of Labor.

As my colleague, Mr. STENHOLM, has indicated, the Davis-Bacon Act was, indeed, a much needed response to unscrupulous, fly-by-night contractors, hauling gangs of itinerant, cheap, bootleg labor around the country to undercut local firms on Federal public works projects at a time when there was little other new construction.

But if we weaken Davis-Bacon now, surely these terrible past practices will return.

Mr. Chairman, we are currently in a precarious time of little or no new construction. We are again in a dismal time of limited employment opportunities and limited business opportunities. If we harm the Davis-Bacon Act now, we will without a doubt return to the same unscrupulous fly-by-night gang labor that needed stopped by Davis-Bacon in 1931.

Today, make no mistake, we have hard, uncertain economic times throughout America and the world. Any weakening now in the labor laws will invite all manner of ruthless new hiring practices.

For example, one problem might be created because immigrant labor is anxious to obtain employment on our shores. Many desperate peoples of the world, whose labor has been shackled in their own lands, would understandably be more than willing to earn a few dollars in this free nation where they have been told the streets are lined with gold. We know through hard experience, that there are—unfortunately—exploiters here on our own shores, who will not hesitate to reshackle these new American workers.

Therefore we cannot allow the slow and systematic destruction of our labor laws and the hard-earned wages of this Nation's labor. The great social contribution of the 20th century has been a fair wage for a full day's work, with a definite and legislated minimum.

We must not be prepared to throw this hard-won legislation to the wind. We must fight here in the Halls of Congress and stand behind the American worker by opposing the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] and by supporting the amendment

of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

The Stenholm amendment would allow the Labor Department to implement new regulations to expand the practice of hiring helpers. These helpers will receive no formal training and, in time, will become a permanent underclass of workers at very low wages. In addition, a radical change in the spirit of Davis-Bacon—such as the Stenholm amendment—should not be decided by Labor Department regulation.

Mr. Chairman, we recently witnessed another example of the plan to create an underclass of workers when we witnessed the forced agreement on a subminimum wage in the compromise version of the fair labor standards amendments in the last Congress. But this Member of Congress will not idly stand by and allow yet another attempt to gut this Nation's cherished labor protection laws go unchallenged.

The apprenticeship program we must protect today has a long and proud history of training men and women to become skilled journeymen in the construction industry. Allowing the expanded use of helpers on Federal projects would only upset the working relationship between journeymen and apprentices and drive down the wages of all workers at these construction sites.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Stenholm amendment and supporting a better standard of living for all workers on Federal or federally funded construction projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 244, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

AYES—173

Allard	Combost	Gunderson
Andrews (TX)	Cooper	Hall (TX)
Anthony	Cox (CA)	Hammerschmidt
Archer	Cunningham	Hancock
Arney	Dannemeyer	Hansen
Baker	Darden	Hastert
Ballenger	de la Garza	Hatcher
Barnard	DeLay	Hayes (LA)
Barrett	Derrick	Hefley
Bartlett	Dickinson	Hefner
Barton	Doollittle	Henry
Bateman	Dorman (CA)	Herger
Bellenson	Dreier	Hobson
Bentley	Duncan	Holloway
Bereuter	Edwards (OK)	Hopkins
Bilirakis	Emerson	Huckaby
Bliley	Fawell	Hunter
Boehner	Fields	Hutto
Broomfield	Franks (CT)	Hyde
Bunning	Gallegly	Inhofe
Byron	Gekas	James
Callahan	Geren	Jenkins
Camp	Gilchrest	Johnson (CT)
Campbell (CA)	Gillmor	Jones (NC)
Chandler	Gingrich	Kasich
Chapman	Goodling	Klug
Clinger	Goss	Kolbe
Coble	Gradison	Kyl
Coleman (MO)	Grandy	Lagomarsino

Lancaster
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCullum
McCreary
McCurdy
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Miller (WA)
Mollinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker

Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Rhodes
Riggs
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen

Slaughter (VA)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitten
Wolf
Wylie
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeltton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Solarez

Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Thornton
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Trafaant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento

Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)

that it would assume truly crisis proportions, necessitating emergency action to avoid the crisis of insolvency.

Mayor Dixon has courageously risen to the occasion. She has moved to confront the budget deficit in ways that distinguish her among mayors in the United States. Of the more than \$300 million deficit she inherited, she took on two-thirds of the deficit herself. She has made cuts in every operation of the D.C. government beginning with cuts in her own office, and the city council has done likewise.

Further, Mayor Dixon's budget has undergone tough cross-examination in the city council, where Chairman Wilson, who has encyclopedic knowledge of the finances and operations of the D.C. government, has been satisfied that the cuts are both deep and real.

Having taken on the lion's share of the budget deficit ourselves, the District now seeks to renew its partnership with the Congress beginning with this supplemental request. We strongly urge your support.

NOT VOTING—16

Crane
Donnelly
Ford (TN)
Ireland
Levine (CA)
McDade

Michel
Miller (OH)
Mrazek
Murphy
Ortiz
Roybal

Sangmeister
Solomon
Udall
Wilson

□ 1826

Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from "aye" to "no". The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ireland for, with Mr. Ortiz against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee for \$100 million in supplemental funds for the District of Columbia comes before this body with strong and gratifying bipartisan support. For more than 5 years, there has been no increase in the Federal payment to the District of Columbia. As a result, the residents of the District have endured palpable hardship. Already the most heavily taxed city in the United States, already burdened by a shrinking business and resident tax base, Washingtonians increasingly have taken on the Federal share of the burden as well as their own. By way of analogy, there is probably no State in the country whose State capital has been held at level funding for so long a period of time as has the Nation's Capital.

In January, a complete turnover in the leadership of District government occurred. Mayor Sharon Pratt Dixon, Council Chairman John Wilson, and I met and resolved to work cooperatively, together as a team on District affairs. Both of my colleagues have shown themselves to be leaders of great courage and prudence, unflinchingly taking on a daunting budget deficit. We are enormously grateful to have the support of the full Appropriations Committee, under the strong and able leadership of Chairman WHITTEN with the energetic and intelligent support of Chairman DIXON of the D.C. Appropriations Committee.

While we knew that we had to be prepared to take tough steps to eradicate a daunting deficit, none of us expected

NOES—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Boehert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Burton
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English

Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gelderson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harris
Hayes (IL)
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long

Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mateul
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morrison
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage

□ 1830

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAPMAN

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHAPMAN: Page 33, after line 19, insert the following:

SEC. . (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) United States and coalition armed forces devoted enormous human and financial resources to the successful effort to free Kuwait from illegal Iraqi occupations, enforce United Nations resolutions, and preserve the territorial integrity of the Gulf States;

(2) Americans take great pride in the troops who won this historic victory and honor those who gave their lives to liberate Kuwait and turn back aggression;

(3) major trading nations of the world will benefit substantially and directly from the coalition victory in this strategic area;

(4) six nations have pledged \$53,500,000,000 in contributions to help meet the costs of the coalition effort;

(5) some nations have been slow to honor those commitments for 1990; and

(6) the 1991 commitments are agreed to be due on March 31, 1991.

(b) Having appropriated significant supplemental funding for the United States armed forces in the Gulf region in a time of recession and budget deficits, it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) these pledges of financial support from the allied nations are appreciated;

(2) nations that have made such pledges are urged to comply with them at the earliest possible time, with substantial compliance or an agreed upon payment schedule no later than April 15, 1991;

(3) these commitments shall be upheld; and

(4) if these commitments are not met the Congress may consider appropriate action.

Mr. CHAPMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed to the amendment will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Who seeks to claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the 15 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half of my 15 minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL], and yield myself such time as I might consume.

Last night this body and the American people shared a great victory as the President of the United States addressed the Congress of the United States. The cost of that victory in both human and financial terms has been great. Americans have paid with their lives and a commitment that has been truly remarkable, but in economic terms as well the cost of Operation Desert Storm is approaching \$70 billion.

Through the hard work and negotiations of our Secretary of State and the Executive, we have received substantial commitments to defray that cost. In fact, some \$54 billion has now been pledged by our coalition partners to offset the cost of Operation Desert Storm. Our allies have a moral obligation to pay their share of the cost of this war. The American people have already paid with their lives, their troops, their will and their military commitment.

I wholeheartedly agree with this proposition and so do the American people, as I suspect you, my colleagues, have heard back home in your districts.

Today my resolution puts the Congress on record as well with this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, the major trading nations of the world will benefit by this great victory that we as a coalition of forces and as the United States enjoyed in the victory of Operation Desert Storm. Six nations have now pledged nearly \$54 billion to help meet the costs of the coalition effort; however, some nations have been a little bit slow in honoring their commitments. I know that the Executive is working hard on this and I do not with this resolution want to do anything to interfere with their efforts and the good work they have already accomplished in securing these commitments and the

payments so far that have been made; but today we appropriate tens of billions of dollars for the costs of Operation Desert Storm, costs that will cost the American taxpayers since this is financed outside the budget agreement.

Mr. Chairman, in a time of deficits and recession, the American taxpayer will pay upward of \$8 million a day in interest to finance the supplemental appropriation bill that we will pass today. It is time that our allied partners pay their commitments. This resolution simply asks that they do that very thing and lets them know that should they not do so, the Congress will be watching and this Congress does have the ability, the authority, and the will to act.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I call to the attention of my colleagues, those of you who may enjoy a brain teaser, a new brain teaser. I ask you the question, when is \$9 billion not \$9 billion? And the answer is when Japan makes a commitment.

In concert with the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] I would like to call the attention of my colleagues and the American people to one thing. The Japanese Diet has just recently concluded their debate and decided to contribute. They are going to contribute yen, to be exact Y1.17 trillion. At the present exchange rate, that comes to \$8.6 billion, not \$9 billion.

But more importantly, they will be contributing this \$8.6 billion to the Gulf Peace Fund, not to the United States. Japan has used the Gulf Peace Fund before.

Back in September, Japan promised \$2 billion for the war effort. Of that, the United States is slated to receive \$1.7 billion; to date we have only received \$1.3 billion. Only \$860 million of this money has been cash, with \$450 million in kind.

The mechanism the Japanese have opted to use to distribute the money, both in September and now, is the Gulf Peace Fund. The decisionmaking process of Gulf Peace Fund is conducted by two individuals, the Japanese Ambassador to Saudi Arabia and a representative of a group known as the Gulf Cooperation Council which represents six Gulf State nations. These two individuals parcel out the money.

Monitoring statements by the Japanese Embassy and watching the publicity, one would think that the United States has a commitment for \$9 billion. In reality, not a chance. To begin with, Japan is only contributing \$8.6 billion. Furthermore, of the \$2 billion promised in September, we have received less than 85 percent. Indications are that because the war is now over and because there is a need for reconstruction

in the gulf region, there will be pressure to commit a good portion of the \$8.6 billion to reconstruction in the Middle East.

I do not want to suggest that we should take any action today, but tomorrow the decision of the Gulf Peace Fund as to how that money will be distributed is going to be made. I would suggest that my colleagues here in this House, as well as the American people, monitor this situation very carefully. If the nation of Japan does not make its commitment or instead says that the check is in the mail, but we addressed it to the wrong party, that we take strong action to test who our allies and friends really are.

Mr. Chairman, I support the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]. I think the Secretary of State has done an excellent job in getting promises, but I am growing skeptical about the intentions of some of our allies to keep those promises.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the Chapman-Pursell compromise. We discussed this at great length in the full Appropriations Committee and we have worked out a compromise which is permissive in its approach, not mandatory.

There is no question that Operation Desert Storm was such a success because of the historic efforts of President Bush to bring together a diverse coalition of countries who opposed aggression. At no time in our Nation's history has a President been able to organize worldwide action in response to such brutality.

Except for the citizens of Kuwait, however, no country has done more in this effort than the United States. As a veteran of the U.S. Army, the Army Reserve, and as an American, I have never been more proud of our military forces and the spirit that made it all possible.

But the United States cannot bear the burden of leadership alone. While American lives have been lost for the cause of freedom and justice in the Persian Gulf, the American taxpayer must not be left holding the check for the entire operation.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment recognizes the financial pledges of our allies and it expresses our great appreciation. But this amendment also puts the Congress solidly behind the taxpayers by stating that we will make every effort to collect the generous contributions of our friends.

April 15 is a significant day in the life of every American. This amendment ensures that April 15 will have the same significance for our allies.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] for offering the amendment in the full Committee on Appropriations on Tuesday.

I ask the House to support the amendment.

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

Mr. PURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly am willing to follow the gentleman's judgment on this issue, although I am somewhat concerned about the language. But I think it is somewhat interesting that some people in this House seem to be willing to be tougher on your allies than they were willing to be on the Iraqis.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I supported the President here. I should say that the Japanese Government yesterday in their legislature adopted the \$9 billion commitment that they have made to this contributing fund.

So I think the allies are paying up, and we just hope that they fulfill their obligations and continue their responsibilities to match our taxpayer dollars and help pay for the gulf war.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CHAPMAN

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a minor technical perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. CHAPMAN: In the matter proposed by the amendment, on Page 2, line 13, strike "upheld," and insert in lieu thereof, "fulfilled."

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of a minor technical perfecting amendment to the excellent amendment offered by our dear friend from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]. The amendment would simply change the word "upheld" in the amendment to "fulfilled", which would indicate that it is the intent of the Congress that the beneficiaries of the action which was so gallantly taken by the Armed Forces of the United States and our friends and allies would be taken care of by fulfilling the commitments made by other nations which are the beneficiaries.

I would remind my good friends here that it is important that those commitments do be fulfilled. I would remind everybody that the payment of the doctor bills usually does not occur if they are not done before the recovery has been complete.

I would also remind my dear friends and colleagues about the situation which followed World War I. We are still looking for repayment of the obligations achieved during World War I.

I believe it is fair to say that there are certain nations, and I do not think it would be appropriate for me to men-

tion them here, who contributed absolutely nothing to the Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm and who are 100 percent dependent upon imported oil and who are much more heavily dependent upon imported oil and imported oil from the Persian Gulf than is the United States.

It is not too much for this body to expect that they would carry out their responsibilities and their commitments, and it is not unwise to suspect that in the orderly passage of time they might say: "Ahh so, we are still having difficulties selling that to the Diet."

It is my hope that this amendment will help trigger the kind of proper, forthcoming response by friends and allies like that that this country really deserves.

Our soldiers have performed gallantly, our commanders have performed brilliantly, our people have sacrificed. The cost of this undertaking is going to exceed \$70 billion. The cost for a day without war is \$75 million. The cost of a day's war is in excess of half a billion to a billion dollars. The cost will continue to go on.

Now, we can look to the attitudes of the people we serve. They clearly expect that having sacrificed already not only in terms of the lives and well-being of our young people and the times committed not only by our regular forces but by 200,000 Reservists who have given up their family life and given up their peacetime occupations to go and serve in the gulf, that other countries which have contributed nothing to this undertaking in terms of military activity and manpower and blood and tears and sweat and sacrifice should now come forward.

Beyond that it is not too much to expect that when these soldiers, and sailors, and marines, and airmen, men and women, return to the country that they love and that they have served so well and effectively, that they should be able to expect that they are not going to be told, "Welcome home, welcome home, we are delighted you are here. We have a little bill for the cost of Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm because some of our friends and allies are not going to pay up their fair share."

The United States has budgetary problems which we have been debating during this discussion. They are enormous. They will be worse before the year is out.

It is not too much to expect that in dealing with those, we will not have to deal with the recalcitrance of friends and allies who are beneficiaries of the actions of this country and who in fact should be paying for the enormous benefit that has been achieved, not only in terms of guaranteeing their oil supply but in terms of seeing to it that Saddam Hussein did not achieve control of 70 percent of the oil in the world, which

would have made him the dominant economic, political, and military factor not only in the Persian Gulf, not only in the Middle East, but all throughout the world.

This language is permissive. I personally think it should be stronger. But it does tell everyone, including the President of the United States, and the State Department, which is not as diligent in these matters as they could be, that the Congress expects full payment and that if it is not forthcoming, that stronger action will be seen in this body.

I urge my colleagues to vote both for my amendment and the fine amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a technical amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN]. I would like to take a moment to commend the gentleman from Texas for his excellent amendment. With all due respect to the gentleman, this minor change, which substitutes the word "fulfilled" for "upheld", more accurately describes what the Congress is really trying to do here. And that is to make certain that our allies fulfill their obligations to make good on their commitments.

Mr. CHAPMAN's amendment, as modified by my amendment, sends a clear message to our allies that the Congress expects them to make good on their commitment to share the financial costs of Operation Desert Storm. The price of our victory and the ensuing peace must be paid by those who benefit from the fruits of this region.

Today we will later vote to contribute \$15 billion additional to Operation Desert Storm. As a veteran of World War II, I cannot praise highly enough the performance of our service men and women, whose dedication, skill, and professionalism made possible one of the most brilliant military campaigns in history.

While war is never a preferred alternative, our forces contained Saddam Hussein's heavily armed Republican Guard with little loss of American blood—a truly extraordinary accomplishment. We cannot burden our returning veterans—and the American people—with paying for a war we did not cause.

With current estimates showing the war costing almost \$70 billion, our allies have commendably promised to pick up 79 percent of the tab. It should be the sense of this Congress that these pledges be paid by April 15.

Unfortunately, despite the best diplomatic efforts of our administration, almost two-thirds of these pledges remain unpaid. With the war over, I fear that we might start hearing that old excuse, "check's in the mail," from some of our allies.

At the beginning of this Congress, I reintroduced H.R. 317, the Desert Shield Burden Sharing Act. This bill allows the President to determine whether a country delinquent in paying its pledges should be subject to an additional duty of 20 percent on all goods shipped to this country for sale to the American taxpayer. Given the sense of the Congress that the pledges must be paid, we must be ready to use all available means to ensure payment.

DESERT STORM BURDEN SHARING ALLIED CONTRIBUTIONS AND PAYMENTS

(In millions of dollars)

Country	Promised	Delivered	Still due
Saudi Arabia	\$16,839	\$6,023	\$10,816
Kuwait	15,096	3,510	12,486
United Arab Emirates	3,600	1,010	1,990
Germany	6,572	2,963	3,609
Japan	10,740	1,323	9,417
South Korea	385	71	314
Others	3	3	0
Total	53,545	14,903	38,642

Source: Congressional Quarterly March 2, 1991.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. DINGELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this sounds like one of those macho amendments that everybody ought to just vote for and put out a press release and say, "How strong I am."

But let me tell you a couple of things about it. First of all it is a mere sense-of-Congress resolution, it is a political statement. We should not be having sense-of-Congress resolutions on appropriation bills, or anywhere else for that matter. All they are is opinions.

Second, the promises that were secured were about twice what any Member of this body thought could be gotten, just about twice, which is unbelievable, really.

What this resolution does is say:

You who promised to pay twice as much as we thought that you might give must pay up within 6 weeks or we are going to do something to you.

How insulting can you be to those who promised to pay more than we thought they would pay? It does nothing to anybody that did not promise to pay anything, just those that are going to pay about twice what we thought they would pay.

Is this the way you treat our allies and people who are helping you? It is like if you were soliciting for your church and somebody says:

Even though you didn't ask me for \$50, I am going to give you \$100, but I don't have it today. I will give it to you in about 2 months from now when I get my finances arranged.

And just before you leave, you say:

You had better pay every penny that you said you were going to pay, and you had better pay it within 6 weeks.

Now, that is the kind of amendment we have here on the floor. That is not the way we ought to be dealing with this subject in this House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

May I say to my colleagues and the cosponsors of this amendment, we

worked together on many, many things but I must oppose this amendment.

This is a matter of how you go about things. These promises by foreign governments to help pay for our war costs that we read about have usually been made by their executive branches. In most cases these governments have to get an appropriation from their legislative branches.

□ 1850

Mr. Chairman, I have been in the business a long time, and I have always gotten further by persuasion than by threats. If these governments turn us down, what are we going to do? Are we going to call Congress in session here, and issue an edict, and send troops over there?

Based on my own experience I have gotten mighty little out of threats. I think it would be much better to ask them to contribute because in most cases the fellow that made the promise was not in a position to commit his country. He has to go back and get an appropriation. I think this amendment is ill timed, and it is bad. The good intentions of our colleagues are unquestioned. If these commitments are not met, then Congress may consider appropriate action.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know any appropriate action we can do now except to write and ask them to please pay up.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN] for yielding, and I really want people to support his amendment, and let me try and respond to my two good friends, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH]. I hear what they are saying about the sense-of-Congress resolution, and normally I would agree with them.

However, Mr. Chairman, let me say that we here have a very difficult problem. We have the executive branch who collects the pledges, but are also trying to hold together this coalition, which is very fragile, and I think it is very important that it is in this bill because one of the things we are hoping to do in this supplemental is hold down our debt and communicate this.

Now I do not think we have done this before, and the State Department has a lot of trouble being too tough on this issue because they have got to do a lot of other things with these countries. I think it is our job to try and be tough.

Mr. Chairman, I chair the burden-sharing panel of the Committee on Armed Services. Let me tell my colleagues that we just visited some countries, talking to them about their pledge, and they said, "One of the burdens of leadership is, if you get on the roof and people remove the ladder." That is the burden.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the American taxpayer really wants to be left on the roof with all the money outstanding, and so, therefore, I really think here the sense-of-Congress resolution makes sense.

If my colleagues will remember, many of these countries we had experience with in 1987 during the Kuwaiti reflagging, and a lot of those things were not corrected. I know because my committee wrote a report giving everybody credit for what they pledged, and then I had people coming in and saying to me that was wrong, that money did not come, and we were embarrassed to have to back off.

So, I think it is important we say, "We intend to have people keep their pledges." We think that is very important. It is a sense-of-the-Congress resolution, but it helps the administration to collect them, too, by saying, "Here we are pushing that."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we are 1½ years behind in arrears on our pledges to the United Nations. What if one of these countries said or they passed a resolution in their diet or whatever it is and said, "Either you pay up that in the next 6 weeks, or we're going to make you sorry?" Do my colleagues think that is going to make us do any more?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think we should pay those, too, and I think that is part of the new world order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I will try not to use all that time. I hope this amendment would be roundly defeated. It is the most ill-timed and ill-considered amendment I have seen on this floor in a long time.

At a moment of unprecedented international cooperation that we witnessed last night, when we have a coalition melded together by the free nations of the world to stop aggression, we suddenly want to say with some kind of a sense of Congress, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] points out, resolution, "You pay up or else in this body."

My colleagues, the coalition has been together. We have repelled aggression. We saw the diplomatic corps here last night and recognized the ambassador from Kuwait. We liberated a nation because all of us stayed together. We have been together.

The way to solve this problem is through diplomatic channels. That is the way the coalition was created. That is the way the commitments were made. They are not behind. They are being paid in. There is about \$16 billion in right now.

Let us stick with this coalition, this unprecedented international cooperation, and vote this amendment down.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

What if we went outside and saw in the newspaper that Japan had lied and then we came back and said, "If you folks don't pay, you'll wish you had"?

This is not the way to legislate. Let us turn this down, and not threaten these countries.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, Japan is 70 percent dependent on oil from the Persian Gulf. Germany is 50 percent dependent. The United States is about 10 percent dependent upon oil from the Persian Gulf. Yet we fulfilled our pledges, our promise, to repeal Iraqi aggression and free Kuwait 100 percent. Now it is time to make certain that Japan, Germany, and the others honor theirs.

The last thing I want to do as we prepare to welcome home our troops, the young men and women who served in the gulf and won the war, is to hand them a bill for the war they just fought. So, if my colleagues think that the first welcome-home present should be a bill, then do not vote for this resolution. If my colleagues want to ask our allies to share the burden and to pay up for once, like they never do in international trade when they sign these agreements and do not live up to them, then vote for this resolution.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I really believe that the allies have not paid their fair share. I would not be on the floor today. We liberated Kuwait because of the naked aggression of Saddam Hussein and because of the oil dependence of the world in that region. Two-thirds of the reserves are in the Persian Gulf area. Yet the United States—let us be honest about it—the United States provided the lion's share of the brave men and women in the armed forces, and our taxpayers essentially picked up the tab.

Now it is true that we are dependent on that region. But our European allies as a whole are 40 percent dependent on that region, and Japan is more than 65 percent dependent on that region, and yet our allies are not paying their fair share, and they are not paying in cash essentially. They are paying in services and trickling in with equipment, and this was not just America against Iraq and Saddam. This was the world against Saddam.

Mr. Chairman, every member of this coalition ought to pay their fair share, and I support the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that on April 15, the American taxpayers will write a check. This resolution provides that our allies should do nothing more than make their commitments and arrange a payment schedule by that same time. There are no direct threats here, but, if the American people fought this war, and we did, paid with our lives, our equipment, our soldiers, the least we can do is ask our allies to live up to their commitments.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this resolution and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish my colleagues would rely on the words in the committee report. This language just asks them to pay. That is what I believe. We would have more money if we did not threaten them.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues turn this down. I agree with everything that my colleagues have said about the desire, the need, and the obligation. I just figure we get more money if we do not threaten.

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

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, this war with Iraq has cost the United States the lives of almost 100 brave Americans and almost \$70 billion.

Today we are asked to pay \$15 billion of that cost, while our allies argue over who will pay what, and how we can spend the money they do give us.

The allies were quick to make their financial commitments, just as America was quick to commit the lives of our soldiers. Together, they have pledged over \$53 billion.

Among those pledges are:
Saudi Arabia: \$16.8 billion.
Kuwait: \$16 billion.
United Arab Emirates: \$4 billion.
Germany: \$6.5 billion.
Japan: \$10.7 billion.

They were quick to promise, just as we were quick to put American lives on the line in the Iraqi desert.

But the allies have not been quick to fulfill their commitments.

I understand why the Kuwaitis, which just recovered control of their country, have paid only one-fourth of their commitment.

But I do not understand why nations such as Japan and Germany, nations which did not send troops, have paid too little.

Germany has paid only \$3 billion of their promised \$6.5 billion—less than half.

Japan has paid just over \$1 billion out of the more than \$10 billion they pledged, and to that they have attached conditions about how we can spend it.

There are Members who proposed more drastic action to compel our allies to meet their commitments. I support such legislation, if it proves necessary.

It is my hope that we will adopt this sense-of-the-Congress resolution, and that our allies will take notice, and pay what they owe.

When the United Nations made in effect a declaration of war, committing American

troops to combat, the Security Council did not debate the cost of this war to the Government of the United States;

They did not debate how the financial cost would be shared, and they did not ask for an appropriation from the Congress of the United States.

But this Congress did not shrink from supporting the coalition, and granted to the President the authority he needed to make war.

I hope our allies will not shrink from their responsibilities, and will agree to honor their commitments by April 15, the day on which the American people will be asked to make their contribution to the cost of this war.

Please support the Chapman amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN], as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was refused. So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SLATTERY
Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY: Page 33, after line 19, insert the following:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any provision of the Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by that Act or by any other Act may be used for the restoration of the birthplace of Lawrence Welk.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] claims the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know that my colleagues are anxious to get out of here this evening, and so am I. I will be very brief.

First of all, I would like to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], for his tireless work in helping me advance the effort to repeal this \$500,000 appropriation.

Let me just remind my colleagues that we are talking about a very simple amendment. We are talking about deleting \$500,000 that was included in the Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies appropriations bill that was passed last year. This money, as the Members may recall, was included in a conference commit-

tee report in the late hours of the session. It did not receive any review by the House committee, by a subcommittee, or by a State committee or subcommittee meeting by itself.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would just point out that at the time this amendment was added to the bill that I just referred to, the rest of the Congress was working literally day and night trying to find enough money to reduce the deficit and come to an agreement on a very important deficit reduction package. I hope that with the passage, Mr. Chairman, of this amendment this body will send a very important message, and that is that we would like to change the way we do business in the late hours of a session around here.

I would just point out that the National Taxpayers Union, the Citizens for a Sound Economy, and over 100 of my colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of Congressman SLATTERY's amendment and Congressman KASICH's amendment to eliminate funds to restore the birthplace of Lawrence Welk.

Now that the war in the Persian Gulf is over, we must concentrate our energies and resources on controlling our Nation's budget. We no longer can afford projects that have little or no merit. With our national debt hovering above \$3 trillion, we only have funds for programs that are absolutely essential, not only desirable.

Can anyone in this body argue seriously that restoring the birthplace of Lawrence Welk is absolutely essential to our Nation?

The average taxpayer will labor 125 days, from January 1 to May 5, to satisfy all Federal, State, and local tax obligations.

I'm sorry, but few people in central Florida would want to work a week to restore the birthplace of Lawrence Welk.

The time is now to redeem promises once made to the American people by a Presidential candidate early in this century. He said:

*** For three long years I have been going up and down this country preaching that government—Federal, State, and local—costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching. As an immediate program of action.*** we must eliminate unnecessary functions of government.***

*** We must consolidate subdivisions of government and, like the private citizen, give up luxuries which we can no longer afford.

Those were Franklin D. Roosevelt's words as he accepted the Democratic nomination for President in 1932.

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 put our Nation's fiscal house in order and restore consumer confidence.

This amendment is a tremendous opportunity to make a statement about unnecessary spending. It is a statement consumers want to hear and our economy needs to hear.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the Slattery amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that there is some misinformation here. These grants are authorized by law. This item was added by the Senate subcommittees and approved by their full committee, and the full Senate. I chaired the conference committee and this was considered in the conference. I chaired the conference, so it is a mistake to say it was added in the conference.

May I say that we have a national program in which we have tried to help communities throughout the country. I have some mighty good friends from North Dakota, folks that I have served with, Mr. DORGAN and others. They are the best ones to decide how they wish to do those things.

I know that my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, means well. Now, this committee received this letter on March 5, from the gentleman. He wants us to add \$5 million for a project in Kansas for—what is it? What is the word here? Oh, this is for the hall of fame in Kansas. But he is against this rural development project in North Dakota. I just cannot understand his position.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee yield to me?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. I would like to have an opportunity to respond to that. The point I would make here is that the problem we have is that we are talking about going into a conference committee where we do not go through the whole legislative process to give Members an opportunity to be heard at the committee level. Yes, I will tell the chairman that I certainly have made requests, and I will continue to make requests, but I expect to go to the gentleman's subcommittees and go through the complete process to be heard. I expect I will have difficulty also in getting some of my requests responded to.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will not list the many things we have put in our bill for Kansas, but I could. It is quite a large number, and I do not say that to be complaining.

I want to say to my colleagues that since we started meeting local needs with Federal programs, the wealth of this country has increased 41 times. I am for looking after each of the States. They are all part of the country. The people in the States and the people of

the Nation, are the same people. I just say that I treat folks from North Dakota like they wish to be treated, and I will tell the gentleman he will be treated fairly, whatever happens here.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I know the chairman of the committee has already treated me fairly, and for that I am always grateful.

Mr. WHITTEN. We mean to do that. As I mentioned before, these grants are authorized by law. The grant was added by the Senate subcommittee, it was approved by their full committee and by the full Senate. It was approved by the conference committee. The grant was considered in the normal legislative process. I would also point out that \$5 million for a hall of fame in Kansas is a whole lot more than \$500,000 for North Dakota, and I think the Senators from North Dakota are the best judges of what they want in North Dakota. I think they are better judges of that than I am.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

No issue caused us as much grief in the country last year as this issue of the money for the Lawrence Welk home. It may be a valued project, but what was concerning me was that the process was never publicly debated at all, and the fact is that at least from the American people, as we were going through this budget debacle last year, we took the blame for almost all the economic travails of this country because of this particular project.

I understand the concerns that the gentleman from Mississippi has. I just say that this caused us so much grief that I think it ought to go through the normal reauthorization process.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman was not in the conference, but this was certainly in the subcommittee and was accepted by the full committee. It was in the conference, and we went along with the fact that they were the best judges of how to spend this money. We did as we have always done for various States.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I under the gentleman's position, but this did cause us a lot of unnecessary embarrassment, and I just think the gentleman is correct in his statement.

□ 1910

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment by Mr. SLATTERY is an attempt to use one provision out of a mountain of similar provisions in last year's appropriations bills to try to demonstrate that the appro-

priations process doesn't provide for careful hearings, and for considered judgment on some of the individual projects that are funded. They maintain and I agree that some Federal spending is wasteful.

Last year, I stood on the floor here in Congress and said that even though some \$80 million was scheduled to be spent in my congressional district on the MX Rail Garrison Program, I felt the program was a waste of money, and it should not be built. It was not built, and that money was not spent in North Dakota.

I think I have demonstrated a willingness to take the right medicine when it comes to dealing with funding for programs and projects that are inappropriate even those in my home State. On the specific project referred to in Mr. SLATTERY'S amendment, there was report language last year seeking \$500,000 for that project. I indicated last year publicly that I had supported some seed money for that project of \$75,000, but that I thought \$500,000 was excessive. I reiterate that position today. I would support an amendment that would restrict to \$75,000, the money used for that project, and I intend to offer that as an amendment to the Slattery amendment.

I would like to make a couple of other observations, however. The Slattery amendment, if left unchanged, not only prohibits the use of any money designated for this project last year. But, it says that none of the funds appropriated by the act last year, or by any other act may be used for this project. It would in effect say to the people who are involved in this project, you are not eligible to apply for any grant or any opportunity that might be used to advance your project. I think that puts this project at a disadvantage to every other project in the country. I don't think that is what the gentleman from Kansas should intend to do.

This project has been referred to as the Lawrence Welk birthplace project. In fact, the project in south central North Dakota is a project that is a German-Russian heritage interpretive center project that is being completed with enormous effort and commitment of funds from the local area. And is one that is being constructed in the part of North Dakota that has been economically devastated by drought in the past several years.

I wanted to point that out because I think to refer to this as simply Lawrence Welk's birthplace project is not describing for our colleagues the inaccurate picture of what this project is to south central North Dakota.

The project is not to restore the Welk home. That has been done with private funds. This project, as part of a rural development project establishes a German-Russian interpretive center in that part of North Dakota. The bulk of the money will be used for that purpose.

Again, having said all of that, I want the gentleman from Kansas to understand that I have demonstrated on a number of occasions, last year on the MX rail garrison project as I referred to earlier, and also more recently on this specific project a willingness to take the medicine to reduce spending where I felt it was appropriate. I will once again state I felt \$75,000 was appropriate for this project as seed money for what I felt was a worthy project.

I would like to offer a proposition to the House of Representatives. If you intend to proceed with this action on projects of this type, I want to offer an amendment today to add to the list of projects for proposed funding cuts. I present the following five projects to be added to the proposal as an amendment.

First, a \$590,000 appropriation in the interior bill for a new visitor center at the Fort Larned National Historic Sight in Larned, KS. The National Park Service rejected the new center in its long-term plans having concluded that the existing facility was adequate, and the money was added last year in the Senate.

Second, \$150,000 for a study to determine the feasibility of a Pony Express Visitor Center for the Maryville or Hollenberg, KS.

Third, \$100,000 for a feasibility study for Wilson Lake, KS.

Fourth, \$516,000 for the restoration of the McKinley Home in Ohio which was actually owned by former President McKinley's in-laws.

Fifth, \$3.731 million in 1991 for the Throck Morton Plant Science Center at Kansas State University. Funding for this facility was provided even after the feasibility study conducted in 1987 by the USDA concluded that "funding for the proposed plant science center is the responsibility of the State of Kansas, and should not require an appropriation of Federal funds."

It seems to me entirely inconsistent that those who profess to be interested in cutting unnecessary Federal spending are interested only in limiting that to a single project in a State that has only a single vote here in Congress. They have now demonstrated an unwillingness to consider cutting other projects that were added in exactly the same manner to appropriations bills last year—some of which have been recommended not to be funded by the executive agencies and all of which have had no hearings, and no serious discussion. I can only conclude by the unwillingness to add these projects to this amendment that the action today is not a serious attempt to respond to waste, and not even a first step. It is more likely to generate a little press than a little progress.

In its current form, I must vote against the gentleman's amendment because it would not only take the \$500,000 away but it would prohibit this project from applying for any Federal funding or Federal grants from any source, and I think that is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, it is somewhat incongruous to see my friends from Kansas both speak, and the chairman indicated that the Committee on Appropriations has a letter asking for a one-time appropriation of \$5 million for an expansion of a National Agricultural Hall of Fame located in Bonner Springs, KS. That is 10 times the amount of money we are talking about here. I do not have the foggiest idea whether this is a good project or it is not a good project.

But this notion that what is in your district is waste, and what is in my district is fine, is a notion that we ought to explore in some depth, it seems to me. I would like to at least illuminate a few facts.

First of all, we are not talking about money to restore Lawrence Welk's

home. That has been done. It has been done with local money. What they are talking about in the south central portion of North Dakota is a German-Russian interpretive center designed to attract and develop tourism and jobs in the area of the State that has been devastated for 4 years by drought. It is the single biggest area of the State that has been devastated economically by drought.

Nobody needs to talk to me about waste. Last year I stood up here early in the year and opposed \$80 million in funding in my State for the MX Rail Garrison Program, and took a fair amount of flack back in North Dakota for opposing that \$80 million. It was not spent in my State, because the MX Program was scrapped.

On this particular project last year, I indicated that I supported a sum less than the money that was ultimately appropriated, much to the consternation of people in my district as well. I said that publicly and in my district when the money was put in the bill.

So I do not have to be lectured about waste. I have spoken what I have spoken in my district.

But this amendment goes far beyond that. This amendment says that this project shall not accept these funds or be eligible for any other appropriated funds under any other act. That is far beyond the pale, it seems to me.

Let me just demonstrate the problem with this approach. I would like to offer an amendment that demonstrates the problem, if I might, an amendment that will do the following five things.

I would ask that we add as an amendment, and I will make that in order, move the amendment, the following five projects: a \$590,000 appropriation in the Interior bill for a new visitors center at Fort Larned National Historic Site in Larned, KS, one the Park Service rejected, saying the existing facility center was adequate; \$150,000 to determine the feasibility of a Pony Express visitors center in Marysville or Hollenberg, KS; \$100,000 for a feasibility study for Wilson Lake, KS; \$516,000 for restoration of the McKinley home in Ohio, which was actually owned by former President McKinley's in-laws; and, finally, \$3,731,000 for the Throckmorton Plant Science Center at Kansas State University, funding for which as a result of the feasibility study should have been, according to the study, the responsibility of the State of Kansas.

I simply offer these as a demonstration of the trouble we get into in evaluating these projects, and I ask the amendment be considered by the House as an addition to the Slattery amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment that I have just described.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SLATTERY

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota to the amendment offered by Mr. SLATTERY:

At the end of the amendment, insert the following.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 305. (a) Of the funds provided in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts in the following amounts:

Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Construction, \$590,000 that was to be used for a visitor center at Fort Larned National Historic Site, Kansas; and

Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Operation of the National Park System, \$150,000 that was to be used for general management plans for Pony Express; \$125,000 that was to be used for general management plans for Wilson Lake, Kansas; and \$516,000 that was to be used for Statutory and Contractual Aid for the William McKinley Memorial.

(b) Of the funds provided in the Rural Development, Agriculture, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991, the following funds are hereby rescinded:

Agricultural Programs, Cooperative State Research Service, Buildings and Facilities, \$3,731,000 that was to be used for the Throckmorton Plant Science Center, Kansas State University, Kansas.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] will state his point of order.

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

Mr. SLATTERY. I will be happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me just observe that if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] insists on a point of order, he is insisting on a point of order on projects that are identical to the projects that he is bringing to the floor under a waiver of a point of order he sought in the Committee on Rules in order to get it here in the first place. The waiver of the point of order necessary to get it here was requested of the Rules Committee, and he is asserting a point of order against the same kind of projects now.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, my point of order,

Mr. Chairman, is that the amendment by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is out of order. Let me just further respond by saying that none of the projects that the gentleman mentioned, none of them, save the Throckmorton project, is anything I had anything to do with. The Throckmorton project is something that, as far as I am concerned, has gone through the process.

All I am saying is that in the future, projects should be considered on their own merit. Everything that I have done around here, that I have been personally involved with, has gone completely through the process.

That is the thing that I am objecting to, is the fact that the process is sometimes circumvented. I would just point out to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], that if people over on the other side, in the other body, want to do things that in my opinion are not being done properly, that is a matter that the gentleman can deal with. If the gentleman would like to introduce legislation to deal with some of these projects, I would be happy to visit with him about that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I would make the point of order on the point of order that has been reserved, that this would be legislation on appropriation bills, and for that reason would be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] wish to be heard on the point of order as well?

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order that I would be delighted to consider an additional number of pork barrel projects, including any that you have in Ohio, that get done this way. I understand the objection. We are probably going to lose this amendment based on a parliamentary technique. But I want to tell the gentleman, that if he wants to join us in our effort to include more projects like this, I encourage him to do it. I welcome it. I am not here to preserve any of these projects. I think that if we took votes on these in this House, one after another, including bicycle paths that cost money, and trips down canals in Florida, I welcome it.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], I welcome his involvement also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair controls the debate on questions of point of order. The Chair is prepared to rule.

It is clear to the Chair that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is legislation on an appropriations bill,

and therefore the point of order against its consideration is sustained.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear with this effort tonight, that there is some confusion about what our intent here is. The intent of the gentleman from Kansas and myself has never been just to zero in on the Lawrence Welk home. Our intent was to establish a precedent, a shot across the bow, as I said earlier today, that these projects that end up being paid for by taxpayers, inserted in the last moment, not going through the normal legislative procedure, are something we object to.

I want to say to my friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], I do not take issue with him or his project. What I am suggesting is that this procedure is very bad. I think the Congress overall does not want these kinds of projects to be approved.

Now, why did we pick on Lawrence Welk? I will be very clear about it. Because it was the one that got the visibility, where we felt we would have the greatest chance of success here.

But this is not the end of it, as far as I am concerned. I would like to continue to work with the gentleman from Kansas, along with other Members of this House, to look at all these different projects. But we wanted to be politically smart, and that is to come to the floor with a chance of success.

I have been here for 9 years now, and I have never seen a vote on an individual project like this. I think the Committee on Rules should be commended for their bipartisan decision to let us have a chance to vote on this thing. I would hope that we could get a band together of Republicans and Democrats alike who want to send the message that these kinds of spending programs do not make sense.

1920

Some of my colleagues have said this is an important thing. The issue here is not just Lawrence Welk. It is a variety of programs and projects, and I hope we can expand the list.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, last fall we told the American people that every effort had been made to slice fat from the budget. Yet, after all of our assurances that we were on a fat-free diet, Congress couldn't resist voting for half a million dollars to renovate the birthplace of Lawrence Welk. It is no wonder that we have a credibility problem here on Capitol Hill.

The Lawrence Welk appropriation and other equally shameful pork barrel projects confirm that fiscal responsibility is needed now more than ever. Today, thanks to Mr. SLATTERY's amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill, we have an opportunity to restore taxpayer confidence in our pork-cutting abilities. Mr. SLATTERY's amendment would repeal

the half a million dollar appropriation for refurbishing Lawrence Welk's home.

Nothing against Lawrence Welk but it is time to draw the line. I strongly support Mr. SLATTERY's amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Let's show the American people that the days of cheating on our diet are past. Surely, it is time.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, Congress is conducting its Lawrence Welk encore, and I am hopeful that reviews for our sequel performance will be more flattering than those we received for the original.

I rise in support of my colleague, Congressman SLATTERY, and his amendment to prohibit expending the \$500,000 included in the 1991 agriculture appropriations bill to renovate Lawrence Welk's North Dakota birthplace.

Many of us in this body, and many of our constituents, were rightly outraged last year when the Senate added a half-million dollars for this dubious project.

I have nothing against Mr. Welk. In fact, my sister, Mary Ann Flagg, religiously watches the reruns every Saturday night. However, a \$500,000 appropriation to restore his birthplace cannot be justified—especially during this time of recession and severe budget constraints. Further, it's reported that Mr. Welk's family did not ask for the money, and is embarrassed by the controversy surrounding it.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this amendment. And to this waste of precious and scarce Federal money I say "good night, sleep tight, and pleasant dreams to you."

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge support for the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

I have just come from a meeting between several of my colleagues and senior officials of Farmers Home Administration. During this meeting we discussed the utter devastation that many of our farmers have faced because of the severe droughts, and inclement weather conditions across the South.

We also discussed the prospects for a supplemental appropriations bill which would include funding for disaster assistance.

Mr. Chairman, we are having to fight tooth and nail to fund programs which individuals desperately need, and yet \$500,000 was included in the fiscal 1991 Agricultural Appropriations Act to restore the home of an entertainer, Mr. Lawrence Welk.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members of this body to give careful consideration to what they consider national priorities.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. SLATTERY's amendment and rescind this inappropriate spending measure.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for the Slattery amendment rescinding \$500,000 appropriated for establishing a museum and tourist center at Lawrence Welk's birthplace.

The arguments for eliminating funding for this project have been well articulated by my colleagues, and are well known to the American people. Many of my constituents have contacted me asking that no Federal funding go toward this project.

What has received less attention, however, is that for every appropriation like this one that is rescinded, there are dozens of others that

are just as egregious that get funded, such as the \$19 million grant studying flatulent cows' effects on global warming, A \$3 million fish farm, and countless others.

I note that these kinds of expenditures have strikingly similar beginnings: They are often born in the dark of night, behind closed doors, in a 2,000-page unprinted omnibus bill no one has seen—let alone read—in the waning hours of the Congressional session. Appearances suggest the projects cannot stand the light of day; they are added without hearings, without authorization, without administration request, without competition and peer review, and without floor debate. They are usually at the request of an individual member.

In relation to the Government's massive deficit and near quarter of a trillion debt, an amendment cutting \$500,000 may seem insignificant. But, it is significant to the 122 American families who worked an entire year to pay \$500,000 in Federal taxes. Moreover, this amendment is very significant in that it is a beginning. A beginning of the end of business as usual with the way Congress spends taxpayers' money. A beginning of an effort to rescind billions of dollars in pork-barrel expenditures. As Senator Everett Dirksen said, "a billion here and a billion there and pretty soon you're talking about real money."

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 71, noes 11.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Consequences of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, Food Stamps, Unemployment Compensation Administration, Veterans Compensation and Pensions, and Other Urgent Needs Act of 1991".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA) having assumed the chair, Mr. ECKART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1281) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations for the con-

sequences 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, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 365, nays 43, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 35]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie	Browder	DeLay
Ackerman	Brown	Derrick
Alexander	Bruce	Dicks
Anderson	Bryant	Dingell
Andrews (ME)	Bustamante	Dixon
Andrews (NJ)	Byron	Dooley
Andrews (TX)	Camp	Doollittle
Annunzio	Campbell (CA)	Dorgan (ND)
Anthony	Campbell (CO)	Dornan (CA)
Applegate	Cardin	Downey
Aspin	Carper	Dreier
Atkins	Carr	Early
AuCoin	Chandler	Eckart
Bacchus	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Barnard	Clay	Edwards (OK)
Barrett	Clement	Edwards (TX)
Bartlett	Clinger	Emerson
Bateman	Coleman (MO)	Engel
Bellenson	Coleman (TX)	English
Bennett	Collins (IL)	Erdreich
Bentley	Collins (MI)	Espy
Bereuter	Condit	Evans
Berman	Conyers	Fascell
Bevill	Cooper	Fawell
Bilbray	Costello	Fazio
Bilirakis	Coughlin	Feighan
Bliley	Cox (CA)	Fields
Boehlert	Cox (IL)	Fish
Boehner	Coyne	Flake
Bonior	Cramer	Foglietta
Borski	Cunningham	Ford (MI)
Boucher	Darden	Frank (MA)
Boxer	Davis	Franks (CT)
Brewster	de la Garza	Frost
Brooks	DeFazio	Gallegly
Broomfield	DeLauro	Gallo

Gaydos	Manton	Rostenkowski
Gejdenson	Markay	Roukema
Gekas	Marlenee	Rowland
Gephardt	Martin	Sabo
Geren	Martinez	Sanders
Gibbons	Matsui	Sarpallus
Gilchrest	Mavroules	Sawyer
Gillmor	Mazzoli	Saxton
Gilman	McCandless	Schaefer
Gingrich	McCloskey	Scheuer
Glickman	McCollum	Schiff
Gonzalez	McCurdy	Schroeder
Gordon	McDade	Schulze
Goss	McDermott	Schumer
Gray	McEwen	Serrano
Green	McGrath	Sharp
Guarini	McHugh	Shaw
Gunderson	McMillan (NC)	Shays
Hall (OH)	McMillen (MD)	Sikorski
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Siskowski
Hamilton	Meyers	Skaggs
Hammerschmidt	Mfume	Skeen
Harris	Michel	Skelton
Hastert	Miller (CA)	Slattery
Hatcher	Miller (WA)	Slaughter (NY)
Hayes (IL)	Mineta	Slaughter (VA)
Hefner	Mink	Smith (FL)
Heger	Moakley	Smith (IA)
Hertel	Molinari	Smith (NJ)
Hoagland	Mollohan	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Montgomery	Snowe
Hochbrueckner	Moody	Solarz
Holloway	Moran	Solomon
Hopkins	Morella	Spence
Horn	Morrison	Spratt
Horton	Murtha	Staggers
Hoyer	Myers	Stallings
Hughes	Nagle	Stark
Hunter	Natcher	Stearns
Hutto	Neal (MA)	Stokes
Hyde	Neal (NC)	Studds
Inhofe	Nichols	Sundquist
Jacobs	Nowak	Swett
James	Oakar	Swift
Jefferson	Oberstar	Synar
Jenkins	Obey	Tallon
Johnson (CT)	Olin	Tanner
Johnson (SD)	Orton	Tauzin
Johnston	Owens (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Jones (GA)	Owens (UT)	Taylor (NC)
Jones (NC)	Packard	Thomas (CA)
Jontz	Pallone	Thomas (GA)
Kanjorski	Parker	Thornton
Kaptur	Patterson	Torres
Kasich	Paxon	Torricelli
Kennedy	Payne (NJ)	Towns
Kennelly	Payne (VA)	Trafcant
Kildee	Pease	Traxler
Kiecicka	Pelosi	Unsold
Klug	Perkins	Valentine
Kolter	Peterson (FL)	Vander Jagt
Kopetski	Peterson (MN)	Vento
Kostmayer	Pickett	Vislosky
Kyl	Pickle	Volkmer
LaFalce	Poshard	Vucanovich
Lagomarsino	Price	Walsh
Lancaster	Quillen	Washington
Lantos	Rahall	Waters
LaRocco	Ramstad	Waxman
Laughlin	Rangel	Weber
Leach	Ravenel	Weldon
Lehman (CA)	Ray	Wheat
Lehman (FL)	Reed	Whitten
Lent	Regula	Williams
Levin (MI)	Rhodes	Wise
Lewis (CA)	Richardson	Wolf
Lewis (GA)	Ridge	Wolpe
Lightfoot	Riggs	Wyden
Lipinski	Rinaldo	Wylie
Livingston	Ritter	Yates
Lloyd	Roe	Yatron
Long	Roemer	Young (AK)
Lowery (CA)	Rogers	Young (FL)
Lowey (NY)	Rohrabacher	Zeliff
Luken	Ros-Lehtinen	Zimmer
Machtley	Rose	

Huckaby	Petri	Smith (OR)
Kolbe	Roberts	Stenholm
Lewis (FL)	Roth	Stump
Moorhead	Russo	Thomas (WY)
Nussle	Santorum	Upton
Oxley	Savage	Walker
Panetta	Sensenbrenner	
Penny	Shuster	

NOTIFICATION TO MEMBERS ON OFFERING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1175, NATIONAL DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to notify members of the Rules Committee's plans with respect to H.R. 1175, the National Defense Supplemental Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991.

The committee plans to meet next Tuesday, March 12, to take testimony on the bill. To assure fair and timely consideration, the committee is considering a rule that may structure the offering of amendments.

Mr. Speaker, any Member who contemplates offering an amendment to the bill should submit 35 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation by 5 p.m. on this Monday, March 11. The committee offices are in H-312 in the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to all offices explaining our intentions on this bill. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in our effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule.

NOT VOTING—25

Baker	Henry	Porter
Callahan	Ireland	Pursell
Crane	Levine (CA)	Roybal
Donnelly	Madigan	Sangmeister
Durbin	McCrery	Udall
Dwyer	Miller (OH)	Weiss
Dymally	Mrazek	Wilson
Ford (TN)	Murphy	
Gradison	Ortiz	

□ 1942

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

Mr. HERTEL and Mr. BEILENSEN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Henry against.
Mr. Ireland for, with Mr. Pursell against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 180. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to veterans education and employment program, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution designating March 4 through 10, 1991, as "National School Breakfast Week";

H.J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to designate March 26, 1991, as "Education Day, U.S.A."; and

H.J. Res. 167. Joint resolution designating June 14, 1991, and June 14, 1992, each as "Baltic Freedom Day".

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1315, RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION FUNDING ACT OF 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-13) on the resolution (H. Res. 105) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1315) to provide additional funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I asked that the vote be held so that I could get over here. Just as I walked through the door, the machines were closed. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "yea" on the last vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include therein tabular and extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1282, making supplemental appropriations and transfers for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm for fiscal year 1991.

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

There was no objection.

OPERATION DESERT SHIELD/DESERT STORM SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1991

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1282) making supplemental appropriations and transfers for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes;

NAYS—43

Allard	Coble	Grandy
Archer	Combest	Hancock
Army	Dannemeyer	Hansen
Ballenger	Dellums	Hayes (LA)
Barton	Dickinson	Hefley
Bunning	Duncan	Houghton
Burton	Goodling	Hubbard

and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1282, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

□ 1950

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, in last year's act making the first supplemental appropriation for Operation Desert Shield we included authority to establish an account—the defense cooperation account—into which foreign governments and others could make contributions to offset the U.S. cost of the Persian Gulf operation. We required that any funds deposited in that account be made available only in a subsequent appropriation bill.

The request now before the committee from the executive branch is to establish a working capital fund with a \$15,000,000,000 appropriation from the general fund which would then be available for transfer to any DOD appropriation account by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of OMB. The request also proposes to amend the law establishing the defense cooperation account to permit the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of OMB, to transfer funds from that account to any DOD appropriation account.

The bill before the committee today does establish a new account—the Persian Gulf regional defense fund—into which not less than \$27,588,372,000 is transferred from the defense cooperation account and \$15,000,000,000 is appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury. The bill requires defense cooperation account moneys to be used

before the U.S. appropriation can be used.

Appropriations are then, by transfer, made to 18 separate accounts to pay the incremental costs of the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard associated with the war in the Persian Gulf.

Thus, the committee and the Congress retain the normal prerogatives over appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I urge it be adopted.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the supplemental for Desert Storm. And I want to pay special tribute to the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, my colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JACK MURTHA.

My friend and colleague's leadership and foresight on defense issues over the years contributed markedly to the readiness and quality of the forces we sent to the gulf.

And then, over the past 7 critical decision months, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] played a crucial role in forging support in the Congress for the President's remarkable policy, which has liberated Kuwait and brought Saddam Hussein to heel.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has done us all proud.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who was in this Chamber last night, anyone who watched President Bush's address, could not help but be moved, moved to the very marrow of their bones, as we watched the President and his First Lady, Barbara, report to the Nation on their stewardship of the Persian Gulf crisis.

Watching them, I could not help but reflect on the countless solitary decisions they have confronted at this critical juncture of world history—decisions made alone; decisions made correctly.

And I do not mean to imply that this President was acting in a solitary, sequestered fashion.

In the 29 years that I have served in this body I have not seen any Chief Executive reach out as this one did—to the Congress, to the country, to the world—in forging a coalition unparalleled in history and which led to the overwhelming rout of Saddam Hussein.

This President has, indeed, set the stage for a new world order. And in so doing, he has taught us all lessons regarding Presidential leadership in times of great peril, which will be studied by historians for decades to come.

As will the firm, calm leadership of our Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Colin Powell, and Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf. And the bravery, skill, and patriotism of the men and women of our all-volunteer military.

Let me focus now on the legislation before us—the Desert Storm supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, even as our military was displaying new and novel ways of combat in the Middle East, events have conspired to create an equally novel situation with respect to the financing of the operation.

We have seen an unprecedented degree of allied burdensharing. Not only did 31 nations send military forces to the coalition against Iraq, many countries have also joined together to pledge their help in defraying the costs of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

As of today the United States has received over \$16 billion in cash and in-kind support from our allies. Over \$14 billion in cash contributions have been received by our Government—\$2 billion since this past Friday.

And just yesterday, the Japanese Diet, the parliament, gave final approval to its Government's pledge of \$9 billion to the operation.

In all, we have had commitments of nearly \$54 billion. This is a remarkable effort which underscores the solidarity of the international coalition forged so skillfully by the President and the Secretary of State.

We have pored over the estimates provided by the Pentagon and, by and large, found them to be sound.

The administration estimated all costs short of actual combat to come in at—\$40 billion to cover the costs of calling up, deploying, supporting, and bringing the force home.

After review we have shaved this amount by some \$3.5 billion.

In addition we have put in the lowest estimate available to cover the additional costs of combat—some \$6.2 billion.

As a result, in total, we provide specific appropriations to cover \$42.6 billion.

And to give you a feel for how this is broken out—where the actual costs were incurred, and how we allocate this money:

Some \$25 billion is for the operations and maintenance accounts—the added training time, flying and steaming hours, repair and maintenance of the air, land, and sea armada that went to the gulf.

An additional \$270 million is for spare and repair parts.

Nearly \$8 billion is for added personnel costs, the bulk being the callup of over 200,000 Guard and Reserves.

And less than \$3 billion is for actual weapons procurement.

The administration had originally asked for \$6.4 billion in the procurement accounts, to replenish the stocks of smart weapons, of ammunition, of Patriot missiles. They didn't ask for major items like tanks and planes, but expendables—bombs and ammunition.

They asked for \$6.4 billion, but because the war was so brief, we were able to pare this amount for weapons, cut it by more than half, to \$2.9 billion, based on the best information available going into our subcommittee markup last Thursday.

In short, I think we have produced a solid, lean bill which will meet our military's requirements.

And under the mechanism the chairman described, we have tried to ensure that to the largest degree possible the foreign contributions will cover these costs.

If a U.S. dollar is spent, as soon as a foreign dollar comes in, the U.S. dollar goes back to the fund.

I am confident that our allies will meet their pledges. And in the end, when they do, and if the costs don't change, and we do not think they will change much, under the mechanism we have created the \$15 billion we appropriate here today will revert to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been reviewed by the administration and has its approval; it meets the valid needs resulting from Operation Desert Storm; and it must be passed with dispatch.

I urge your overwhelming support.

However, I would like to close with a look to the future.

Over the past 7 months since the invasion of Kuwait, our Nation and indeed the world has seen quite a display. And regardless of all the twists and turns, the emotional highs and lows associated with this crisis, without question one shining, bright constant has been the bravery, the skill, and, yes, the leadership and wisdom that the military forces of the United States of America have shown to the world.

The Congress and the American public have been given every reason to be proud of the men and women who've volunteered to serve the Nation in the Armed Forces. They have every right to be proud and I would add—vindicated.

During the 1980's, there were many bruising debates and arguments—many in this very Chamber—over the size and makeup of the defense budget. These were not idle discussions—they were debates made with great passion and conviction.

But the bottom line is that as a Nation we moved to strengthen the military, to improve their hardware and equipment, to support the costs of an All Volunteer Force.

I do not want to make much more of this. But while we pause to praise the performance of our Armed Forces—I think it is more than appropriate to note that even as our forces were dazzling the world, and routing Saddam Hussein's legions—this Pentagon and this President have gone forward with their plans to dramatically cut the military by over 25 percent by 1995.

We are not debating that build-down today—but I must remind all of you that the same military force we are so proud of at this juncture took over a decade to build and hone.

And if we fail to exercise care and restraint in the months and years ahead, we may well tear the fabric of this force apart.

So in the weeks and months ahead, when we move on beyond this supplemental and rejoin the arduous process of building down our defense posture, the Congress needs to break out its precision tools, and not the buzz saw, as we reshape our military in what is without question still a dangerous and uncertain world.

MURTHA PROVISION IN H.R. 1281 CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S HELPER REGULATIONS

H.R. 1281 contains a limitation provision, added by Rep. Murtha, that forbids the Department of Labor from implementing regulations that would change the way helpers (unskilled workers) are treated under the Davis-Bacon Act;

The Davis-Bacon Act was enacted in 1931 to insure that laborers receive a prevailing wage for their work;

Critics say that Davis-Bacon is costly and imposes Federal regulations on local job markets;

For that reason there have been many attempts to overturn or alter the Davis-Bacon Act since its enactment. The most recent attempt to alter the Act began in 1982 and involves a set of DoL regulations that would permit the use of semi-skilled construction workers or "helpers" on federally-funded or assisted construction projects;

The helper regulations, published by DoL in 1982, permitted wider use of semi-skilled, lower paid helpers under the Act. It said lower paid helpers could be used on Federal projects under a broad definition of duties and in a maximum ratio of two helpers for three journeymen if the helper classification was "identifiable" in an area;

The regulations were enjoined in litigation with the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, and a number of other unions in 1982. Subsequently DoL and the unions have spent most of the past eight years waging legal battles over the "helper" issue in the courts;

Last September 24 the District Court lifted the injunction against the DoL helper regulations, saying that the "... plaintiffs have failed to show that the regulations are irrational or contrary to the language or purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act. ...". The plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the Court of Appeals on October 5, 1990.

The Senate report accompanying H.R. 5257, the FY 91 L/HHS/Ed Appropriations Bill, contained language asking DoL to postpone implementation of the regulation until adequate steps were taken to protect the job opportunities, wages, and fringe benefits of laborers nationwide. On October 31, 1990 Senator Byrd sent a letter to Secretary Dole referencing the Senate language and urging her to postpone implementation of the regulations;

On November 30, 1990 Acting Labor Secretary Roderick DeArment signed the final rule designed to implement the "helper" regulations;

During her confirmation hearing Secretary designate Lynn Martin received requests from several Senators that she postpone im-

plementation of the regulation until the union's appeal was resolved. She stated her intent was to move forward with implementation;

The Administration and DoL have voiced their opposition to the Murtha provision in H.R. 1281 because there is no legal reason why the regulations should not be implemented. A letter from Secretary Martin to Rep. Moakley opposing Murtha's action is attached, as is a copy of the Statement of Administration Policy which also voices opposition to the provision;

During the full committee mark-up Rep. Carl Pursell reserved the right to oppose the provision on the floor;

Rep. Stenholm spoke against Murtha's provision in the Rules Committee and requested an amendment striking it from the bill. Rep. Petri submitted a written statement supporting Stenholm's position;

According to OMB the helper regulation is expected to save about \$550 million in budget authority and \$178 million in outlays in FY 92. After the regulations are fully implemented, federal construction costs would be reduced by almost \$600 million per year in both BA and outlays;

The unions support Rep. Murtha's provision in H.R. 1281;

Previous attempts to weaken the Davis-Bacon Act in the way DoL proposes have met with overwhelming defeat on the House floor;

Arguments in favor of retaining Murtha's provision include:

The unions want the provision retained; Congress, not DoL, should be the only group to make changes in the Davis-Bacon Act;

The full effect of the proposed DoL regulations have not yet been explored, more time is needed; and

Skilled laborers would be placed at-risk of losing their jobs to less skilled workers willing to work for a lower (less than prevailing) wage.

Arguments in favor of deleting Murtha's provision include:

Secretary Martin and the rest of the Administration want to implement the regulations;

Nine years is enough time for the helper regulations to be debated, if DoL has met the standards of the Courts and has made a good faith effort to work out disagreements with the unions then DoL should be allowed to implement their regulations;

If implemented the regulation could save the federal government \$500 million in construction contract costs;

A supplemental appropriations bill is the wrong place for this type of provision.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, DC, March 6, 1991.

Hon. JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that the Rules Committee will be meeting this afternoon to consider the nature of the rule governing House debate on H.R. 1281, the "Dire Emergency Supplemental." This letter is to express the Administration's strong objection to a Murtha amendment which was accepted yesterday by the House Appropriations Committee in its consideration of H.R. 1281. The Murtha amendment would prohibit the Department of Labor from expending funds to administer regulations governing the use of semi-skilled helpers on federal-financed and assisted construction contracts subject to the Davis-

Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA). (These regulations went into effect on February 4, 1991.) It would also enjoin the Department from promulgating final regulations pertaining to revisions to the apprenticeship programs in the construction industry.

I oppose this amendment and its purposes. I also oppose legislating substantive labor policy in an appropriations bill. An appropriations bill is not the appropriate vehicle for introducing significant reversals in established governmental policies. For these reasons, I am asking that the Committee agree to a rule that provides for an "up or down" consideration of the Murtha language on the House floor.

The issues underlying the DBRA regulations have been examined extensively over the past decade, and the Department's authority to implement them has been sustained through the courts. The objections to these regulations were considered in the courts and were rejected. The helper regulations reflect a longstanding position of the Executive Branch over the last decade.

These regulations set no government-imposed constraints or conditions on construction contractors or construction workers. The employment of helpers is permitted only when their use is the prevailing practice in an area. The regulations do place limits on the ratio of helpers to journeymen to prevent abuses—their use is limited to two for every three journeymen.

Permitting the use of helpers, according to local industry practices, will:

Provide increased job opportunities for semi-skilled workers and encourage their use in a manner which provides training;

Update outmoded practices under Davis-Bacon to more accurately reflect widespread industry practices thereby enhancing private sector competition on Federal construction projects;

Save the Federal government a substantial amount in construction labor costs (estimated to be at least \$500 million in FY 1992).

The proposed revisions to the regulations governing the Department's registration of traditional apprenticeship programs were published after two years of research, review, and discussion in an open and public debate on the issues. The purpose was to streamline and update these regulations as part of an overall Departmental program to expand apprenticeship to additional occupations and industries and to maintain and improve the quality of all apprenticeship programs. These regulations would require State Apprenticeship Councils to promptly advise a sponsor of a proposed apprenticeship program of a decision on the sponsor's request and furnish an explanation of the decision in the event of a denial. In addition, there would be the right of appeal to the Department of Labor if the request was denied.

The changes proposed in the revised regulations are intended to reduce subjectivity and the opportunity for bias in determining conditions for program registration and in the monitoring of programs. Background information on the helper regulations is enclosed.

When put in place, these revised regulations will:

Ensure that all registered programs meet consistent, high quality standards;

Ensure that all potential program sponsors are treated fairly by setting up a Departmental appeal process;

Establish a uniform Federal standard for registering apprenticeship programs, with allowances for State flexibility for specific State purposes.

In addition, I would point out that these regulations are still in proposed form. We will keep the Congress informed as the rule-making proceeds.

For the foregoing reasons, the Administration asks that the Rules Committee would grant a rule which allows for the "up or down" consideration of the Murtha amendment.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the transmittal of this letter from the standpoint of the President's program.

Sincerely,

LYNN MARTIN.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, currently before you is the supplemental bill for Desert Shield/Desert Storm, fiscal year 1991.

Before I explain to the House the contents of this supplemental bill, I would like to make a few comments.

First of all Mr. Chairman, we must never forget that despite the great military success of Desert Shield and the remarkably low number of allied casualties, there were a number of Americans who paid the ultimate price. I am sad to say, Mr. Chairman, that probably no congressional district suffered more casualties than my district, the 12th District of Pennsylvania.

Five soldiers from families in my district were killed in Desert Storm. Four of them died in the SCUD attack that hit the barrack in Dhahran.

I would like to place in the RECORD the names of those five soldiers:

Sgt. John Boxler;

Spec. Frank S. Keough;

Spec. Richard V. Wolverton;

Spec. Stephen Siko; and

Lance Cpl. James E. Waldron.

Second, Mr. Chairman, I would like to salute all of the brave men and women who served in the Persian Gulf. As we say in our supplemental report: The sacrifices they endured; the skill with which they carried out their duties; the courage with which they conducted operations; and the swiftness and totality of their victory is a source of enormous pride to all Americans.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the American defense industry for the development and manufacturing of the vast array of equipment that worked so well in Desert Storm. The preciseness of the new generations of weapons enabled us to achieve a rapid decisive victory, while simultaneously minimizing casualties and collateral damage.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the Congress.

There was a vigorous but civil debate.

During the debate, the distinguished Speaker, Mr. FOLEY, delivered one of

the most eloquent speeches that has ever been given in this Chamber.

I would like to thank the distinguished minority leader, Mr. MICHEL and the gentleman from New York, Mr. SOLARZ, for the leadership they provided in the passage of the MICHEL—SOLARZ resolution which gave congressional support to the United States resolutions on Kuwait.

Once the majority in Congress had spoken in passage of that resolution, almost everyone who serves in this body rallied around the flag and supported the will of the majority.

SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

With regard to the specifics of this supplemental bill, I will be brief.

It places a ceiling of \$42.6 billion on the total funds that can be used to pay the incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm and allocates these funds by appropriation account.

It appropriates \$15 billion in new budget authority to the newly created Persian Gulf regional defense fund.

It places the following restrictions on this fund:

First, the new budget authority can be obligated only after the gift fund money is exhausted;

Second, any balances of new budget authority remaining in the fund unexpended after all expenses have been paid will be returned to the treasury.

Third, as gift fund money is received, the defense fund balance is restored to the \$15 billion level.

Fourth, requires that the fuel price increase apply only to fuel consumed in direct support of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

Also the committee reduced the category of near-term investment costs by \$3.5 billion and provided combat costs at the lowest per day rate estimated by the Defense Department, \$150 million per day for 42 days

I urge support for this supplemental. Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1282

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, namely:

PERSIAN GULF REGIONAL DEFENSE FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For incremental costs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Transportation associated with operations in and around the Persian Gulf as part of operations currently known as Operation Desert Shield (including Operation Desert Storm), \$15,000,000,000 is appropriated to the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund, which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, and in addition such sums as nec-

essary are appropriated to such Fund by transfer from current and future balances in the Defense Cooperation Account, such sums so appropriated to the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund to be available only for transfer in a total amount not to exceed \$42,588,372,000 to the following chapters and accounts in not to exceed the following amounts:

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army", \$4,863,700,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy", \$797,400,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps", \$983,400,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force", \$1,278,200,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army", \$16,393,750,000, of which \$350,000 shall be available only for the 1991 Memorial Day Celebration.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy", \$3,009,500,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", \$1,330,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", \$4,080,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies", \$236,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", \$16,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", \$55,000,000.

PROCUREMENT

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft procurement, Army", \$7,100,000.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Missile procurement, Army", \$311,900,000.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED

COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army", \$26,300,000.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of ammunition, Army", \$437,000,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Other procurement, Army", \$30,300,000.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Aircraft procurement, Navy", \$16,000,000.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Weapons procurement, Navy", \$1,065,100,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Other procurement, Navy", \$34,600,000.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Marine Corps", \$68,000,000.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft procurement, Air Force", \$101,200,000.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Missile procurement, Air Force", \$400,000,000.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Other procurement, Air Force", \$419,100,000.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Procurement, Defense Agencies", \$2,700,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND

EVALUATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND

EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army", \$1,200,000.

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

ARMY STOCK FUND

For an additional amount for "Army Stock Fund", \$57,000,000.

AIR FORCE STOCK FUND

For an additional amount for "Air Force Stock Fund", \$214,000,000.

COMBAT COSTS OF OPERATION DESERT

SHIELD/DESERT STORM

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to finance the estimated partial costs of combat and other related costs of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm in the following additional amounts: for Operation and maintenance, \$5,000,000,000; for Procurement, \$1,300,000,000; In all: \$6,300,000,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. (a) In administering the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund, the Secretary of Defense shall use the corpus of the Fund only to the extent that amounts transferred to the Fund from the Defense Cooperation Account established under section 2608 of title 10, United States Code, are not currently available.

(b) If the balance of the corpus of the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund is less than \$15,000,000,000, the Secretary shall transfer amounts from the Defense Cooperation Account to the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund, to the extent that amounts are available in that Account, to restore the balance in the corpus of the Fund to \$15,000,000,000.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "corpus of the Fund" means the amount of \$15,000,000,000 appropriated by this Act to the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund from the general fund of the Treasury, as such amount is restored from time to time by transfers from the Defense Cooperation Account.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 102. (a) The authority provided in this Act to transfer funds from the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this or any other Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1991.

(b) Amounts transferred from the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred.

(c) Amounts appropriated to the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund shall remain available until transferred.

(d)(1) Upon payment of all incremental costs associated with the purpose for which the Persian Gulf Regional Defense Fund is established, the Fund shall be terminated.

(2) If the balance in the Fund at the time of the termination is \$15,000,000,000 or less, the balance shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury. If the balance in the Fund at the time of the termination is in excess of \$15,000,000,000, the amount of \$15,000,000,000 shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury and the remaining amount shall revert to the Defense Cooperation Account.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 103. (a) For the purpose of adjusting amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1991 to reflect changes in expenses due to the order to active duty (other than for training) of members of the National Guard and Reserves in connection with operations in and around the Persian Gulf as part of operations currently known as Operation Desert Shield (including Operation Desert Storm), the Secretary of Defense may during fiscal year 1991 transfer not to exceed \$446,000,000 among the fiscal year 1991 Military Personnel appropriation accounts of the Department of Defense.

(b) Amounts transferred under subsection (a) shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred.

(c) A transfer of funds under subsection (a) is subject to regular congressional reprogramming notification requirements.

(d) The transfer authority in subsection (a) is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this or any other Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1991.

SEC. 104. Of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act, the amount for fuel price increases shall be allocated only to the fuel consumed in direct support of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

SEC. 105. Any CHAMPUS (Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services) medical provider may voluntarily waive the patient co-payment for medical services provided from August 2, 1990, until the termination of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm for dependents of active duty personnel: *Provided*, That the government's share of medical services is not increased during the specified time period.

SEC. 106. Mitchel Field Health Care Facility in the State of New York shall only be funded from the Operation and Maintenance, Navy, appropriation and shall not be funded or included within the congressionally imposed ceiling of the Uniformed Services Treatment Facility account.

CHAPTER II

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Construction, Army", \$35,000,000, to remain

available for obligation until September 30, 1994.

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", \$18,922,000.

This Act may be cited as the "Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1991".

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 11, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore. [Mr. FASCELL] having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1282) making supplemental appropriations and transfers for Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURTHA. 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 380, nays 19, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—380

Abercrombie	Archer	Bateman
Ackerman	Armey	Bellenson
Alexander	Aspin	Bennett
Allard	Atkins	Bentley
Anderson	AuCoin	Bereuter
Andrews (ME)	Bacchus	Berman
Andrews (NJ)	Ballenger	Bevill
Andrews (TX)	Barnard	Bilbray
Annunzio	Barrett	Bilirakis
Anthony	Bartlett	Billey
Applegate	Barton	Boehlert

Boehner	Gray	McNulty
Boniior	Green	Meyers
Borski	Guarini	Michel
Boucher	Gunderson	Miller (CA)
Boxer	Hall (OH)	Miller (WA)
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Mineta
Brooks	Hamilton	Mink
Broomfield	Hammerschmidt	Molinari
Browder	Hancock	Mollohan
Brown	Hansen	Montgomery
Bruce	Harris	Moody
Bryant	Hastert	Moorhead
Bunning	Hatcher	Moran
Burton	Hayes (LA)	Morella
Bustamante	Hefley	Morrison
Byron	Hefner	Murtha
Camp	Herger	Myers
Campbell (CA)	Hertel	Nagle
Campbell (CO)	Hoagland	Natcher
Cardin	Hobson	Neal (MA)
Carper	Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)
Carr	Holloway	Nichols
Chandler	Hopkins	Nowak
Chapman	Horn	Oakar
Clement	Horton	Oberstar
Clinger	Houghton	Obey
Coble	Hoyer	Olin
Coleman (MO)	Hubbard	Orton
Coleman (TX)	Huckaby	Owens (UT)
Collins (MI)	Hughes	Oxley
Combest	Hunter	Packard
Condit	Hutto	Pallone
Cooper	Hyde	Panetta
Costello	Inhofe	Patterson
Coughlin	Jacobs	Paxon
Cox (CA)	James	Payne (VA)
Cox (IL)	Jefferson	Pease
Coyne	Jenkins	Pelosi
Cramer	Johnson (SD)	Penny
Cunningham	Johnston	Perkins
Dannemeyer	Jones (GA)	Peterson (FL)
Darden	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)
Davis	Jontz	Petri
de la Garza	Kanjorski	Pickett
DeFazio	Kaptur	Pickle
DeLauro	Kasich	Poshard
Derrick	Kennedy	Price
Dickinson	Kennelly	Rahall
Dicks	Kildee	Ramstad
Dingell	Kleczka	Ravenel
Dooley	Klug	Ray
Doolittle	Kolbe	Reed
Dorgan (ND)	Kolter	Regula
Dorman (CA)	Kopetski	Rhodes
Downey	Kostmayer	Richardson
Duncan	Kyl	Ridge
Durbin	LaFalce	Riggs
Early	Lagomarsino	Rinaldo
Eckart	Lancaster	Ritter
Edwards (CA)	Lantos	Roberts
Edwards (OK)	LaRocco	Roe
Edwards (TX)	Laughlin	Roemer
Emerson	Leach	Rogers
Engel	Lehman (CA)	Rohrabacher
English	Lehman (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Erdreich	Lent	Rose
Espy	Levin (MI)	Rostenkowski
Evans	Lewis (CA)	Roth
Fascell	Lewis (FL)	Roukema
Fawell	Lightfoot	Rowland
Fazio	Lipinski	Russo
Feighan	Livingston	Sabo
Fields	Lloyd	Sanders
Fish	Long	Santorum
Foglietta	Lowery (CA)	Sarpalius
Ford (MI)	Lowey (NY)	Sawyer
Frank (MA)	Luken	Saxton
Frank (CT)	Machtley	Schaefer
Frost	Manton	Scheuer
Galleghy	Markey	Schiff
Gallo	Marlenee	Schroeder
Gaydos	Martinez	Schulze
Gejdenson	Matsui	Schumer
Gekas	Mavroules	Sensenbrenner
Gephardt	Mazzoli	Sharp
Geren	McCandless	Shaw
Gibbons	McCloskey	Shays
Gilchrest	McCollum	Shuster
Gillmor	McCurdy	Sikorski
Gilman	McDade	Sisisky
Gingrich	McDermott	Skaggs
Glickman	McEwen	Skeen
Goodling	McGrath	Skelton
Gordon	McHugh	Slattery
Goss	McMillan (NC)	Slaughter (NY)
Grandy	McMillen (MD)	Slaughter (VA)

Smith (FL)	Tallon	Walker
Smith (IA)	Tanner	Walsh
Smith (NJ)	Tauzin	Waxman
Smith (OR)	Taylor (MS)	Weber
Smith (TX)	Taylor (NC)	Weiss
Snowe	Thomas (CA)	Weldon
Solarz	Thomas (GA)	Wheat
Solomon	Thomas (WY)	Whitten
Spence	Thornton	Wise
Spratt	Torres	Wolf
Stallings	Trafcant	Wolpe
Stark	Traxler	Wyden
Stearns	Unsoeld	Wylie
Stenholm	Upton	Yates
Studds	Valentine	Yatron
Stump	Vander Jagt	Young (AK)
Sundquist	Vento	Young (FL)
Swett	Visclosky	Zeliff
Swift	Volkmr	Zimmer
Synar	Vucanovich	

NAYS—19

Clay	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Collins (IL)	Mfume	Stokes
Conyers	Nussle	Towns
Dellums	Owens (NY)	Washington
Flake	Payne (NJ)	Waters
Gonzalez	Rangel	
Hayes (IL)	Savage	

NOT VOTING—34

Baker	Ireland	Porter
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Pursell
Crane	Levine (CA)	Quillen
DeLay	Madigan	Roybal
Dixon	Martin	Sangmeister
Donnelly	McCrery	Staggers
Dreier	Miller (OH)	Torricelli
Dwyer	Moakley	Udall
Dymally	Mrazek	Williams
Ford (TN)	Murphy	Wilson
Gradison	Ortiz	
Henry	Parker	

□ 2013

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present on the House floor for rollcall No. 35 and rollcall No. 36.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both votes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this 1-minute for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the program for the balance of this week and, more important, the program for next week.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], my distinguished friend.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for yielding.

Obviously our business is finished for today. There will not be legislative business on tomorrow.

On Monday, March 11, the House will meet at noon, but there will not be legislative business.

On Tuesday, March 12, the House will meet at noon to consider House Concurrent Resolution 45, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust and H.R. 1315, the Resolution Trust Corporation funding, modified closed rule, 1 hour of debate.

Wednesday, March 13, the House will meet at 2 p.m. to consider under suspension H.R. 751, the National Literacy Act of 1991, and H.R. 1175, the Desert Storm emergency authorization, subject to a rule.

On Thursday, March 14, the House will meet at 11 a.m., but there will not be legislative business, nor will there be votes.

On Friday, March 15, the House will not be in session.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 11, 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 7, 1991, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY,
MARCH 13, 1991, CONSIDERATION
OF MOTION ON H.R. 751,
THE NATIONAL LITERACY ACT
OF 1991

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, March 13, to consider a motion pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXVII on H.R. 751, the National Literacy Act of 1991.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 29 on H.R. 991 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 29, in the permanent RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

□ 2020

AGREEMENT BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND AUSTRIA ON SOCIAL SECURITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS of New York) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216; 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith the Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria on Social Security, which consists of two separate instruments—a principal agreement and an administrative arrangement. The Agreement was signed at Vienna on July 13, 1990.

The United States-Austria Agreement is similar in objective to the social security agreements already in force with Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation, and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a comprehensive report prepared by the Department of Health and Human Services, which explains the provisions of the Agreement and provides data on the number of persons affected by the Agreement and the effect on social security financing as required by the same provision of the Social Security Act. I note that the Department of State and the Department of Health and Human Services have recommended the Agreement and related documents to me.

I commend the United States-Austria Social Security Agreement and related documents.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 7, 1991.

NATIONAL AMERICAN INDIAN
HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that I am introducing legislation which will designate November as National American Indian Heritage Month.

Last year, the Congress passed and the President signed into law, for the first time, legislation setting aside a full month for our Nation to recognize and celebrate the American Indians' proud heritage. This year I hope to find support in the Halls of this great Chamber to make the month of November, National American Indian Heritage Month on a permanent basis. I know there is support in both the House and Senate for this step, and I can see as a most appropriate time as we approach 500 years since the arrival of Christopher Columbus in the Western Hemisphere.

This year's legislation gives special recognition to the American Indians' contributions to the United States; the American Indians have also contributed substantially to the entire world in the areas of agriculture, medicine, government organization, linguistics and the arts.

Mr. Speaker, native American culture has been known since prehistoric times for its philosophy of unity of human life, animal life, water, and land. I hope that now, 499 years after the arrival of the culture that so decimated the Indians, and 100 years after our own battles with this culture and people, we can find it only proper to give permanent recognition to the original inhabitants of our great Nation and throughout the Western Hemisphere.

H.J. RES. —

Whereas American Indians were the original inhabitants of the lands that now constitute the United States of America;

Whereas American Indians have made an essential and unique contribution to our Nation, not the least of which is contribution of most of the land which now comprises these United States;

Whereas American Indians have made essential contributions to the world, including prehistoric cultivation and harvesting of corn, squash, peppers, beans, and sweet potatoes, all of which have become mainstays of the American diet;

Whereas the people of the United States should be reminded of the assistance given to the early European visitors to North America by the ancestors of today's American Indians, including knowledge and training provided to the pilgrims in how to plant, fer-

tilize, and cultivate corn, beans, squash, and tobacco; how and where to fish and hunt; how and where to tap maple syrup; and the location of the best routes west.

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the assistance given to this country's Founding Fathers by the ancestors of today's American Indians including the support the original inhabitants provided to George Washington and his troops during the winter of 1777-1778, which they spent in Valley Forge;

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded that certain concepts such as freedom of speech, the separation of powers in government, and the balance of power within government, all of which were found in the political systems of various American Indian nations, influenced the formulation of the Government of the United States of America;

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the advanced medicines used by American Indians prior to the arrival of Europeans, many of which are still in use today, including quinine for the cure of many ailments; hemlock and pine leaves as a source of vitamin C to cure scurvy; coca leaves to reduce hunger, drowsiness, and thirst; curare, from the vine *Chondodendron*, as a fast-acting poison for arrow tips (now used as a muscle relaxant and for treating tetanus); and ipecac, from the root of *Cephalalis ipecacuanha*, to treat dysentery.

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the many words in the English language still in use today, including hickory, moose, raccoon, caucus, tamarack, caribou, maize, canoe, chocolate, chili, pecan, coyote, hurricane, and possibly the expression O.K. (from the Choctaw "okeh");

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of prominent American Indian performers, artisans and scholars, including Will Rogers, Jr., actor; Buffy Sainte-Marie, musician; Louis Ballard, composer; Black Elk, philosopher; and Vine Deloria, Jr., author.

Whereas the people and Government of the United States should be reminded of the benefits of conservation and reverence for the earth and life practiced by American Indians for centuries and yet still disregarded by many of us living today;

Whereas the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives believe that a resolution and proclamation of the nature requested in this resolution can encourage self-esteem, pride and self-awareness to young American Indians;

Whereas the approaching 500th anniversary of the arrival of Christopher Columbus to the Western Hemisphere provides an opportunity for the people of the United States to consider and reflect on our Nation's current relationship with today's American Indians; and

Whereas the month of November concluded the traditional harvest season of the American Indians and was generally a time of celebration and giving thanks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That beginning in 1991 and thereafter, the month of November is designated as "National American Indian Heritage Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon Federal, State, and local governments, interested groups and organizations, and the people of the United States

to observe the month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SPACE SHUTTLE BELONGS TO AMERICAN PEOPLE

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, isn't it strange that the more things change the more they remain the same. Whenever I pick up a paper, it seems there's an article about a foreign company buying or wanting to buy or rent something of value developed by Americans.

Recently, I read that Nippon Television Network has announced its intentions at whatever it costs to rent our valuable national space treasures for a commercial celebration for the Japanese network's 40th anniversary. Nippon Television wants to obtain the shuttle *Enterprise*, an Apollo capsule, a rocket, a spacesuit, and moon conveyor vehicle for a year.

Nippon has hustled Smithsonian officials in a series of meetings over the last year and, claims it is a done deal. But a Smithsonian official stated "the Japanese company is counting its spacecraft before they've been launched." I second that remark. Why should they have our national space treasures? Nippon TV is not in the space business—or is it?

Japan is engaged in an aggressive space program and intends in the next year to at least launch satellites and rockets. With its H-2 rocket, Japan through a joint venture of 75 companies, is making a real bid for international satellite launchings and, is competing with the United States.

Regardless of what Japan wants to pursue, America's national space treasures belong with the Smithsonian. Nippon Television should not have an Apollo capsule for any reason, particularly for a commercial event for the company.

The American people paid for the United States' space effort with our tax dollars. Japanese television may covet our space treasures, but they should have to wait for the cow to jump over the Moon before they rent our Moon conveyor vehicle, an Apollo capsule.

The Japanese network has more than a passing commercial interest in space. Last year the sale of TV sets fitted for satellite reception increased by 409 percent from the previous year. This year an official of the television network announced the need for an international news network as an answer to America's CNN.

A network official recently flew in space with the Russians at a cost of \$30 million. Now the television network is willing to spend another \$30 million for the space shuttle. Why are they willing to spend millions and go to the effort

of a fast hustle of the Smithsonian officials for something that rightfully belongs to the American people? It certainly isn't for public relations.

The space treasures of America would serve only as a public relations event for the network and highlight a strategic aim of the Japanese Government in space.

The fact Japan wants to buy or rent the best of America is nothing new, whether it is in space, on the ground, our patents or the entertainment industry. Anything we do well, they want to buy.

Japanese companies recently bought our flagship properties, the Rockefeller Center and Pebble Beach and several more spectacular golf courses. Dai-Ichi Corp. of Myrtle Beach, SC is marketing 75 of our golf courses to Japanese buyers.

In addition Japanese companies have purchased 40 percent of our movie studios. What makes this such a poor deal for the United States is it places Japan squarely in the market to attack aggressively our electronics industry.

The National Journal reports that the prosperity of the American economy is increasingly tied to Hollywood's well-being. It reports that television and movie businesses now annually generate a \$4.5 billion trade surplus, second only to the aerospace industry for the United States.

This latest effort by Nippon Television looks like one more coordinated governmental attack on another American industry. What will be the slogan for Japan's space program? Instead of Neal Armstrong's "One small step for man, one giant step for mankind," will it be "one small step for man and one large step for Japan?"

TRIBUTE TO THE "ORANGE RIBBON LADY," ELLEN LAMBING

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

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, over the last week, we have heard about the heroic and victorious American men and women who fought in the Middle East as part of Operation Desert Storm.

And what a remarkable joy they have done. These men and women deserve every bit of praise they have received, they will receive, and even more.

Throughout America there have been thousands who have served by standing in waiting for our troops. Their energy and enthusiasm has been a testament to the support all of America shares for our men and women in the Persian Gulf. Their work has been selfless and their support for the families and friends of our Armed Forces has had an immeasurable benefit for our Nation.

I would like to draw your attention to a woman in my district who has made an indelible difference in count-

less peoples' lives. Known to many people as the Orange Ribbon Lady, Ellen Lambing is the founder of the military support group, Operation Orange Ribbon.

Words cannot express the gratitude greater Cincinnati feels toward Ellen today for all of her unselfish and generous work on behalf of our troops who served so valiantly in the Persian Gulf. She has been there for every family in need during the Persian Gulf conflict.

I know by now you are all familiar with the orange ribbons flying throughout our Nation. We have one woman to thank for that, Ellen Lambing. Ellen's idea to tie on an orange ribbon to show support for U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf has caught on nationwide. Even Barbara Bush took a giant orange bow from Ellen for the White House.

Ellen founded Operation Orange Ribbon on August 2, the day Iraqi President Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. This group has grown from what she originally thought would be a group of about 10 or 15 people in her living room to a nonprofit corporation complete with a board of directors serving thousands in our area.

The heart of the organization is the thousands of volunteers both in Cincinnati and throughout the country who spend countless hours working for the support group. Their leader and inspiration is Ellen Lambing.

Ellen has been described as magnetic, energetic, and tireless. She kept busy with her full days volunteering for Operation Orange Ribbon, but everybody knows she will continue her efforts until all troops have come home to American soil. I suspect she'll continue supporting veterans of the Persian Gulf long into the future. She loves her troops that much.

Thank you, Ellen Lambing, for all you have done for our Nation and for our troops. You are an inspiration to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from the neighboring district in Cincinnati. I, too, want to commend the troops, our men, and women who fought so bravely representing the United States and the allied coalition in the Middle East. The support that was given by the families and the people throughout America is commendable. Certainly the efforts of Ellen Lambing from nearby Cincinnati played a great role in helping to stir that activity, certainly in Cincinnati, and throughout even my district.

Mr. Speaker, it was not long after the troops were in the Middle East that orange ribbons began to show up all through the district. I know on a number of occasions over the last few months I spent time with Ellen Lambing. As a matter of fact, my wife even today was at a junior high school

in my neighborhood with Ellen, where this large group of junior high students honored Ellen for her activity throughout Ohio and throughout our country in getting solid support for the troops in the Middle East.

□ 2030

I want to take this moment to thank Ellen Lambing for her bravery, thank her for her efforts on behalf of the men and women who have supported us in the Middle East, and on behalf of all of the families that have loved ones there.

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE
ON BUDGET REGARDING CUR-
RENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND
REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR
1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OWENS of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of spending, credit, and revenues for fiscal year 1991. This is the second report of the first session of the 102d Congress.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, credit authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

Current level reports are intended to provide Members information to compare enacted spending and revenues with the aggregate ceilings on budget authority, outlays, and revenues established in a budget resolution, and also to compare enacted legislation with the allocations of new discretionary budget authority, entitlement authority, and credit authority made to a committee pursuant to subsection 302(a) of the Budget Act. This report compares the spending, credit, and revenue levels in current level with those assumed in the conference report to accompany the budget resolution for fiscal year 1991, House Concurrent Resolution 310. The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 10, 1990, page H9280.

Current level reports provide information that is necessary for enforcing section 311 of the Budget Act. Section 311(a) prohibits the consideration of a spending or revenue measure if the adoption of that measure would cause the ceiling on total new budget authority or total outlays set in the budget resolution for a fiscal year to be exceeded or would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level of revenues set forth in the budget resolution.

Section 311(b) provides an exception to the 311(a) point of order for measures that would breach the ceilings on total spending set forth in the budget resolution but would not cause a committee to exceed its appropriate allocation of discretionary spending made pursuant to section 302(a) of the Budget Act. Such an exception was first provided by the budget resolution for fiscal year 1985, House Concurrent Resolution 280, 98th Congress. The exception was made permanent by the amendments to the Budget Act included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985—Public Law 99-177, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. This exception is intended to protect a committee that has stayed within its allocation of discretionary budget authority and new entitlement authority from points of order if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control.

Section 311(c) of the Budget Act provides that, for purposes of enforcing section 311, the levels of new budget authority, entitlement authority, outlays, and revenues shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget. Current level reports represent partial fulfillment of this enforcement responsibility of the Budget Committee by providing both estimates of enacted aggregate spending and revenues, and, for purposes of determining the applicability of the section 311(b) exception, estimates of the relationship between the budgetary effect of enacted legislation within a committee's jurisdiction and the allocation of spending authority made to that committee.

The estimates in this report are based on economic and technical assumptions in place at the time of the adoption of the budget resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 106, on May 18, 1989. This is intended to protect committees which acted on the basis of the assumptions of the budget resolution from changes in economic and technical factors over which they have no control. Unless the Congress adopts a subsequent budget resolution for a fiscal year that alters the assumptions concerning legislative actions, committees should be able to expect that measures that conform with the budget resolution will not be subject to points of order for violation of the Budget Act. To do otherwise and base enforcement on constantly changing economic and technical estimates would seriously disrupt the legislative process, penalize committees that are unable to complete work on legislation within a short period after adoption of budget resolution, and undermine respect for budget enforcement procedures.

In addition to section 311, the Budget Act contains another point of order that requires Budget Committee estimates for enforcement. Section 302(f)(1) of the Budget Act prohibits the consideration of a measure providing new budget authority, new entitlement authority, or new credit authority if the adoption of that measure would cause a committee to exceed its allocation of new spending or credit authority made pursuant to subsection 302(b) of the Budget Act. The 302(b) allocation is a subdivision of the new spending, new entitlement, and new credit authority allocated to a committee pursuant to section 302(a), among either the subcommittees of that committee or among programs over which the committee

has jurisdiction. This point of order was added to the Budget Act by the amendments included in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Section 302(g) provides that the enforcement of section 302 shall be based on estimates of spending and credit authority made by the Committee on the Budget. The Budget Committee fulfills this responsibility by providing, as necessary, a separate section 302 status report to the Speaker.

For information purposes only, current level reports will continue to include a comparison of the budget and credit authority divided among the Appropriations subcommittees by that committee's 302(b) division with the actual enacted spending and credit legislation within each subcommittee's jurisdiction.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 6, 1991.

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 30, 1976, the Committee on the Budget outlined the procedure which it had adopted in connection with its responsibilities under Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, to provide estimates of the current level of revenues and spending.

I am herewith transmitting the status report under H. Con. Res. 310, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 1991.

In the House of Representatives, the procedural situation for fiscal year 1991 with regard to the spending ceilings (total new budget authority and total outlays) and the revenue floor is affected by Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended by P.L. 99-177. Section 311(a) prohibits the consideration of a spending or revenue measure which would cause the ceiling on total new budget authority or total outlays set in the budget resolution for a fiscal year to be exceeded or would cause total revenues to be less than the appropriate level set in the budget resolution. Section 311(b) provides an exception to the 311(a) point of order for measures which would breach the ceilings on total spending in the budget resolution but would not cause a committee to exceed its "appropriate allocation" of new discretionary budget authority or new entitlement authority under Section 302(a) of the Budget Act.

The intent of Section 311(b) of the Budget Act is to protect a committee that has stayed within its spending authority allocations—new discretionary budget authority or new entitlement authority—from points of order if the total spending ceilings have been breached for reasons outside of its control. The 302(a) allocations to House committees made pursuant to the conference report on H. Con. Res. 310 were printed in the Congressional Record on October 10, 1990, page H. 9280.

The enclosed tables compare enacted legislation to each committee's 302(a) allocation of discretionary budget authority, new entitlement authority, new direct loan obligations and new primary loan guarantee commitments. The estimates of spending and revenues for purposes of the application of points of order under the Budget Act are based upon the economic and technical as-

sumptions underlying the fiscal year 1991 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 310.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1991 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 310

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MAR. 5, 1991

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Appropriate level	1,485,600	1,236,900	1,172,900
Current level	1,481,536	1,236,224	1,176,177
Amount under ceilings	4,064	676	
Amount over floor			3,277

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure which provides budget or entitlement authority and which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$4,064 million in budget authority for fiscal year 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310 to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure which increases outlays and which is not included in the current level estimate and that exceeds \$676 million for fiscal 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310 to be exceeded.

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss which is not included in the current level revenue estimate and that exceeds \$3,277 million in revenues for fiscal year 1991, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 310.

FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET AUTHORITY—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION ALLOCATION BY COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SECTION 302

(In millions of dollars)

	Current level budget authority
House committee:	
Agriculture	-742
Appropriations ¹	-1,344
Armed Services	+57
Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs	-32
District of Columbia	
Education and Labor	
Energy and Commerce	-14
Foreign Affairs	
Government Operations	
House Administration	
Interior and Insular Affairs	+74
Judiciary	+3
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	-5
Post Office and Civil Service	+869
Public Works and Transportation	
Science and Technology	+1
Small Business	
Veterans' Affairs	-94
Ways and Means	-2,354
Unassigned (Sequestration)	-389

¹ See next table for detail.

Note.—Committees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(a) allocation for "discretionary action."

FISCAL YEAR 1991 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DISCRETIONARY ACTION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL AND BUDGET RESOLUTION SUBDIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 302

(In millions of dollars)

	Current level budget authority	Direct loans	Primary loan guarantees
House Appropriations Subcommittee:			
Commerce, State, Justice	-7	-11	-184
Defense	-54		
District of Columbia	-2		
Energy and Water	-775		
Foreign Operations	+404	-17	-1
Interior			
Labor, HHS, Education	-624		
Legislative Branch	-63		
Military Construction	-136		
Rural Development and Agriculture	-6	-112	-49
Transportation	-1		
Treasury, Postal Service	-4		
VA/HUD/Independent Agencies	-76	-198	
Total	-1,344	-338	-234

Note.—Subcommittees are over (+) or under (-) their 302(b) subdivisions for "discretionary action."

FISCAL YEAR 1991 ALLOCATION OF NEW ENTITLEMENT AUTHORITY (NEA) PURSUANT TO SEC. 302

(In millions of dollars)

Committee	Allocation	Reported ¹	Enacted ²	Enacted over(+)/under(-) allocation
Agriculture	+53	+1,309	-566	-619
Appropriations		+2,253	+2,253	+2,253
Armed Services		+2,209	+2,270	+2,270
Education and Labor	-120		+1	+121
Energy and Commerce	+305		+1	-304
Judiciary		+2	+2	+2
Post Office and Civil Service	-1,230		-1,390	-160
Veterans' Affairs	-65		+180	+245
Ways and Means	-4,200		-3,182	+1,018

¹ These figures are used for 401(b)(2) of the Budget Act.

² These figures are used for 302(f) points of order.

Note.—The figures for the Armed Services and Appropriations Committee represent the full costs of the January 4.1-percent pay raise for Federal military and civilian personnel respectively. The pay raise was assumed in the budget resolution, but the New Entitlement Authority (NEA) was not allocated to any committee because the budget resolution assumed that the pay raise would be achieved through administrative actions.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 6, 1991.

HON. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, estimated revenues, and direct and guaranteed loan levels in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1991 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 310). This report, for fiscal year 1991, is tabulated as of close of business March 5, 1991. A summary of this tabulation follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	Current level	Budget resolution H. Con. Res. 310	Current level +/- resolution
Budget authority	1,481,536	1,485,600	-94,064
Outlays	1,236,224	1,236,900	-676
Revenues	1,176,177	1,172,900	3,277
Direct loan obligations	20,507	21,000	-393
Guaranteed loan commitments	106,940	106,800	140

Since my last report, dated February 6, 1991, there has been no action that affects the current level of spending or revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONG., 1ST SESS., HOUSE SUPPORTING DETAIL, FISCAL YEAR 1991 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS MAR. 5, 1991

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
I. Enacted in previous sessions:			
Revenues			1,176,178
Permanent appropriations and trust funds	1,066,350	801,618	
Other legislation	664,057	676,371	
Offsetting receipts	-243,564	-242,564	
Total enacted in previous sessions	1,487,843	1,235,425	1,176,178
II. Enacted this session: Extending IRS Deadline for Desert Storm Troops (Public Law 102-2)			1
III. Continuing resolution authority			
IV. Conference agreements ratified by both Houses			
V. Entitlement authority and other mandatory adjustments required to conform with current law estimates in budget resolution	-6,307	799	
Total current level ¹	1,481,536	1,236,224	1,176,177
1991 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 310)	1,485,600	1,236,900	1,172,900
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution			3,277
Under budget resolution	4,064	676	

¹ In accordance with section 606(D)(2) of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Title XIII of Public Law 101-508) current level excludes \$1,335 in budget authority and \$1,562 in outlays for Operation Desert Shield, Debt Forgiveness for Egypt and Poland and Internal Revenue Service funding above the June 1990 baseline level. In addition, current level outlays include a savings of \$1,100 million for the Bank Insurance Fund that the Committee attributes to the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (Public Law 101-508) and revenues include the Office of Management and Budget's estimate of \$3,037 million for the Internal Revenue Service provision in the Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations Bill (Public Law 101-509).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. 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 this evening.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH ON HIS 89TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the birthday of an extraordinary West Virginian and American,

because tomorrow is the day when Senator Jennings Randolph turns 89 years young.

When Jennings Randolph was born on March 8, 1902, in Salem, WV, who could have predicted that here was a man who would serve his State and Nation in the U.S. Congress in a career that would span nine Presidencies. And throughout 14 years in the House and 26 years in the Senate, never did Jennings Randolph lose sight of his overriding goal—to make life better for working men and women.

To add personal dimension to the scope of his career, Jennings Randolph was elected to the House nearly 20 years before I was born, and when he retired from the Senate, I was serving as the Congressman from his former congressional district. And since his retirement, Senator Randolph has graciously served as my campaign treasurer.

March 9 is a day that we all should stop for a moment to reflect on the improvements in the quality of our life due to the efforts of Jennings Randolph, but especially 18-year-old Americans. Senator Randolph authored and shepherded the 26th amendment to the U.S. Constitution into being, giving 18-year-olds the right to vote.

Jennings Randolph served with an undying confidence in our young people, and I believe that the accomplishments of our troops in the gulf is an excellent reflection that his trust was not misplaced.

And if there are tourists in town tomorrow, they may want to take a moment to remember that Senator Randolph authored the legislation that led to the creation of the Air and Space Museum.

To the man who helped conceive and foster the New Deal, to the man who led the fight to develop our Interstate Highway System, to the man who helped write the National Labor Relations Act and so much more, I say happy birthday, Jennings. Thank you for all you have given your Nation, and thank you for allowing us to be a part of your incredible life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the dean of our delegation, Mr. NICK RAHALL.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of history and pride that I rise today to pay tribute to Jennings Randolph, former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, who will be 89 years young tomorrow.

Happy Birthday Senator, with warmest wishes to you for many, many more to come.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to work closely with Jennings Randolph, from my first day as a Member of the House more than 14 years ago, and before that as an employee of the U.S. Senate in the Democratic Cloakroom under Senator ROBERT C. BYRD. The experience that was mine, with Jennings Randolph and ROBERT BYRD as my early mentors,

has been the most rewarding aspect of my service in Congress. I am proud to say at this point that I still work closely with Senator ROBERT BYRD, a great American.

Jennings Randolph first arrived in Washington 58 years ago, in 1933. He was sworn in as one of the new Members of the House of Representatives, and became part of President Franklin Roosevelt's historic first 100 days. Jennings Randolph was present at the creation of the New Deal programs, most of which are still in existence today. Programs that serve the human needs of individuals and families to which Jennings Randolph pledged his entire career.

Jennings Randolph served in the House of Representatives from 1933 to 1947; he returned as a U.S. Senator in 1958, where he served until he retired in 1984. During that span of time, which represents a quarter of the life of this Republic, Jennings Randolph never stood still.

As we pay tribute to him on this, his 89th birthday, let me first express my great respect for this senior, and much beloved public servant from the great State of West Virginia, and to thank him for what he did for our State, and for this Nation, during his half-century of service.

Today, with the advent of the war in the gulf and the accompanying rhetoric we hear about how it is time to establish a national energy policy in the United States, and how it is time to reduce or eliminate our dependence on foreign oil, it is appropriate and timely to make part of this tribute a reference to Jennings Randolph's 1942 action to introduce legislation known as the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, which created ways in which to transform coal and its products into other useful energy forms. Not content with introducing legislation, Jennings Randolph followed up by copiloting a plane from Morgantown, WV, to Washington, DC, using fuel made from coal. If that could be done in 1942, it surely can be done today with all the technology at our disposal.

Jennings Randolph was a visionary. His early actions included the Randolph-Sheppard Act for the blind; later he originated and chaired the first Subcommittee on the Handicapped in the Senate, and he kept that chair until 1981 when the Senate majority went to the Republicans. Today, America has Jennings Randolph to thank for ushering into existence the first-ever Education for all Handicapped Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and the Developmental Disabilities Act.

As the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee for 14 years, it was Jennings Randolph who guided to enactment the National Interstate Highway System signed into law by President Dwight Eisenhower. It was Jennings Randolph who fought against im-

poundment of interstate highway funds under President Nixon, when billions of dollars appropriated by Congress for highways were not being spent.

As ranking Democrat on the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Jennings Randolph was a champion of education, health care services and facilities, and labor standards such as the enactment of the first black lung compensation act for coal miners suffering and dying from that occupational respiratory disease.

His chairmanship of the Public Works Committee saw enactment of this Nation's first Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, the Superfund Program to clean up toxic wastes, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

Jennings Randolph, who was well-known for his love and his understanding and trust in the younger generation, authored the 26th amendment to the Constitution calling for the 18-year-old's right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, my time is short, but finally I call to mind the Jennings Randolph who was, above all else, a gentleman.

Jennings Randolph was known for his courtly manners at all times in the conduct of official business with his House and Senate colleagues. His constituents found him to be warm, and always receptive, always available to them, when they made the trip to Washington to plead their causes.

Jennings also set an example for all Members of Congress in the strict observance of the codes of conduct unique to both bodies. He made it unnecessary for senior Members and freshmen alike to seek out a book of etiquette to instruct them in the correct management of relations between and among Members. While there was no such publication to be had, Jennings taught them by example the subtle ways of representative government.

Jennings is a leader who led by example, as well as through the whispered confidence, the silent gesture, the humorous anecdote, or a gentle rebuke. Mostly, he used the welcome plaudit, always giving credit where credit was due to other Members of Congress for their achievements in the service of their States and congressional districts.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute to the man who is the embodiment of the characteristic wit and wisdom of a gentleman, who imposed and followed the finest traditions of the House and the Senate, and those of our great country.

From all of West Virginia, happy birthday Senator Jennings Randolph. God willing, may you have many, many more.

Our thoughts and prayers are with you always.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am going to call Jennings Randolph and I am sure he is going to have

two or three people that need some help, and he is going to tell me about them. He is that type of person. He cared about West Virginia and the Nation when he served, and he still cares about West Virginia and the Nation, and I want to wish him a happy birthday.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker. During its distinguished history, this U.S. Congress has been blessed with some truly exceptional leaders; men and women who, by virtue of their knowledge, foresight, and compassion, have left a mark which time cannot erase.

I am honored to join today with my colleagues in the West Virginia delegation in paying tribute to such a man, former Senator Jennings Randolph, on the occasion of his 89th birthday.

Senator Randolph has devoted a lifetime of service to the people of his State and his Nation. His long and honorable career in Congress began 58 years ago, when he became a member of this House in the same year that Franklin Delano Roosevelt began his presidency. The first vote that he cast as a Member of Congress, in fact, helped pass the Emergency Banking Act of 1933.

Without question, Senator Randolph served our Nation during some of its most trying times: times of depression, and times of war. Yet through it all, he served with a gracious effectiveness that earned him the respect and the admiration of his constituents in West Virginia and his colleagues here in Washington.

The Senator's legislative legacy reflects his many interests and accomplishments. He championed the rights of blind and handicapped Americans. He introduced legislation that initiated the creation of the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission. He authored the legislation which evolved into the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. And he worked tirelessly to develop the very first congressional initiative of new coal technologies.

Those are, of course, just a few items from Senator Randolph's list of accomplishments. The whole list is much too long for me to recount here, but rest assured that it is most impressive.

Perhaps the best testament to his distinguished career can be found in a statement made by former Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker of Tennessee, who also retired from Congress in 1985.

Baker said at the time, "Many individuals have wondered why I have decided to join Jennings in retirement from the Senate. The reason is quite simple. I can't imagine and don't want to be in a Congress that doesn't include Jennings Randolph."

Mr. Speaker, I know we can all appreciate that sentiment. But thankfully, Senator Randolph remains very much a part of this Congress through the continuation of programs he initiated during his 40 years of service.

On behalf of the people of West Virginia's First Congressional District, I wish Senator Randolph a "Happy Birthday" and a heartfelt "Thank You."

MEETING THE PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE FOR THE NATION

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 will not take nearly my full time, but I did want to rise tonight to say that I thought the House's performance today was very sad considering President Bush's speech last night. The President came up and pointed out that by applying modern thinking, by applying modern approaches that we had had remarkable success in the Persian Gulf, that in 100 hours we had been able to defeat the Iraqis in a ground war because we had the right kind of equipment, the right kind of training, the right kind of people, and they had formed a team that worked. And he challenged the Congress to reform and renew America, to bring America into the 21st century.

Yet, today, in the first of a series of votes that I am afraid we are going to see in the Congress, what we got was just the opposite. The efforts of Secretary Kemp to develop new ideas and new approaches in housing, to give people a chance to own their own homes, to give people a chance to have more control over their lives, to truly help the poor, that was knocked down by the Democrats here in the House today in a vote that was frankly very surprising and very one-sided. I think it was in many ways a reactionary vote, a vote propping up a decaying past, protecting Democrats and not helping the poor, but just protecting those interest groups that are already out there.

Later in the day we had another vote on an effort to allow the Federal Government to spend its money more intelligently, to apply a better standard to the Davis-Bacon Act, which is a 1931 law that involves how much we pay workers. Everybody knows this is wasteful. Every report the General Accounting Office ever made says that this is wasteful. But it is an example of union power, and it is an example of propping up an old and obsolete provision that no longer makes sense and that costs extra money. And once again, the Democrats overwhelmingly voted on the reactionary side, propping up the past, costing extra money and not getting anything for it, the exact opposite of what President Bush asked for last night.

Furthermore, as I said earlier today when I did an initial 1-minute speech, we are wasting \$8 million a day every day that we fail to pass continued funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation. The Resolution Trust Corporation pays the depositors insurance for every depositor who had money in a savings and loan. Everyone knows the Congress is going to pay it. There is no question it is going to be paid. So every day we fail to pay it, we add \$8 million

in additional interest that does not do any good to anyone, just an additional \$8 million that the taxpayer loses.

Everyone in America can understand that. It is like having a credit card outstanding or having a loan outstanding. The longer you wait, the more you are going to have to pay.

We do not get anything for the money, and yet the Democratic leadership again today failed to bring up a bill, although that means we already owed \$56 million to date, and it is going to go to \$64 million on Friday, it is going to go to \$72 million on Saturday, \$80 million on Sunday, \$88 million on Monday, and by the time we do any serious legislative business on Tuesday, we are going to be back to \$96 million, and that still will not have gotten the bill to conference with the Senate, passed, and down to the President.

So the Democratic leadership, by its failure to respond in a timely way, is going to throw away over \$100 million in absolute, pure waste, money that we do not have any reason to have spent on the Resolution Trust Corporation.

Finally, I am very concerned that the President issued a challenge to the Congress which is not going to be taken up. The President challenged the Congress to pass the highway transportation bill and to pass crime legislation. When we recognize that the crime legislation is vitally needed, that drugs and violent crime are an enormous problem in America, that in fact more Americans were killed in the United States during the 100 hours of ground combat than were killed in the ground operations in Desert Storm, it is obvious we need to pass a much stronger crime bill.

The President first sent up his crime proposals back in June of 1989. Now he is challenging the Congress to pass them, as he said, not in 100 hours, which was how long it took Desert Storm, but in 100 days. Yet today our first indications were that the Democratic leadership is not going to pass the crime bill on time, that in fact it is going to find excuses to delay the process, and so I want to repeat tonight the challenge.

I would hope the Democrats would decide to pass a clean Resolution Trust funding so we can get it through, get it signed and get it to the White House, and that will save the taxpayers money. I would hope the Democrats would reconsider the kind of votes they cast today. We really need a lot of reform in America if we are going to have a successful country.

□ 2040

We need to have a 21st century America, not just a 21st century Army. I think that is going to take a lot of changes.

Automatically taking the reactionary position of voting against new ideas, voting against new reforms, vot-

ing against new proposals, that only is not good for the Democratic Party, it is very bad for America. It weakens our ability to get into the future the way we ought to.

On all of those grounds, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Democratic leadership will reconsider where it is going, that it will decide to cooperate with President Bush.

I can assure you that we on the Republican side would reach out a bipartisan hand to work with you if we could find a way to set up a schedule for hearings, for markup, and for legislation on the crime bill, for hearings, for markup, and for legislation on the highway bill, and move forward, for example, as the President has asked for a civil rights bill that does not have quotas, to move forward and have the kind of reforms that we badly need in education, to move forward and have the kind of housing reforms Secretary Kemp has been working for.

There is much we can do, but I think we need to get busy and work together to do it.

THE S&L BAIL-OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, there has been a great deal of criticism leveled at those in the Congress who are reluctant to provide additional funding to the RTC to continue the thrift bailout. I believe that criticism is unwarranted. In fact, I believe such hesitation is called for, and is in the interest of the American taxpayer. It is time we stopped to think about what we are doing. In my view, the approach we are taking is maximizing the cost to the American taxpayer and the damage to the industry.

Just over a year ago, the administration asked the Congress to authorize \$50 billion to handle the problems of failed and failing thrifts, and Congress obliged. The administration is now asking for \$30 billion more in loss funds. And projections suggest that next year the Congress will be asked for still another \$50 billion. It would be unconscionable if, before we approve over twice the sum originally requested, the Congress did not insist on knowing what the American taxpayer was being asked to pay for and why. Yet the administration is insisting on a blank check and blaming the Congress for not providing it.

This is not a partisan issue. Votes taken in the House Banking Committee indicate that there is sentiment on both sides of the aisle that the resolution process is not proceeding as anticipated and requires reform. Yet we are being pressured to pour apparently limitless funds into the RTC without exercising any control as to its use.

I believe the FIRREA approach was fundamentally flawed from its inception. It represented a misdiagnosis of the problem, and a misprescription as to the proper solution, and we now see continuing malpractice in its implementation. As such, FIRREA has become,

not the solution to the thrift crisis, but a major contributor in its own right to its ever vaster proportions.

Let me review the problems with the FIRREA legislation itself and the continuing problems I see with its implementation.

I. FIRREA LEGISLATION

I voted against and argued against final passage of the FIRREA for several reasons including: First, the approach to funding; second, the precipitous application of new standards; and third, the structure and functioning of the RTC.

A. FUNDING

First of all, it was clear from the very beginning that the funding the administration requested was grossly inadequate, minimizing the scope of the problem and making it easier to lay what appeared a more limited burden at the taxpayers' door. I stated at the time that "the administration's projections regarding the overall level of funding required and the source of that funding are based on a series of overly optimistic and implausible assumptions * * *. Each time any of these implausible assumptions proves incorrect, it is the taxpayers' potential liability that increases." Unfortunately, that judgment has proved only too correct. The cost estimates continue to mount, and the ever-larger bill is indeed being placed at the taxpayers' door.

The approach to funding was also fundamentally flawed. When FIRREA was being considered, far too much attention was directed to the debate regarding on-budget versus off-budget financing. That was never a key issue. Certainly, if we are to borrow, we should borrow at cheapest cost, Treasury borrowing rather than a convoluted and costly bonding program. But in the context of the thrift crisis there was absolutely no justification for borrowing. The only rationale given was the continuing reluctance to come to grips with the grave implications of deficit financing for the health of our economy, and that is no rationale at all.

Any responsible business manager will tell you one borrows for capital improvements. One does not borrow for current expenditures and certainly never for past expenditures. Yet we chose to borrow to fund past losses and forced future generations—our children and grandchildren—to pay the costs. That is a profound generational inequity. As I noted during consideration of the legislation, "borrowing in any form is a much higher cost solution than a direct infusion of funds * * *. We are foisting higher costs than would otherwise be necessary on to future generations. That is unjust."

There is recognition in the Congress as to that inequity. A floor amendment I advanced during consideration of FIRREA that would have placed the funding on Gramm-Rudman and insisted we pay as we go garnered 171 votes on the House floor, despite Presidential and congressional industry opposition. In a recent House Banking markup, an amendment of a somewhat similar nature passed with bipartisan support.

The generational inequity was compounded by an approach that maximized the cost to Federal taxpayers for mistakes made largely at the State level. It's generally estimated that approximately half of the costs of the bailout

are attributable to State-chartered institutions, operating in many cases under lax State supervision and regulation, with powers far in excess of those available under the Federal charter. Yet the States have borne none of the financial responsibility. We have a dual banking system, which carries responsibilities as well as rights. While the full House has never had an opportunity to vote on this important issue, many increasingly share my view that some reasonable State contribution to the costs of the bailout are in order.

B. APPLICATION OF NEW STANDARDS

FIRREA saw the imposition of significantly higher tangible capital standards for thrift institutions and the elimination of accounting techniques previously agreed upon between the regulators and thrift institutions. The changes were largely appropriate. Capital is the chief protection for the insurance fund and the taxpayer, and adequate capital standards are crucial.

But the precipitous application of those standards wreaked further havoc in an industry already reeling from systemic problems, and destabilized weakened but viable institutions that might have otherwise survived the crisis. As I have argued before, FIRREA itself became "the largest shock to the system. New capital requirements were essential, but the precipitous application of new requirements in some cases can create more problems than it will solve * * * meaning distinctions needed to be drawn between basket case institutions that have no hope of recovery * * * and other weakened institutions who * * * are in a position to gradually increase their tangible capital position. To treat these institutions alike was to unnecessarily increase taxpayer liability."

In addition, FIRREA changed regulatory accounting standards that had been negotiated as elements of existing contracts between the regulators and thrift institutions, particularly those institutions which had previously purchased failing institutions as part of an effort to address industry problems. Some of those standards may have been ill-conceived and paved the way for institutions to operate solely with phony capital, endangering the insurance fund. But immediate changes in those contracts may have put even institutions that were profitable and capable of improving their tangible capital at risk, and left potential acquirers with a reluctance that continues to this day to deal with the Government.

I predicted at the time that the Government could not blithely break contracts with private parties and expect to escape unscathed. Since that time, court actions undertaken by thrifts accusing the Government of breaking contracts have been extremely successful—increasing yet again the cost to the taxpayer—and the pool of potential acquirers has diminished considerably.

C. THE RTC

Finally, the Congress was forced to vote on the FIRREA legislation with little or no understanding of the nature and function of the agency which would be responsible for carrying out the implementation of the program, the RTC. As I noted at the time, "the responsibilities confronting the RTC are massive and unprecedented * * *. Yet the structure of the organization is ill-defined, its policies and procedures are left to its own devising, and its accountability to the public is negligible."

At one point, an administration representative characterized the RTC as a small oversight organization, with 100 or fewer employees, largely engaged in overseeing private sector action. Today we have an organization with over 5,000 employees that is the largest asset disposition organization in the history of the world. No entity could be less fit than a Government agency to play that role, and no entity could play it at greater cost.

II. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF FIRREA

Since FIRREA was passed, matters have simply gone from bad to worse.

A. NEW FUNDING NEEDS

Estimates of the cost of the bailout continue to mount. The administration is now asking for an additional \$30 billion, but even that is not the end. Projections suggest as much as another \$50 billion will be required next year. What is more, we are still borrowing to finance this bailout, piling ever greater interest expenses on the basic bailout cost that is already mind-boggling. If we continue on this path we will be committing hundreds of billions of dollars in future revenues to paying the interest on the Federal debt that could otherwise be used productively. And to what end?

Unless we stop this endless cycle of deficit finance, we will be placing burdens on our economy and on future generations of taxpayers that are incalculable. These interest costs will not remain forever invisible. As they come due, they may well have to be funded by cuts in education, health care, Social Security, day care, and other social programs on which our citizens rely. The result could be a decline in this Nation's standard of living beyond what we can even begin to imagine. The only way to avoid that result is to make some hard choices now.

B. IMPLEMENTATION OF FIRREA

First. The current liquidation philosophy.—Some of those choices concern the basic approach that is being used. If FIRREA was flawed in its conception, it is equally flawed in its implementation. We must move away from the liquidation philosophy that has dominated the administration's and most of the Congress' thinking on this issue from the very beginning toward a

reconstruction philosophy. We are now liquidating an industry, some of which remains viable, at taxpayer expense and—whether we are willing to acknowledge it in budget calculations or not—expanding our budget deficit in order to do so. The effect of the current philosophy is only to maximize taxpayer cost and to place enormous burdens on our economy years into the future.

But it is not only the future burden on our economy which should concern us. The severe credit crunch we continue to see is no coincidence. The vast accumulation of assets by the RTC has created an enormous overhang on the real estate market, depressing values. The worst case scenarios that regulators have brought to the assessment of asset portfolios of banks as well as thrifts may have forced unnecessary writedowns and created additional stress on the capital positions of our lending institutions. The result should have been easy enough to predict—less and less lending, even to creditworthy borrowers.

In my view, the administration is being inordinately purist about the problems we face. It seems intent on purging from the thrift industry, through mounting deficit finance, every marginally problematical institution.

We can do that, and we could then turn to the banking industry and do the same. But the costs would be incalculable, and the burden on the American taxpayer, unjustifiable. Granted, we would achieve some very necessary industry consolidation, but I cannot think of a more extravagant and shortsighted way to do it. We cannot write every weak institution out of the economy at taxpayer expense through deficit finance without doing irreparable damage to our economy.

2. The need for a change in approach.—It is time to move away from the liquidation philosophy that now dominates both the OTS and the RTC and move toward a reconstruction philosophy. A comparison of the current effort of the RTC to the approach undertaken by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation [RFC] earlier in this century is enlightening. The RFC, like the RTC, bore responsibility for liquidating incurable banks. But it did not make the assumption that all problem institutions were untreatable. Much of the RFC's energies were focused on restoring capital in solvent but weak banks and restructuring weak but curable institutions.

In contrast, the OTS and RTC are currently watching the condition of the wounded slowly and painfully deteriorate while focusing all their energies on burying the dead. Hundreds more thrift institutions have now been neatly categorized in terms of the level of risk they present. But the Government is neither providing assistance

nor marketing their franchise while it still has worth. Instead, bureaucrats are simply spending time calculating their dwindling prospects under alternative theoretical economic scenarios. The necessary effect of this wait and see attitude is to maximize taxpayer cost.

I do not quarrel with the fact that there was an array of basket case institutions in the thrift industry that were operating without a meaningful portfolio of earning assets, steadily losing money, and paying above market rates solely to draw in funds to pay interest on deposits. Such institutions held out no prospect of long-term viability and were only accruing additional losses for which the taxpayer would eventually be responsible. They required quick and decisive action.

But many, perhaps most, of those institutions have already been resolved. Unfortunately, they were not the only institutions put on the road to conservatorship. Others immediately tagged capital deficient have been in decline ever since.

We are now at or at least close to the point where we are considering placing in Government hands institutions which have some reasonable level of tangible net worth and/or are profitable—institutions whose condition has nevertheless been allowed to deteriorate as the administration has focused its energies elsewhere. Certainly, some of them are weak and are not in compliance with the new, much tougher, capital requirements. But if effecting a complete purge of all weaker institutions from the system will cost the American taxpayer yet another \$50 billion in short-term, it is worth inquiring whether so dramatic a purge is necessary. It may be worth taking the risk that some of them can be turned around or the problem can be resolved more efficiently and at less cost through inducement of private sector action.

This is particularly the case since any significant improvement in our general economic outlook will alone be of assistance. The fate of many thrifts and banks depends on when and by how much the real estate market comes back. Yet we are doing everything possible to depress that market and continue the drag on our economy by moving endless assets into the public sector.

There are two clear advantages to moving toward a program focused on maximizing the potential of the private sector to handle the problem, with Government assistance if necessary. First of all, any financial institution is worth far more as an operating institution than it will ever be worth in Government hands. If an institution must be resolved, it should be resolved while it has some inherent worth, reducing taxpayer cost. Second, as Felix Rohatyn has pointed out in recent

commentary on the situation in the banking industry, a Federal dollar invested in the equity capital of a still solvent institution will support from 15 to 25 times as much credit liquidity as a Federal dollar used after a failure to reimburse an insured depositor or to dispose of a growing inventory of failed institutions and depreciating assets.

Weak institutions not taken directly into Government hands need not and should not be left to their own devices. As the law provides, any institution that does not meet capital standards should operate under a supervisory agreement and capital plan developed and overseen by the regulators which will stem the flow of loss and place the institution under tight managerial controls in an effort to put it back on its feet.

Ultimately, many such institutions may not be able to survive as independent institutions. But it is far preferable to market such institutions as operating entities rather than rush them headlong into conservatorship status. However little an institution might be worth, it is worth more as an operating entity than it is worth in Government hands. Once the Government takes an institution, its franchise and its assets decline precipitously in value. An emphasis on a liquidation philosophy eliminates any intangible value inherent in the franchise of an operating institution, maximizing the ultimate disposal costs to the Government and the taxpayer.

Let us recognize what happens. When the Government takes an institution, it must one way or another infuse funds sufficient to "fill the hole" which represents the difference between the institution's assets and liabilities. In doing so, it must value those assets at current market value, in an environment where real estate is at an all-time low, a problem to which the liquidation approach further contributes, in an endless downward spiral. The effect is to freeze-frame the institution's losses at their maximum and then impose those losses on the taxpayer.

In most cases, the RTC is ultimately left with the responsibility to dispose of the assets on an already depressed market, thus driving down the value of all similar assets even farther. Moreover, this is a responsibility it is ill-equipped to fill because it is ill-equipped to respond to market signals. Instead, it must try to respond to ever-shifting political imperatives, called upon one moment not to dump assets, at another to sell them quickly to reduce the need for additional loss funds. No private asset disposition agency would even pretend to be able to maximize returns on such a short leash.

I would prefer that the Government move in early, while the institution still has some tangible net worth, and direct its resources to keeping the institution and its assets in the private

sector. Certainly, money should not simply be allocated in a futile effort to keep weak institutions operating independently. But funds could be used constructively to restructure institutions with potential and provide incentives to private acquirors.

I believe the Accelerated Resolution Program [ARP], a cooperative effort between the OTS and RTC which attempts to market weakened institutions while they still have franchise value, is an important step in the right direction. But it has gotten too little attention and too few resources.

The purpose of the program, as described by the Office of Thrift Supervision, is to lower the ultimate cost of thrift resolutions by accelerating the marketing and sale of troubled institutions, thereby reducing the deterioration in franchise value and core deposits that can result from placing an institution into RTC conservatorship.

It is the right goal. It should have been the goal all along. Instead we have this minimalist pilot program, begun quite belatedly and involving only nine institutions. How much money might have been saved if a serious effort of this nature had begun right from the start? We have spent too much money and attention on "resolving" the basket cases and not enough on marketing the salvageable.

If effecting a private sector merger or acquisition requires Government financial incentives, so be it. We must accept a fundamental fact of our market economy: private acquirors are interested in moneymaking propositions not charitable contributions, and the Government cannot force them to acquire weak institutions in whole or in part, if they have no hope of a reasonable return. At least the projected costs of Government incentives are somewhat calculable, as opposed to the incalculable and ever-mounting cost to the community, the real estate market, and the taxpayer of having the Government control and manage the largest asset disposition project in history.

In some cases, it may well be more economical to sell separately various parts of a franchise to maximize value. Under certain circumstances, it might also be appropriate for the Government to take some form of equity interest in the surviving institution. That too should be considered. The ultimate arbiter should be what reduces taxpayer cost the most.

There is an equity issue here and I am cognizant of it. Healthy institutions can rightfully argue that they are the losers if weak institutions headed for insolvency are resurrected by a Government infusion of funds, potentially heightening the competition they must face in an industry already experiencing significant overcapacity. They make a legitimate point. But at this point, I am forced to conclude that

the inequity to the taxpayer is far greater. We must strike a balance, and I would strike it in the taxpayers' favor. Moreover, funneling assets endlessly into RTC hands under the current approach is only further depressing real estate markets, to everyone's disadvantage. That very clearly includes the banking industry—to which the problem has now spread—and the businesses throughout this country which rely on that industry for finance. As I indicated before, the causes of the current crunch are easy enough to trace.

Third. The need for structural change.—The change in emphasis I am proposing cannot work unless other structural changes are effected. There continue to be arbitrary restrictions on what kinds of firms can purchase financial institutions, in what geographic location, what use can ultimately be made of the franchise acquired, and what array of products financial institutions can provide. If we are to maximize the degree to which the problem can be solved in the private sector and effect necessary consolidation industrywide, we must remove artificial geographic, product, and ownership and cross-marketing restrictions and move toward a standardized charter and harmonized regulatory structure.

Before we purify the industry totally at taxpayer expense, we should cleanse and rationalize it through private sector efforts. The best way to do that is to improve the franchise value of existing institutions, remove arbitrary restrictions on acquisitions and investment, and see what level of industry rationalization might occur through private sector efforts. A change in attitude is also imperative. To date, we have done as much as possible to alienate potential acquirers. That strategy is self-defeating and must change.

It is interesting to note something of a change in perspective that has occurred as we have shifted our attention to the commercial banking industry. In the banking context, the administration is not following a liquidation strategy but rethinking its regulatory posture and advocating structural reform.

In fact, it is only the recognition of the horrendous financial burden we would incur if we applied FIRREA logic to banking industry problems and the serious credit crunch which has ensued as a very predictable result of the approach taken in FIRREA that has led to some reassessment.

Capital deficiencies in the banking industry and the resulting credit crunch have encouraged the regulators to reassess their approach to evaluating real estate portfolios. The new posture would steer examiners away from a worst-case liquidation mode in assessing the worth of real estate portfolios, and new pending regulations would moderate the terms of loan

write-downs. While tighter examination standards have clearly been in order, there has been absolutely no point to bringing a worst case scenario to every assessment. The effect is only to deliver the maximum level of loss on the taxpayer in the shortest possible timeframe.

This new approach stands in stark contrast to the attitude struck in the thrift context. While we have not introduced market to market accounting in the thrift industry, the preoccupation with a liquidation approach and the conservatorship program has forced a focus on liquidation values. In the currently depressed real estate market, such a focus necessarily maximizes taxpayer cost.

Had the newer standards been brought to bear in regard to thrift real estate portfolios, it is likely that fewer institutions would as readily have become candidates for conservatorship. It is anomalous indeed that these new standards, if adopted, will be applied to thrifts going forward, and will hopefully help preclude institutions' unnecessarily being thrust into conservatorship. But we might have saved billions had we been more temperate in our approach from the beginning.

Moreover, the banking industry, in putting forward its proposal to recapitalize the BIF, included provisions that would channel Government funds into weakened institutions in order to try to turn them around and to provide necessary assistance to potential acquirers. Open bank assistance is now being considered by the FDIC in attempting to resolve bank problems in New England. This has been an approach largely frowned upon by the administration in the context of the thrift crisis. Yet it is an approach that could save taxpayer dollars. While the RTC has the authority to provide such assistance, it has largely chosen not to do so.

CONCLUSION

I opposed the FIRREA legislation and I cannot now in conscience vote additional taxpayer dollars that should more properly be spent on education, on health care, on other vital social needs, on a program that has spread what was essentially a sectoral problem throughout our economy and has maximized taxpayer cost—particularly when this program is not our only option. It is unfortunate that the administration and the Congress have spent so much time and energy on the process by which we would procure more funding for the RTC program that we have had no time to consider the merit of the program itself, and the alternatives to it.

There is a way to solve financial industry problems temperately and responsibly. It will require greater cooperation between the public and private sector. It will require public pol-

icymakers to rethink our compartmentalized and fragmented financial services structure. It will require portions of the industry to move their thinking beyond concerns about the fate of their own little portion of the financial universe. It may not effect the liquidation of the thrift industry on which the administration seems so bent, or a sweeping purification of the banking industry at taxpayer expense which could follow if the same philosophy prevails.

This different approach might take longer. It might not immediately eliminate every struggling institution. It may be more complicated and involve less immediate certitude. It may ultimately be less pure. But it will be much more responsible, more realistic, more measured, and much less expensive for the American taxpayer, and that is good enough.

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

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is facing tremendous problems in dealing with solid waste disposal. Today, I am joined by my distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. BULEY] in introducing legislation which will help us reduce solid waste disposal in an economical manner.

The Plastic Recycling Assistance Act of 1991 will aid those entrepreneurs willing to invest in our environment by providing a national standard for identifying plastic resins.

With 18 percent of the Nation's waste volume coming from plastics, much can be done to make sure plastic products play a more environmentally responsible role in our society. Recycling has the potential to play a significant role in reducing the need for landfills or other disposal methods for the Nation's solid waste. To be economically recycled, plastics items must be separated by their resin content.

This process is being made easier through the voluntary efforts of some in industry who are already printing codes which specify the type of resin used in the product. The Plastics Recycling Assistance Act would require all plastic product manufacturers to code their packages using a national identification system.

While assisting in recycling efforts, the bill also promotes the use of degradable plastics while addressing environmental concerns that degradable plastics interfere with some recycling efforts. By requiring that degradables be coded with a distinguishable symbol unless they have been demonstrated not to interfere with recycling efforts, recyclers will be able to separate degradables as quickly as they separate vinyl from high density polyethylene.

Biodegradable plastics using a corn starch mix play a needed role in waste reduction efforts, including acting as a vital component of a yard waste composting program at Urbana, IL, in my district. Photodegradable plastics are produced by the ITW hi-cone facility in Charleston of my congressional district to minimize the environmental problems which could be caused by six-pack rings and other plastic bindings.

Degradables are not the complete answer to solid waste problems, but they do have a role to play which must not be stifled.

Finally, the plastics recycling assistance act looks to the future. It requires the environmental protection agency to do a thorough study of the prospects of using advanced technologies for recycling separation of all solid waste materials.

As America looks ahead in fighting the crisis which continues to develop in solid waste disposal, we must recognize that we will not maximize recycling by asking every citizen to maintain separate waste disposal bins for each recyclable commodity. Along with helping promote recyclable product markets, a workable system of waste separation which makes recycling more economical must be developed.

I would like to thank the original cosponsors of this legislation for their support and applaud them for backing a better environment.

H.R. 1318

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 "Plastic Recycling Assistance Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

- (1) reduction of solid waste through recycling of plastics can help to reduce solid waste, conserve resources and save money;
- (2) no national standards presently exist for coding of plastic products to distinguish resin type and whether the product is degradable;
- (3) national standards for coding plastic containers by resin type and degradability will facilitate separation of disposed plastic containers, promote recycling and assure that use of degradable plastic products does not adversely affect plastic recycling; and
- (4) the Federal Government should promote plastics recycling and assure that use of degradable plastic products does not adversely affect plastic recycling.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to establish a uniform national standard for coding of plastic containers by resin type and by degradability to assure that use of degradable plastic products does not adversely affect recycling of nondegradable plastic products.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) PLASTIC CONTAINER.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "plastic container" means—

- (i) a rigid or semirigid vessel, including bottles, made of plastic with a capacity of 8 fluid ounces or more and less than five gallons, designed to hold some commodity; and
- (ii) flexible garden and leaf bags made of plastic.

(B) Such term shall not apply to vessels manufactured for use in medical or laboratory processes or procedures.

(2) DEGRADABLE.—The term "degradable" means the ability of a material to be reduced, by exposure to microorganisms, light or chemicals, to environmentally benign subunits within the shortest period of time consistent with the material's intended use, but in no event greater than a 5-year period.

(3) PLASTIC.—The term "plastic" means a material that contains as an essential ingredient one or more organic polymeric substances of large molecular weight, and that

at some stage in the manufacture or processing into finished articles can be shaped by flow.

SEC. 4. CODING.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF PLASTIC RESIN.—Within the 12-month period following the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue regulations to require manufacturers of plastic containers manufactured or offered for sale in the United States to encode such containers to identify the principal plastic resin used in their manufacture in accordance with this Act. Such regulations shall apply to plastic containers manufactured on or after the later of January 1, 1993 or 90 days after the date such regulation is published in the Federal Register.

(b) SYMBOL.—The code required under subsection (a) shall consist of—

(1) a symbol—

(A) in the case of all plastic resins other than those identified in paragraph (2)(H), triangular in shape, comprised of three equal-length arrows, such arrows being curved at the apexes of the triangular-shaped symbol with the heads of the arrows pointing in a clockwise direction, and

(B) in the case of plastic resins identified in paragraph (2)(H), diamond in shape, comprised of four equal sides and rounded at the corners; and

(2) a specific number within the symbol and a series of letters immediately below the base of the symbol identifying the principal type of plastic resin from which the container was produced in accordance with the following schedule:

(A) The number "1" and the letters "PETE" for polyethylene terephthalate.

(B) The number "2" and the letters "HDPE" for high density polyethylene.

(C) The number "3" and the letter "V" for vinyl.

(D) The number "4" and the letters "LDPE" for low density polyethylene.

(E) The number "5" and the letters "PP" for polypropylene.

(F) The number "6" and the letters "PS" for polystyrene.

(G) The number "7" and the word "OTHER" for other resins or multiple resins.

(H) The number "8" and the letters "DEGR" for degradable resins.

(3) The Administrator may, by rule, from time-to-time, add to or otherwise revise the designation of resins referred to in paragraph (2).

(4) The Administrator shall, by rule or order, permit containers manufactured from degradable plastic resin to bear a resin code other than that for degradable resins if the Administrator determines that the degradable plastic resin from which such container is manufactured is demonstrated to be recyclable and that mixture of such degradable plastic resin with such nondegradable resin will not reduce the value of the mixture, will not interfere with the recycling of such mixture, will not adversely affect the performance characteristics of recycled material containing such degradable plastic as compared to recycled material lacking such degradable plastic, and will not adversely affect the performance characteristics of any product manufactured from such mixed recycled material.

(c) CODING UNIFORMITY.—No State or political subdivision thereof may enforce any requirement of State or local law applicable to the coding of any plastic container unless such requirement is the same as the provisions of this Act. No State or political sub-

division thereof may enforce any ban under State or local law on manufacture, sale, distribution, or use of any plastic container if such container is coded in conformance with the requirements of this Act unless such ban is equally applicable to containers made from other materials.

SEC. 5. PENALTY.

(a) CIVIL PENALTY.—Any person or entity which violates this Act shall be subject to a civil penalty assessed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency of not more than \$5,000 for each offense.

(b) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—Any person or entity which knowingly violates this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be subject to a fine of not more than \$10,000, imprisoned for not more than one year, or both, for each offense.

SEC. 6. MONITORING.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, by regulation, establish and implement a system for monitoring compliance with, and enforcement of, the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 7. STUDY AND REPORTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall prepare and submit, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a progress report that contains:

- (1) information on enforcement of and compliance with the provisions of this Act;
- (2) information as to the problems, if any, incurred in the administration of the provisions of this Act;
- (3) statistics on the number and type of violations detected and prosecuted by the Federal Government and by the States; and
- (4) a summary of personnel and financial resources required to implement this Act.

(b) STUDY.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall study technology which may be applied to facilitate the automated sorting of plastic containers in municipal solid waste to separate recyclable plastic containers from non-recyclable plastic and to separate further recyclable plastic containers by resin type. Such study shall include identification of current and potential technology for automated separation of plastics by resin type. The Administrator shall report to Congress on the results of each study, including any recommendations for further legislation or for authorization of funding of research, development, or demonstration projects which offer the potential for development and application of innovative technology to facilitate expanded recycling of plastics.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS FOR THE 102d CONGRESS

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of Procedure adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on Small Business on March 7, 1991, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 102ND CONGRESS

1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House, and in particular the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on Small Business to the extent applicable and by this reference are incorporated, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") is a part of the committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the committee, and to its rules to the extent applicable.

2. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

Unless retained for consideration by the full committee, all legislation and other matters referred to the committee shall be referred by the chairman to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdictions, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgment, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement thereon.

3. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee on Small Business shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House is in session. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives.

At least three days' notice of such additional meeting shall be given unless the chairman determines that there is good cause to call the meeting on less notice.

The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the chairman subject to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the House of Representatives.

A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered or, upon at least three days' notice, it may be set for a different date.

4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS

Unless the chairman, or the committee by majority vote, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing at an earlier date, public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee at least one week before the commencement of that hearing.

5. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(A) Meetings

Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee or its subcommittees, shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll-call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public: *Provided, however,* That no person other than members of the committee, and such congressional staff and such depart-

mental representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

This provision does not apply to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(B) Hearings

Each hearing conducted by the committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives: *Provided, however,* That the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearings.

No member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the committee or any subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to members by the same procedures designated for closing hearings to the public.

6. WITNESSES

(A) Interrogation of Witness

The right to interrogate witnesses before the committee or any of its subcommittees shall alternate between the majority members and the minority members. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority and minority party members present and may recognize two majority party members for each minority party member recognized. Each member shall be limited to 5 minutes in the interrogation of witnesses until such time as each member of the committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(B) Statement of Witnesses

Each witness shall file with the committee, 48 hours in advance of his appearance, 100 copies of his proposed testimony and shall make a brief oral summary of his views.

7. SUBPENAS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the chairman of the committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as he deems necessary. The ranking minority member shall be promptly notified of the issuance of such a subpoena.

Such a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the chairman of a subcommittee with the approval of a majority of the members of the subcommittee and the approval of the chairman of the committee or a majority of the members of the committee.

8. QUORUM

No measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a majority of the committee is actually present; for purposes of taking testimony or receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum; and for all other purposes one-third of the members shall constitute a quorum.

9. AMENDMENTS DURING COMMITTEE MARKUP

Any amendment offered to any pending legislation before the committee must be made available in written form when requested by any member of the committee. If such amendment is not available in written form when requested, the chairman shall allow an appropriate period of time for the provision thereof.

10. PROXIES

A vote by any member of the committee or any of its subcommittees by proxy is permitted, provided that such proxy shall be in writing, and delivered to the clerk of the committee, shall assert that the member so voting by proxy is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the committee or its subcommittee, shall designate the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto; except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn, or other procedural matters. Each proxy shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

11. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

There will be six subcommittees as follows: SBA, the General Economy, and Minority Enterprise Development (nine Democrats and six Republicans)

Procurement, Tourism, and Rural Development (six Democrats and four Republicans)

Regulation, Business Opportunities, and Energy (seven Democrats and four Republicans)

Antitrust, Impact of Deregulation and Ecology (five Democrats and three Republicans)

Exports, Tax Policy and Special Problems (seven Democrats and four Republicans)

Environment and Employment (four Democrats and two Republicans)

During the 102d Congress, the chairman and ranking minority members shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees, without vote, and the full committee shall conduct oversight of all areas of the committee's jurisdiction.

In addition to conducting oversight in the area of their respective jurisdictions, each subcommittee shall have the following jurisdiction:

SBA, The General Economy, and Minority Enterprise Development

SBA program authorizations.

General economic problems.

Access to capital.

Programs to promote minority enterprise development.

Promotion of women-owned business.

Job creation.

Procurement, Tourism and Rural Development

Participation of small business in Federal procurement, generally.

Small Business Innovation Development Act.

Travel and tourism.

Telecommunications.

Agriculture and rural development.

Regulation, Business Opportunities, and Energy

Responsibility for, and investigative authority over, the regulatory policies of Federal departments and agencies.

General promotion of business opportunities.

Energy issues in general.

Antitrust, Impact of Deregulation and Ecology

Anticompetitive and unfair activities affecting small business.

Antitrust and monopolies.

Ecological issues.

Impact of deregulation of common carriers and other industries.

Securities, acquisitions, and mergers.

Exports, Tax Policy, and Special Problems

Export opportunities.

Foreign business practices.

Impact of tax policies.

Special problems not elsewhere assigned.

Environment and Employment

Employment issues in general.

Environmental and hazardous waste.

12. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the chairman of the full committee and other subcommittee chairmen, with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible. Meetings of subcommittees shall not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full committee.

13. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

(A) Investigative Hearings

The report of any subcommittee on a matter which was the topic of a study or investigation shall include a statement concerning the subject of the study or investigation, the findings and conclusions, and recommendations for corrective action, if any, together with such other material as the subcommittee deems appropriate.

Such proposed report shall first be approved by a majority of the subcommittee members. After such approval has been secured, the proposed report shall be sent to each member of the full committee for his supplemental, minority or additional views.

Any such views shall be in writing and signed by the member and filed with the clerk of the committee within 5 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) from the date of the transmittal of the proposed report to the members.

After the expiration of such 5 calendar days, the report may be filed as a House report.

(B) End of Congress

Each subcommittee, not later than November 15th of each even-numbered year, shall submit to the Committee a report on the activities of the subcommittee during the Congress.

14. COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee on Small Business shall be as follows:

(A) The professional and clerical employees of the committee, except those assigned to the minority or to a subcommittee chairman or ranking minority members as provided below, shall be appointed and assigned, and may be removed, by the chairman. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the chairman, and they shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman.

(B) The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be appointed and their remuneration determined as the minority members of the committee shall determine; *Provided, however,* That no minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her ma-

jority staff counterpart. Such staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee who may delegate such authority as they deem appropriate.

(C) Each subcommittee chairperson and each ranking minority member on not more than six subcommittees shall have the right to appoint and assign one person to work on subcommittee business at a salary commensurate with the responsibilities prescribed but at a rate not to exceed 75 percent of the maximum established rate for the employees on the professional staff of the committee. Such staff members shall perform services in facilities assigned to the committee and to the extent that they are not occupied during regular working hours with tasks assigned by the subcommittee chairperson or ranking minority member who appointed them, they shall perform other tasks as assigned by the chairman or the appropriate staff director.

15. RECORDS

The committee shall keep a complete record of all actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each subcommittee rollcall vote, together with a description of the matter voted upon, shall be promptly made available to the full committee and such votes shall be available for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee.

The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with rule XXXVI of the rules of the House, except that the committee authorizes use of any record to which clause 3(b)(4) would otherwise apply after such record has been in existence for 20 years. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

16. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Access to classified information supplied to the committee and attendance at closed sessions of the committee or its subcommittees shall be limited to members, and to members of the committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance when the chairman determines that such access or such attendance is essential to the functioning of the committee.

The procedure to be followed in granting access to those hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the committee which involve classified intelligence information or information deemed by a subcommittee to be sensitive shall be as follows:

(a) Only Members of the House of Representatives may have access to such information.

(b) Members who desire to read materials that are in the possession of the committee should notify the clerk of the committee or the subcommittee possessing the materials.

(c) The clerk will maintain an accurate access log which identifies without revealing the material examined, the staff member involved, and the time of arrival and departure of all members having access to the information.

(d) If the material desired is material which the committee or subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special handling, before receiving access to such

information, Members of the House will be required to identify the information they desire to read and sign an access information sheet acknowledging such access and that the Member has read these procedures.

(e) Such material shall not be removed from the room.

(f) A staff representative shall insure that the documents used by the Member are returned to the proper custodian or to original safekeeping as appropriate.

(g) No notes, reproductions or recordings may be made of any portion of such information.

(h) The contents of such information shall not be divulged to any person in any way, form, shape, or manner and shall not be discussed with any person who has not received the information in an authorized manner either under these rules or the laws or rules in effect for officials and employees of the executive branch.

(i) When not being examined in the manner described herein, such information will be kept in secure safes in the committee rooms.

(j) These procedures only address access to information the committee or a subcommittee deems to be sensitive enough to require special treatment.

(k) If a Member believes the material should not be classified or considered restricted as to dissemination or use, the Member may ask the committee or subcommittee to so rule; however, as far as materials and information in the custody of the Small Business Committee is concerned, the classification of materials as determined by the executive branch shall prevail unless affirmatively changed by the committee or the subcommittee involved, after consultation with the appropriate executive agencies.

(l) Other materials in the possession of the committee are to be handled in accordance with the normal practices and traditions of the committee and its subcommittees.

17. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Upon approval by the committee or its subcommittees, all committee and subcommittee hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography or by any such methods of coverage.

The chairman of the full committee or the chairmen of the subcommittees are authorized to determine on behalf of the full committee or its subcommittees, respectively, whether hearings which are open may be broadcast, unless the committee or its subcommittees respectively by majority vote determine otherwise.

Permission for such coverage shall be granted only under the following conditions:

(1) Live coverage by radio or television shall be without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off.

(3) Each committee or subcommittee chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras to be permitted in the room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in the

room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures as devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Television and radio media equipment shall not be installed in, or removed from, the room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage at the then current state of the art.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International News-pictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage by the other media.

(11) Television and radio media personnel shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Still photography personnel shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

18. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The chairman of the full committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the committee.

The committee may not be committed to any expense whatever without the prior approval of the chairman of the full committee.

19. AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the committee may be modified, amended, or repealed by a majority vote of its members, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each such member at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting at which the vote on the change occurs.

APPENDIX

RULE XI—RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR COMMITTEES IN GENERAL

1. (a)(1) The Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees

so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are nondebatable motions of high privilege in committees and subcommittees.

(2) Each subcommittee of a committee is a part of that committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of that committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(b) Each committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under Rule X, and (subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 5) to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Each committee is authorized to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the committee. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of a committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

(d) Each committee shall submit to the House, not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, a report on the activities of that committee under this rule and Rule X during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

COMMITTEE RULES

Adoption of written rules

2. (a) Each standing committee of the House shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. Such rules—

(1) shall be adopted in a meeting which is open to the public unless the committee in open session and with a quorum present, determined by rollcall vote that all or part of the meeting on that day is to be closed to the public;

(2) shall be not inconsistent with the Rules of the House or with those provisions of law having the force and effect of Rules of the House; and

(3) shall in any event incorporate all of the succeeding provisions of this clause to the extent applicable.

Each committee's rules specifying its regular meeting days, and any other rules of a committee which are in addition to the provisions of this clause, shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than thirty days after the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year. Each select or joint committee shall comply with the provisions of this paragraph unless specifically prohibited by law.

Regular meeting days

(b) Each standing committee of the House shall adopt regular meeting days, which shall be not less frequent than monthly, for the conduct of its business. Each such committee shall meet, for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the transaction of other committee business, on all regular meeting days fixed by the committee, unless otherwise provided by written rule adopted by the committee.

Additional and special meetings

(c)(1) The Chairman of each standing committee may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business. The committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the chairman.

(2) If at least three members of any standing committee desire that a special meeting

of the committee be called by the chairman, those members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the chairman does not call the requested special meeting, to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held, specifying the date and hour of, and the measure or matter to be considered at, that special meeting. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered; and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

Vice chairman or ranking majority Member to preside in absence of chairman.

(d) The member of the majority party on any standing committee or subcommittee thereof ranking immediately after the chairman shall be vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside at any meeting during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting.

Committee records

(e)(1) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each such rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and whether by proxy or in person, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(2) All committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as chairman of the committee; and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto, except that in the case of records in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct respecting the conduct of any Member, officer, or employee of the House, no Member of the House (other than a member of such committee) shall have access thereto without the specific, prior approval of the committee.

(3) Each committee shall include in its rules standards for availability of records of the committee delivered to the Archivist of the United States under rule XXXVI. Such standards shall specify procedures for orders of the committee under clause 3(b)(3) and clause 4(b) of rule XXXVI, including a requirement that nonavailability of a record for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable under that rule shall be approved by vote of the committee.

Proxies

(f) No vote by any member of any committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy unless such committee, by written rule adopted by the committee, permits voting by proxy and requires that the proxy authorization shall be writing, shall assert that the member is absent on official business or is otherwise unable to be present at the meeting of the committee, shall designate the person who is to execute the proxy authorization, and shall be limited to a specific measure or matter and any amendments or motions pertaining thereto: except that a member may authorize a general proxy only for motions to recess, adjourn or other procedural matters. Each proxy to be effective shall be signed by the member assigning his or her vote and shall contain the date and time of day that the proxy is signed. Proxies may not be counted for a quorum.

Open meetings and hearings

(g)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of each standing committee or subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. *Provided, however,* That no person other than members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This paragraph does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(1) of Rule X or by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, or to any meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(2) Each hearing conducted by each committee or subcommittee thereof shall be open to the public except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony,

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in clause 2(k)(5) of rule XI. No Member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of any committee or subcommittee, with the exception of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, unless the House of Representatives shall by a majority vote authorize a particular committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subparagraph for closing hearings to the public: *Provided, however,* That the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing except that the Committee on Ap-

propriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the subcommittees therein may, by the same procedure, vote to close up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

(3) Each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the committee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, it shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this subparagraph shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

(4) Each committee shall, insofar as is practicable, require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the committee (in advance of his or her appearance) a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of his or her argument.

(5) No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure reported by any committee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with the provisions of this clause; except that a point of order on that ground may be made by any member of the committee which reported the measure if, in the committee, such point of order was (A) timely made and (B) improperly overruled or not properly considered.

(6) The preceding provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the committee hearings which are provided for by clause 4(a)(1) of Rule X.

Quorum for taking testimony and certain other action

(h)(1) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence which shall be not less than two.

(2) Each committee (except the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Ways and Means) may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation which shall be not less than one-third of the members.

Prohibition against committee meetings during five-minute rule and during joint sessions and joint meetings

(i)(1) No committee of the House (except the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Rules, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and the Committee on Ways and Means) may sit, without special leave, while the House is reading a measure for amendment under the five-minute rule. For purposes of this subparagraph, special leave will be granted unless 10 or more Members object.

(2) No committee of the House may sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

Calling and interrogation of witnesses

(j)(1) Whenever any hearing is conducted by any committee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with re-

spect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(2) Each committee shall apply the five-minute rule in the interrogation of witnesses in any hearing until such time as each member of the committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question each witness.

Investigative hearing procedures

(k)(1) The chairman at an investigative hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and this clause shall be made available to each witness.

(3) Witnesses at investigative hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at an investigatory hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person,

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of this Rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if a majority of the members of the committee, a majority being present, determine that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of request to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the committee.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

Committee procedures for reporting bills and resolutions

(l)(1)(A) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring a matter to a vote.

(B) In any event, the report of any committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (executive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by a

majority of the members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request. This subdivision does not apply to the reporting of a regular appropriation bill by the Committee on Appropriations prior to compliance with subdivision (C) and does not apply to a report of the Committee on Rules with respect to the rules, joint rules, or order of business of the House or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(2)(A) No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present.

(B) With respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution of a public character, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such bill or resolution shall be included in the committee report.

(3) The report of any committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee (A) shall include the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of Rule X separately set out and clearly identified; (B) the statement required by section 308(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the measure provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures; (C) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of such Act, separately set out and clearly identified, whenever the Director (if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison to the committee, and (D) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government operations under clause 4(c)(2) of Rule X separately set out and clearly identified whenever such findings and recommendations have been submitted to the legislative committee in a timely fashion to allow an opportunity to consider such findings and recommendations during the committee's deliberations on the measure.

(4) Each report of a committee on each bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by such committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or joint resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(5) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by any committee, other than the Committee on Rules, any member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(A) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been sub-

mitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(B) shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under subdivisions (C) and (D) of subparagraph (3)) are included as part of the report. This subparagraph does not preclude—

(1) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely requests for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this subparagraph; or

(ii) the filing by any such committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(6) A measure or matter reported by any committee (except the Committee on Rules in the case of a resolution making in order the consideration of a bill, resolution, or other order of business), shall not be considered in the House until the third calendar day, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, on which the report of that committee upon that measure or matter has been available to the Members of the House or as provided by section 305(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the case of a concurrent resolution on the budget: *Provided however*, That it shall always be in order to call up for consideration, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 4(b), Rule XI, a report from the Committee on Rules specifically providing for the consideration of a reported measure or matter notwithstanding this restriction. If hearings have been held on any such measure or matter so reported, the committee reporting the measure or matter, shall make every reasonable effort to have such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such measure or matter in the House. This subparagraph shall not apply to—

(A) any measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by the Congress; or

(B) any decision, determination, or action by a Government agency which would become or continue to be, effective unless disapproved or otherwise invalidated by one or both Houses of Congress.

For the purposes of the preceding sentence, a Government agency includes any department, agency, establishment, wholly owned Government corporation, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

(7) If, within seven calendar days after a measure has, by resolution, been made in order for consideration by the House, no motion has been offered that the House consider that measure, any member of the committee which reported that measure may be recognized in the discretion of the Speaker to offer a motion that the House shall consider that measure, if that committee has duly authorized that member to offer that motion.

Power to sit and act; subpoena power

(m)(1) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under this rule and Rule X (including any matter referred to it under clause 5 of Rule X), any committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized (subject to subparagraph (2)(A) of this paragraph)—

(A) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, and

(B) to require, by subpoena—otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents

as it deems necessary. The chairman of the committee, or any member designated by such chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(2)(A) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (1)(B) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by the committee.

(B) Compliance with any subpoena issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

Use of committee funds for travel

(n)(1) Funds authorized for a committee under clause 5 are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities; however, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds, including those authorized under clause 5, shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of the committee or its employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions:

(A) No member or employee of the committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country for any day at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law, or if the Member or employee is reimbursed for any expenses for such day, then the lesser of the per diem or the actual, unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) incurred by the member or employee during that day.

(B) Each member or employee of the committee shall make to the chairman of the committee an itemized report showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, any funds expended for any other official purpose and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and/or appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed no later than sixty days following the completion of travel with the chairman of the committee for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law and shall be open for public inspection.

(2) In carrying out the committee's activities outside of the United States in any country where local currencies are unavailable, a member or employee of the committee may not receive reimbursement for expenses (other than for transportation) in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law, or if the member or employee is reimbursed for any expenses for such day, then the lesser of the per diem or the actual unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) incurred, by the member or employee during any day.

(3) A member or employee of a committee may not receive reimbursement for the cost of any transportation in connection with travel outside of the United States unless the member or employee has actually paid for the transportation.

(4) The restrictions respecting travel outside of the United States set forth in subparagraphs (2) and (3) shall also apply to travel outside of the United States by Members, officers, and employees of the House authorized under clause 8 of Rule I, clause 1(b) of this rule, or any other provision of these Rules of the House of Representatives.

(5) No local currencies owned by the United States may be made available under this paragraph for the use outside of the United States for defraying the expenses of a member of any committee after—

(A) the date of the general election of Members in which the Member has not been elected to the succeeding Congress; or

(B) in the case of a Member who is not a candidate in such general election, the earlier of the date of such general election or the adjournment sine die of the last regular session of the Congress.

BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

3. (a) It is the purpose of this clause to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings, or committee meetings, which are open to the public may be covered, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution of the United States as an organ of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause shall not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered, under authority of this clause, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations and shall not be such as to—

(1) distort the objectives and purposes of the hearing or other meeting or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

(b) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or any Member or being in the House, the committee, or any Member into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of committee hearings and meetings by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(e) Whenever any hearing or meeting conducted by any committee of the House is open to the public, that committee may permit, by majority vote of the committee, that hearing or meeting to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, but only under such written rules as the committee may adopt in accordance with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause: *Provided, however*, Each committee or subcommittee chairman shall determine, in his discretion, the number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room.

(f) The written rules which may be adopted by a committee under paragraph (e) of this clause shall contain provisions to the following effect:

(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his or her will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of this rule, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(3) The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(5) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobolights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

(8) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to

photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International News pictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers Gallery.

(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

PRIVILEGED REPORTS AND AMENDMENTS

4. (a) The following committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Appropriations—on general appropriation bills and on joint resolutions continuing appropriations for a fiscal year if reported after September 15 preceding the beginning of such fiscal year; the Committee on the Budget—on the matters required to be reported by such committee under Titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; the Committee on House Administration—on enrolled bills, contested election, and all matters referred to it of printing for the use of the House or the two Houses, and on all matters of expenditure of the contingent fund of the House and on all matters relating to preservation and availability of noncurrent records of the House under Rule XXXVI; the Committee on Rules—on rules, joint rules, and the order of business; and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct—on resolutions recommending action by the House of Representatives with respect to an individual Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives as a result of any investigation by the committee relating to the official conduct of such Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives.

(b) It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business (except it shall not be called up for consideration on the same day it is presented to the House, unless so determined by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the Members voting, but this provision shall not apply during the last three days of the session), and, pending the consideration thereof, the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced the Speaker shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the report shall have been fully disposed of. The Committee on Rules shall not report any rule or order which provides that business under clause 7 of Rule XXIV shall be set aside by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members present; nor shall it report any rule or order which would prevent the motion to recommit from being made as provided in clause 4 of Rule XVI.

(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when the bill or resolution involved is ordered reported by the committee. If any such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege (but only on the day after the calendar day on which such Member announces to the House his intention to do so) and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules makes an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of such resolution and adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege.

(d) Whenever the Committee on Rules reports a resolution repealing or amending any of the Rules of the House of Representatives or part thereof it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(1) the text of any part of the Rules of the House of Representatives which is proposed to be repealed; and

(2) a comparative print of any part of the resolution making such an amendment and any part of the Rules of the House of Representatives to be amended, showing by an appropriate typographical device the omissions and insertions proposed to be made.

COMMITTEE EXPENSES

5. (a) Whenever any committee, commission or other entity (except the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget) is to be granted authorization for the payment, from the contingent fund of the House, of its expenses in any year, other than those expenses to be paid from appropriations provided by statute, such authorization initially shall be procured by one primary expense resolution for the committee, commission or other entity providing funds for the payment of the expenses of the committee, commission or other entity for that year from the contingent fund of the House. Any such primary expense resolution reported to the House shall not be considered in the House unless a printed report on that resolution has been made available to the Members of the House for at least one calendar day prior to the consideration of that resolution in the House. Such report shall, for the information of the House—

(1) state the total amount of the funds to be provided to the committee, commission or other entity under the primary expense resolution for all anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission or other entity; and

(2) to the extent practicable, contain such general statements regarding the estimated foreseeable expenditures for the respective anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission or other entity as may be appropriate to provide the House with basic estimates with respect to the expenditure generally of the funds to be pro-

vided to the committee, commission or other entity under the primary expense resolution.

(b) After the date of adoption by the House of any such primary expense resolution for any such committee, commission or other entity for any year, authorization for the payment from the contingent fund of additional expenses of such committee, commission or other entity in that year, other than those expenses to be paid from appropriations provided by statute, may be procured by one or more supplemental expense resolutions for that committee, commission or other entity as necessary. Any such supplemental expense resolution reported to the House shall not be considered in the House unless a printed report on that resolution has been made available to the Members of the House for at least one calendar day prior to the consideration of that resolution in the House. Such report shall, for the information of the House—

(1) state the total amount of additional funds to be provided to the committee, commission or other entity under the supplemental expense resolution and the purpose or purposes for which those additional funds are to be used by the committee, commission or other entity; and

(2) state the reason or reasons for the failure to procure the additional funds for the committee, commission or other entity by means of the primary expense resolution.

(c) The preceding provisions of this clause do not apply to—

(1) any resolution providing for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of sums necessary to pay compensation for staff services performed for, or to pay other expenses of, any committee, commission or other entity at any time from and after the beginning of any year and before the date of adoption by the House of the primary expense resolution providing funds to pay the expenses of that committee, commission or other entity for that year; or

(2) any resolution providing in any Congress, for all of the standing committees of the House, additional office equipment, airmail and special delivery postage stamps, supplies, staff personnel, or any other specific item for the operation of the standing committees, and containing an authorization for the payment from the contingent fund of the House of the expenses of any of the foregoing items provided by that resolution, subject to and until enactment of the provisions of the resolution as permanent law.

(d) From the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to primary and additional expense resolutions—

(1) the chairman of each standing subcommittee of a standing committee of the House is authorized to appoint one staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman.

(2) the ranking minority party member of each standing subcommittee on each standing committee of the House is authorized to appoint one staff person who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority party member.

(3) the staff members appointed pursuant to the provisions of subparagraphs (1) and (2) shall be compensated at a rate determined by the subcommittee chairman not to exceed (A) 75 per centum of the maximum established in paragraph (c) of clause 6 or (B) the rate paid the staff member appointed pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph.

(4) for the purpose of this paragraph, (A) there shall be no more than six standing subcommittees of each standing committee of the House, except for the Committee on Ap-

propriations, and (B) no member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to the above provisions.

(5) the staff positions made available to the subcommittee chairman and ranking minority party members pursuant to subparagraphs (1) and (2) of this paragraph shall be made available from the staff positions provided under clause 6 of Rule XI unless such staff positions are made available pursuant to a primary or additional expense resolution.

(e) No primary expense resolution or additional expense resolution of a committee may provide for the payment or reimbursement of expenses incurred by any member of the committee for travel by the member after the date of the general election of Members in which the Member is not elected to the succeeding Congress, or in the case of a Member who is not a candidate in such general election, the earlier of the date of such general election or the adjournment sine die of the last regular session of the Congress.

(f)(1) For continuance of necessary investigations and studies by—

(A) each standing committee and select committee established by these rules; and

(B) except as provided in subparagraph (2), each select committee established by resolution;

there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amounts as may be necessary for the period beginning at noon on January 3 and ending at midnight on March 31 of each year.

(2) In the case of the first session of a Congress, amounts shall be made available under this paragraph for a select committee established by resolution in the preceding Congress only if—

(A) a reestablishing resolution for such select committee is introduced in the present Congress; and

(B) no resolution of the preceding Congress provided for termination of funding of investigations and studies by such select committee at or before the end of the preceding Congress.

(3) Each committee receiving amounts under this paragraph shall be entitled, for each month in the period specified in subparagraph (1), to 9 per centum (or such lesser per centum as may be determined by the Committee on House Administration) of the total annualized amount made available under expense resolutions for such committee in the preceding session of Congress.

(4) Payments under this paragraph shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, except as provided in subparagraph (5), and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(5) Notwithstanding any provision of law, rule of the House, or other authority, from noon on January 3 of the first session of a Congress, until the election by the House of the committee involved in that Congress, payments under this paragraph shall be made on vouchers signed by—

(A) the chairman of such committee as constituted at the close of the preceding Congress; or

(B) if such chairman is not a Member in the present Congress, the ranking majority party member of such committee as constituted at the close of the preceding Congress who is a Member in the present Congress.

(6)(A) The authority of a committee to incur expenses under this paragraph shall expire upon agreement by the House to a primary expense resolution for such committee.

(B) Amounts made available under this paragraph shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

(C) The provisions of this paragraph shall be effective only insofar as not inconsistent with any resolution, reported by the Committee on House Administration and adopted after the date of adoption of these rules.

COMMITTEE STAFFS

6. (a)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph and paragraph (f) of this clause, each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than eighteen professional staff members. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority party member of such committee, as the committee considers advisable.

(2) Subject to paragraph (f) of this clause, whenever a majority of the minority party members of a standing committee (except the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) so request, not more than six persons may be selected, by majority vote of the minority party members, for appointment by the committee as professional staff members from among the number authorized by subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. The committee shall appoint any persons so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of any person so selected are unacceptable to the committee, a majority of the minority party members may select other persons for appointment by the committee to the professional staff until such appointment is made. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

(3) The professional staff members of each standing committee—

(A) shall be appointed on a permanent basis, without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions;

(B) shall not engage in any work other than committee business; and

(C) shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business.

(4) Services of the professional staff members of each standing committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee.

(5) The foregoing provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations and to the Committee on the Budget and the provisions of subparagraphs (3) (B) and (C) do not apply to the Committee on Rules.

(b)(1) The clerical staff of each standing committee shall consist of not more than twelve clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority party members, and to the professional staff, as the committee considers advisable. Subject to subparagraph (2) of this paragraph and paragraph (f) of this clause, the clerical staff shall be appointed by majority vote of the committee, without regard to race, creed, sex, or age. Except as provided by subparagraph (2) of this paragraph the clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work both for the committee staff and for the chairman and the ranking minority party member on matters related to committee work.

(2) Subject to paragraph (f) of this clause, whenever a majority of the minority party members of a standing committee (except the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) so request, four persons may be selected, by majority vote of the minority party members, for appointment by the committee to positions on the clerical staff from among the number of clerks authorized by subparagraph (1) of this paragraph. The committee shall appoint to those positions any person so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of any person so selected are unacceptable to the committee, a majority of the minority party members may select other persons for appointment by the committee to the position involved on the clerical staff until such appointment is made. Each clerk appointed under this subparagraph shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work for the minority party members of the committee and for any members of the professional staff appointed under subparagraph (2) of paragraph (a) of this clause on matters related to committee work.

(3) Services of the clerical staff members of each standing committee may be terminated by majority vote of the committee.

(4) The foregoing provisions of this paragraph do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

(c) Each employee on the professional, clerical and investigating staff of each standing committee shall be entitled to pay at a single gross per annum rate, to be fixed by the chairman which does not exceed the maximum rate of pay, as in effect from time to time, under applicable provisions of law.

(d) Subject to appropriations hereby authorized, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget may appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as it determines by majority vote to be necessary, such personnel, other than minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committee may prescribe.

(e) No committee shall appoint to its staff any experts or other personnel detailed or assigned from any department or agency of the Government, except with the written permission of the Committee on House Administration.

(f) If a request for the appointment of a minority professional staff member under paragraph (a), or a minority clerical staff member under paragraph (b), is made when no vacancy exists to which that appointment may be made, the committee nevertheless shall appoint, under paragraph (a) or paragraph (b), as applicable, the person selected by the minority and acceptable to the committee. The person so appointed shall serve as an additional member of the professional staff or the clerical staff, as the case may be, of the committee, and shall be paid from the contingent fund, until such a vacancy (other than a vacancy in the position of head of the professional staff, by whatever title designated) occurs, at which time that person shall be deemed to have been appointed to that vacancy. If such vacancy occurs on the professional staff when seven or more persons have been so appointed who are eligible to fill that vacancy, a majority of the minority party members shall designate which of those persons shall fill that vacancy.

(g) Each staff member appointed pursuant to a request by minority party members

under paragraph (a) or (b) of this clause, and each staff member appointed to assist minority party members of a committee pursuant to an expense resolution described in paragraph (a) or (b) of clause 5, shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of his or her rate of pay, the assignment to him or her of work facilities, and the accessibility to him or her of committee records.

(h) Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this clause shall not be construed to authorize the appointment of additional professional or clerical staff members of a committee pursuant to a request under either of such paragraphs by the minority party members of that committee if six or more professional staff members or four or more clerical staff members, provided for in paragraph (a)(1) or paragraph (b)(1) of this clause, as the case may be, who are satisfactory to a majority of the minority party members, are otherwise assigned to assist the minority party members.

(i) Notwithstanding paragraphs (a)(2) and (b)(2), a committee may employ nonpartisan staff, in lieu of or in addition to committee staff designated exclusively for the majority or minority party, upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the majority party and a majority of the members of the minority party.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 102D CONGRESS

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to and in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the Committee on Appropriations for the 102d Congress as approved by the committee on March 5, 1991:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS [Adopted for the 102d Congress on March 5, 1991]

Resolved, That the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in the One Hundred First Congress, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, shall be and are hereby adopted as the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations in the One Hundred Second Congress.

The foregoing resolution adopts the following rules:

SEC. 1: POWER TO SIT AND ACT

For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under Rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized:

(a) To sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings; and

(b) To require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, reports, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman, or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(c) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees under subsection 1(b) in the conduct of any

investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities only when authorized by a majority of the Members of the Committee voting, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subsection 1(b) may be delegated to the Chairman pursuant to such rules and under such limitations as the Committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any member designated by the Committee.

(d) Compliance with any subpoenas issued by the Committee or its subcommittees may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

SEC. 2: SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall establish the number of subcommittees and shall determine the jurisdiction of each subcommittee.

(b) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee all matters referred to it.

(c) All legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to the subcommittee of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, by majority vote of the Majority Members of the full Committee, consideration is to be by the full Committee.

(d) The Majority Caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of Majority to Minority Members for each subcommittee. The Chairman is authorized to negotiate that ratio with the Minority; Provided, however, That party representation in each subcommittee, including ex-officio members, shall be no less favorable to the Majority than the ratio for the full Committee.

(e) The Chairman is authorized to sit as a member of any subcommittee and to participate in its work.

SEC. 3: COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The Chairman is authorized to appoint the staff of the Committee, and make adjustments in the job titles and compensation thereof subject to the maximum rates and conditions established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. In addition, he is authorized, in his discretion, to arrange for their specialized training. The Chairman is also authorized to employ additional personnel as necessary.

(b) The chairman of each subcommittee may select and designate a staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the subcommittee chairman. Such staff member shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; Provided, That no Member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to these provisions.

(c) The ranking minority member of each subcommittee may select and designate a staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of the ranking minority member. Such staff member shall be compensated at a rate not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; Provided, That no Member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to these provisions.

(d) The Chairman, and the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the Chairman, may each select and designate a staff member at an annual gross salary of not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and may each select and designate one additional staff member.

(e) Each Member not mentioned in subsections (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section may select and designate a staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of that Member. Such staff member shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the Member, not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; Provided, That no Member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e); Provided further, That Members designating a staff member under this subsection must specifically certify by letter to the Chairman that the employee is needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

(f) In addition to any staff members appointed pursuant to any other subsection of this section, each Member may select and designate one additional staff member who shall serve at the pleasure of that Member. Such staff member shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the Member, not to exceed 75 per centum of the maximum established in Clause 6(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; Provided, That no Member shall appoint more than one person pursuant to this subsection; Provided further, That Members designating an additional staff member under this subsection must specifically certify by letter to the Chairman that the employee is needed and will be utilized for Committee work.

SEC. 4: COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) Regular Meeting Day

The regular meeting day of the Committee shall be the first Wednesday of each month while the House is in session, unless the Committee has met within the past 30 days or the Chairman considers a specific meeting unnecessary in the light of the requirements of the Committee business schedule.

(b) Additional and Special Meetings

(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(2) If at least three Committee Members desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those Members may file in the Committee Offices a written request to the Chairman for that special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Upon the filing of the request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman.

(3) If within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Committee Members may file in the Committee Offices their written notice that a special meeting will be held, specifying the date and hour of such meeting, and the measure or matter to be considered. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour.

(4) Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Committee Clerk shall notify all Committee Members that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at the special meeting.

(c) Vice Chairman or Ranking Majority Member To Preside in Absence of Chairman

The member of the majority party on the Committee or subcommittee thereof ranking

immediately after the chairman shall be vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside at any meeting during the temporary absence of the chairman. If the chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the Committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party who is present shall preside at that meeting.

(d) Business Meetings

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or its subcommittees, in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed.

(2) No person other than Committee Members and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed.

(3) The provisions of this subsection do not apply to open hearings of the Committee or its subcommittees which are provided for in Section 5(b)(1) of these Rules or to any meeting of the Committee relating solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(e) Committee Records

(1) The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee action, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each roll call shall be available for inspection by the public during regular business hours in the Committee Offices. The information made available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, or other proposition, and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(2) All hearings, records, data, charts, and files of the Committee shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chairman of the Committee. Such records shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

(3) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House, except that the Committee authorizes use of any record to which Clause 3(b)(4) of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House would otherwise apply after such record has been in existence for 20 years. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to Clause 3(b)(3) or Clause 4(b) of Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination upon the written request of any Member of the Committee.

SEC. 5: COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Overall Budget Hearings

Overall budget hearings by the Committee, including the hearing required by Section 242(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and Clause 4(a)(1) of the Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be conducted in open session except when the Committee in open session and with a majority present, determines by roll call vote that the testimony to be taken at that hearing on that day may be related to a matter of national security; except that the Committee

may by the same procedure close one subsequent day of hearing. A transcript of all such hearings shall be printed and a copy furnished to each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(b) *Other Hearings*

(1) All other hearings conducted by the Committee or its subcommittees shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee in open session and with a majority present determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security or would violate any law or Rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present at a hearing conducted by the Committee or any of its subcommittees, there being in attendance the number required under Section 5(c) of these Rules to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, (1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or (2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in Clause 2(k)(5) of such Rule. No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or its subcommittees unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or any of its subcommittees, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public; Provided, however, That the Committee or its subcommittees may by the same procedure vote to close five subsequent days of hearings.

(2) Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

(3) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or any of its subcommittees as the case may be, insofar as is practicable, shall file in advance of such appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary, except that this provision shall not apply to any witness appearing before the Committee in the overall budget hearings.

(c) *Quorum for Taking Testimony*

The number of Members of the Committee which shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence in any hearing of the Committee shall be two.

(d) *Calling and Interrogation of Witnesses*

(1) The Minority Members of the Committee or its subcommittees shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, by a majority of them before completion of any hearing, to call witnesses selected by the Minority to testify with respect to the matter under consideration during at least one day of hearings thereon.

(2) The Committee and its subcommittees shall observe the five-minute rule during the interrogation of witnesses until such times as each Member of the Committee or subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) *Broadcasting and Photographing of Committee Meetings and Hearings*

(1) The Chairman is authorized to determine the extent and nature of broadcasting and photographic coverage for the overall budget hearing and full Committee meetings and hearings, subject to the guidelines for such coverage set forth in Section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 and Clause 3(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) Unless approved by the Chairman and concurred in by a majority of the subcommittee, no subcommittee hearings or meetings shall be recorded by electronic device or broadcast by radio or television.

(3) Unless approved by the subcommittee chairman and concurred in by a majority of the subcommittee, no subcommittee hearing or meeting or subcommittee room shall be photographed.

(4) Broadcasting and photographic coverage of subcommittee hearings and meetings authorized under the provisions of (2) and (3) above shall be subject to the guidelines for such coverage set forth in Clause 3(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(f) *Subcommittee Meetings*

No subcommittee shall sit while the House is reading an appropriation measure for amendment under the five-minute rule or while the Committee is in session.

(g) *Public Notice of Committee Hearings*

The Chairman is authorized and directed to make public announcements of the date, place, and subject matter of Committee and subcommittee hearings at least one week before the commencement of such hearings. If the Committee or any of its subcommittees, as the case may be, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, the Chairman is authorized and directed to make that announcement at the earliest possible date.

SEC. 6. PROCEDURES OF REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) *Prompt Reporting Requirement*

(1) It shall be the duty of the Chairman, or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill or resolution approved by the Committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, a report on a bill or resolution which the Committee has approved shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days in which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Committee Clerk a written request, signed by a majority of Committee Members, for the reporting of such bill or resolution. Upon the filing of any such request, the Committee Clerk shall notify the Chairman immediately of the filing of the request. This subsection does not apply to the reporting of a regular appropriation bill or to the reporting of resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(b) *Presence of Committee Majority*

No measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(c) *Roll Call Votes*

With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any bill or resolution, the total number of votes cast for, and the total number of votes cast against, the reporting of such a bill or resolution shall be included in the Committee report.

(d) *Compliance With Congressional Budget Act*

A Committee report on a bill or resolution which has been approved by the Committee shall include the statement required by Section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and clearly identified, if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority.

(e) *Inflationary Impact Statement*

Each Committee report on a bill or resolution reported by the Committee shall contain a detailed analytical statement as to whether the enactment of such bill or resolution into law may have an inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy.

(f) *Changes in Existing Law*

Each Committee report on a general appropriation bill shall contain a concise statement describing fully the effect of any provision of the bill which directly or indirectly changes the application of existing law.

(g) *Rescissions and Transfers*

Each bill or resolution reported by the Committee shall include separate headings for rescissions and transfers of unexpended balances with all proposed rescissions and transfers listed therein. The report of the Committee accompanying such a bill or resolution shall include a separate section with respect to such rescissions or transfers.

(h) *Supplemental or Minority Views*

(1) If, at the time the Committee approves any measure or matter, any Committee Member gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, the Member shall be entitled to not less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views in writing and signed by the Member, with the Clerk of the Committee. All such views so filed shall be included in and shall be a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(2) The Committee report on that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which—

(i) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and

(ii) shall have on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views are included as part of the report.

(3) Subsection (h)(1) of this section, above, does not preclude—

(i) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by such subsection; or

(ii) the filing by the Committee of a supplemental report on a measure or matter which may be required for correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that measure or matter.

(4) If, at the time a subcommittee approves any measure or matter for recommendation to the full Committee, any Member of that subcommittee who gives notice of intention to offer supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be entitled, insofar as is practicable and in accordance with the printing requirements as determined by the subcommittee, to include such views in the Committee Print with respect to that measure or matter.

(i) *Availability of Reports*

A copy of each bill, resolution, or report shall be made available to each Member of

the Committee at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in advance of the date on which the Committee is to consider each bill, resolution, or report; Provided, That this subsection may be waived by agreement between the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee.

SEC. 7: VOTING

(a) No vote by any Member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(b) The vote on any question before the Committee shall be taken by the yeas and nays on the demand of one-fifth of the Members present.

SEC. 8: STUDIES AND EXAMINATIONS

The following procedure shall be applicable with respect to the conduct of studies and examinations of the organization and operation of Executive Agencies under authority contained in Section 202(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in Clause 2(b)(3) of Rule X, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(a) The Chairman is authorized to appoint such staff and, in his discretion, arrange for the procurement of temporary services of consultants, as from time to time may be required.

(b) Studies and examinations will be initiated upon the written request of a subcommittee which shall be reasonably specific and definite in character, and shall be initiated only by a majority vote of the subcommittee, with the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member thereof participating as part of such majority vote. When so initiated such request shall be filed with the Clerk of the Committee for submission to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member and their approval shall be required to make the same effective. Notwithstanding any action taken on such request by the chairman and ranking minority member of the subcommittee, a request may be approved by a majority of the Committee.

(c) Any request approved as provided under subsection (b) shall be immediately turned over to the staff appointed for action.

(d) Any information obtained by such staff shall be reported to the chairman of the subcommittee requesting such study and examination and to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, shall be made available to the members of the subcommittee concerned, and shall not be released for publication until the subcommittee so determines.

(e) Any hearings or investigations which may be desired, aside from the regular hearings on appropriation items, when approved by the Committee, shall be conducted by the subcommittee having jurisdiction over the matter.

SEC. 9: OFFICIAL TRAVEL

(a) The chairman of a subcommittee shall approve requests for travel by subcommittee members and staff for official business within the jurisdiction of that subcommittee. The ranking minority member of a subcommittee shall concur in such travel requests by minority members of that subcommittee and the Ranking Minority Member shall concur in such travel requests for Minority Members of the Committee. Requests in writing covering the purpose, itinerary, and dates of proposed travel shall be submitted for final approval to the Chairman. Specific approval shall be required for each and every trip.

(b) The Chairman is authorized during the recess of the Congress to approve travel authorizations for Committee Members and staff, including travel outside the United States.

(c) As soon as practicable, the Chairman shall direct the head of each Government agency concerned not to honor requests of subcommittees, individual Members, or staff for travel, the direct or indirect expenses of which are to be defrayed from an executive appropriation, except upon request from the Chairman.

(d) In accordance with Clause 2(n) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, local currencies owned by the United States shall be available to Committee Members and staff engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories, or possessions. No Committee Member or staff member shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country as a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law.

(e) Travel Reports

(1) Members or staff shall make a report to the Chairman on their travel, covering the purpose, results, itinerary, expenses, and other pertinent comments.

(2) With respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions, the report shall include: (1) an itemized list showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose; and (2) a summary in these categories of the total foreign currencies and/or appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports on foreign travel shall be filed with the Chairman no later than sixty days following completion of the travel for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law, and shall be open for public inspection.

(3) Each Member or employee performing such travel shall be solely responsible for supporting the amounts reported by the Member or employee.

(4) No report or statement as to any trip shall be publicized making any recommendations in behalf of the Committee without the authorization of a majority of the Committee.

(f) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Committee shall be governed by applicable laws or regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, and as promulgated from time to time by the Chairman.

SEC. 10: ELIGIBILITY OF COMMITTEE MEMBER SERVING AS BUDGET COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN FOR APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMANSHIP

If the Chairman of the Budget Committee of the House of Representatives is chairman of a subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee when he becomes Budget Committee Chairman, or would be eligible to become chairman of an Appropriations subcommittee under the Rules of the Majority Caucus of the House of Representatives during his tenure as Budget Committee Chairman, the Appropriations Committee may nominate such Member to serve as chairman of such subcommittee, subject to the approval of the Majority Caucus. But, if so elected and confirmed, the Member shall take a leave of absence while Chairman of the Budget Committee, and the responsibil-

ities of the subcommittee chairmanship shall devolve onto a temporary chairman as determined by the Appropriations Committee and the Majority Caucus of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JACOBS (at his own request), for March 20, 21, and 22, on account of stork.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for between 3:45 and 6 p.m. today, 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 Mrs. BENTLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCEWEN, for 60 minutes, today.
Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on March 12, 13, 19, and 20.
Mr. RIGGS, for 60 minutes, on March 11.

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

Mr. LUKEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LAFALCE, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. BRUCE, for 60 minutes, today.
Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, for 60 minutes each day, on April 10 and 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. DREIER of California.
Mr. FISH.
Mr. BLAZ.
Mr. BLILEY.
Mr. RINALDO.
Mr. COBLE.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. SANTORUM.
Mr. WELDON.
Mr. BALLENGER.
Mr. GRADISON.
Mr. CRANE.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Mr. CAMPBELL of California.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. SCHULZE.
Mr. GREEN of New York.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. SHAW.

Mrs. BENTLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOWNEY.

Mr. SMITH of Florida.

Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. GUARINI.

Mr. DERRICK.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. BACCHUS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. WILLIAMS in three instances.

Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. FUSTER.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

Mr. DE LUGO.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. BROWN.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. SWETT in two instances.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

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

On March 6, 1991:

H.R. 555. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to improve and clarify the protections provided by that Act; to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify veterans' reemployment rights and to improve veterans' rights to reinstatement of health insurance, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 11, 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:

800. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for a dire emergency supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1991 for International

Security Assistance, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (Doc. No. 102-53) to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the 1991 joint military net assessment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113(j); to the Committee on Armed Services.

802. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Defense Reserve Forces Policy Board's annual report for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 115(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially (Transmittal No. DTC-14-90), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

804. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Brazil (Transmittal No. 6-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense equipment sold commercially to Taiwan (Transmittal No. DTC-16-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776a(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

806. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 22d 90-day report of progress of case on the investigation into the death of Enrique Camarena, the investigations of the disappearance of United States citizens in the State of Jalisco, Mexico, and the general safety of United States tourists in Mexico, pursuant to Public Law 99-93, section 134(c) (99 Stat. 421); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

807. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on economic conditions prevailing in Turkey that may affect its ability to meet its international debt obligations and to stabilize its economy, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2346 nt.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

808. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, Agency for International Development, 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.

809. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, 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.

810. A letter from the Environmental Protection Agency, 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.

811. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance 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.

812. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative and Public Affairs, National Science Foundation, 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.

813. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

814. A letter from the Chairman, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize expenditures for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

815. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to authorize an extension of time for filing financial disclosure reports required by such act for persons serving in a designated combat zone for up to 180 days after the person returns from such combat zone; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

816. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide reemployment assistance to persons after service in the uniformed services, to encourage affiliation with and active participation in training programs of the Reserve components, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Energy, transmitting a copy of the report "Clean Coal Technology Demonstration Program: Program Update 1990"; jointly, to the Committee on Appropriations, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.

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. DERRICK: Committee on Rules: House Resolution 105. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1315 to provide additional funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation (Rept. 102-13). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Education and Labor. Report on the subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1991 (Rept. 102-14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN: Committee on Science, Space and Technology. Report on the subdivision of budget totals for fiscal year 1991 (Rept. 102-15). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. ASPIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1175, a bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 in connection with operations in and around the Persian Gulf presently known as Operation Desert Shield/Storm, and for other purposes with amendments; referred to the Committee on Appropriations for a period not to exceed 15 legislative days, with instructions to report back to the House as provided in sec-

tion 401(b) of Public Law 93-344 (Rept. 102-16, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYLLIE:

H.R. 1315. A bill to provide funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 1316. A bill to amend chapter 54 of title 5, United States Code, to extend and improve the performance management and recognition system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. MCGRATH):

H.R. 1317. A bill to restrict U.S. economic and military assistance to Jordan; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCE (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. DREIER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H.R. 1318. A bill to facilitate use of degradable plastics, without adversely affecting recycling of nondegradable plastic products, by requiring coding of plastic containers to facilitate separation of degradable plastic containers from nondegradable plastic containers and sorting of nondegradable plastic containers by resin type to promote recycling of such containers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. RAVENEL):

H.R. 1319. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to allow State disapproval of Federal offshore leasing decisions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. LAUGHLIN):

H.R. 1320. A bill relating to the enhancement of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources, the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 1321. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park, to create the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Conservation Area, to include the Gunnison River in the Nation's Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1322. A bill to authorize services for the prevention, intervention, treatment, and aftercare of American Indian and Alaskan Native children and their families at risk for fetal alcohol syndrome (FAS) and fetal alcohol effect (FAE); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLINGER (for himself and Mr. KOSTMAYER):

H.R. 1323. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating certain segments of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 1324. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, and the Communications Act of 1934 to reform financing of congressional elections, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, House Administration, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 1325. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to increase the percentage of funds allocated to rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 1326. A bill to clarify that Federal assistance provided with respect to domestic building and loan associations shall be treated as compensation for purposes of determining the deduction for losses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

H.R. 1327. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Commissioner to publish annually a report regarding projects completed under title IV of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 1328. A bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction in Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1329. A bill to exclude foreign repatriation payments from considerations as income in determining eligibility and benefits under Federal housing assistance programs; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PEASE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr.

HOLLOWAY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. COMBEST, AND Mr. KYL):

H.R. 1330. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a comprehensive program for conserving and managing wetlands in the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1331. A bill to impose quantitative restrictions on the importation of Chinese textiles until the Government of the People's Republic of China grants internationally recognized worker rights; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that an unmarried individual who maintains a household shall be considered a head of household, without regard to whether the individual has a dependent who is a member of the household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a married individual who maintains a separate household shall be treated as unmarried; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 1334. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period required in order for an individual to be eligible for benefits based on disability or for the disability freeze and to eliminate the 24-month waiting period for disabled individuals to become eligible for Medicare benefits; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 1335. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under the Medicare Program to 10 percent and twice the period of no enrollment; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 1336. A bill to direct the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate whether offenses against the United States or the law of nations by Iraq or its leaders took place during the recent military occupation of Kuwait, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1337. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide mortgage assistance payments to avoid foreclosure on mortgages of members of the Armed Forces who are killed or seriously injured while on active duty; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself and Mr. MOODY):

H.R. 1338. A bill to clarify the treatment of certain Federal financial assistance provided to saving and loan institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 1339. A bill to require Presidential general election candidates who receive amounts from the Presidential Election Campaign Fund to make public presentations of their views on policy issues of national importance; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey):

H.R. 1340. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make a grant to Glassboro State College for the construction of library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 1341. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that a Federal em-

ployee be given at least 60 days written notice before being released due to a reduction in force; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 1342. A bill to modify the authority of the Equal Opportunity Commission to investigate and determine discrimination claims made by Federal employees against the Federal Government, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEVINE of California (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 1343. A bill to encourage arms control in the Middle East, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WOLF, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. REED, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 1344. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to limit outdoor advertising adjacent to Interstate and Federal-aid primary highways; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (for himself and Mr. STENHOLM):

H.R. 1345. A bill to improve certain requirements with respect to funds provided by the Legal Services Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOODY, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 1346. A bill to withhold United States military assistance for El Salvador, subject to certain conditions; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 1347. A bill to provide regulatory incentives to promote national treatment by foreign countries to U.S. providers of certain financial and communications services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. STARK, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COSTELLO,

Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KYL, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. FAZIO):

H.R. 1348. A bill entitled, "the Public Pension Equity Restoration Act of 1991"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H.R. 1349. A bill to provide for partial public funding and broadcast media cost incentives for House of Representatives general election candidates who agree to limit their total expenditures and the proportion of contributions accepted from multicandidate political committees and certain other sources, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAXON:

H.R. 1350. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for residential lead abatement expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROE (for himself (by request), Mr. MINETA, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 1351. A bill to authorize funds for construction of highways, for highway safety programs, for mass transportation programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 1352. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans for the acquisition of a first home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 1353. A bill entitled the "Taonic Mountains Protection Act of 1991"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. BOXER):

H.R. 1354. A bill to end the use of steel jaw leghold traps on animals in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce;

By Mr. SCHULZE:

H.R. 1355. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax-exempt status for rural electric cooperatives having gross receipts exceeding a certain amount; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULZE (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 1356. A bill to require certain Federal monetary awards payable to persons who provide information leading to the arrest and conviction of individuals for the unlawful sale, or possession for sale, of a controlled substance or controlled substance analog; and to provide for incentive awards to States payable from certain funds arising from forfeitures under Federal drug laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHARP:

H.R. 1357. A bill to exempt section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 from termination; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 1358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat spaceports like airports under the exempt facility bond rules; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 1359. A bill to provide for the applicability of combat-related tax benefits to reservists and National Guard members deployed overseas in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WEISS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. YATES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 1360. A bill to promote the integration of women in the development process in developing countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. ECKART):

H.R. 1361. A bill to provide law enforcement authority for criminal investigators of the Offices of Inspectors General, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 1362. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission

for fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SWIFT (for himself Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DICKS, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.R. 1363. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction against self-employment income for amounts deposited into a capital construction fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1364. A bill to amend the Job Corps provisions of the Job Training Partnership Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to provide for disaster relief employment assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota):

H.R. 1366. A bill to clarify that the inspection of meat and poultry products offered for import into the United States is to be conducted by U.S. personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA (for himself, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HORTON, Ms. LONG, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. STOKES):

H.J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the month of November 1991, and thereafter as "National American Indian Heritage Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. LONG, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MFUME, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ERDREICH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mrs. MINK, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SWETT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. WALSH, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. KLUG, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. HORTON):

H.J. Res. 183. Joint resolution to designate the second Sunday in October of 1991 as "National Children's Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H.J. Res. 184. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for staggered 4-year terms for Representatives, to permit the Congress to regulate expenditures in elections for Federal office, and to require a Representative who becomes a candidate for the office of Senator to vacate his seat in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELDON:

H.J. Res. 185. Joint resolution to designate May 27, 1991, as "National Hero Remembrance Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONIOR:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution relating to peace in the Middle East following the Persian Gulf conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

H. Con. Res. 94. Concurrent resolution concerning United States foreign policy toward Israel and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ECKART (for himself, Mr. SISKY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. COMBEST, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BAKER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. TORRES, Mr. RAY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ORTON, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MACHTLEY):

H. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should assist United States small businesses seeking to become involved in the rebuilding of Kuwait, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Small Business, Armed Services, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KYL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HENRY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. COMBEST):

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to provide a sense of the Congress that the legislative and executive branches should better control Federal overhead expenditures and that it is the policy of the United States to reduce its fiscal year 1992 overhead expenditures by 10 percent; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and House Administration.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 106. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Kuwait should encourage the maximum feasible use of American workers, American firms, American products in the reconstruction of Kuwait; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself, Mr. WELDON and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming):

H. Res. 107. Resolution to urge the President to instruct the Attorney General to ap-

point an independent counsel to investigate the involvement of officials of the Federal Government in the savings and loan scandal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELDON (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H. Res. 108. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require the Committee on Ways and Means to include in committee reports the identity, sponsor, and revenue cost of single-taxpayer relief provisions contained in reported bills; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 1: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MFUME, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DELAuro, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HOAGLAND, Ms. HORN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEASE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REED, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAX-

LER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 5: Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. REED, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 35: Mr. RAY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 73: Mr. WILSON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. DIXON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FISH, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 82: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 87: Mr. CARPER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 127: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ARMEY, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 134: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WISE, and Ms. HORN.

H.R. 179: Mr. KOPETSKI and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 193: Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia.

H.R. 233: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 258: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 303: Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. HERGER, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 317: Ms. LONG.

H.R. 325: Ms. OKAR, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 327: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 328: Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 375: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 391: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 414: Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 467: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 519: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 520: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 524: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 537: Mr. WEISS and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 542: Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 544: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HYDE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOODY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 553: Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. UDALL.

H.R. 572: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 583: Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 596: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 601: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 642: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 643: Mr. NOWAK, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. WISE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 644: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 658: Mr. WISE, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 661: Mr. HORTON, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. McGRATH, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 672: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 688: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 696: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 706: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 713: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 730: Mr. WOLPE and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 731: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 738: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 751: Mr. PENNY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. ROE, Mr. FROST, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 766: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 772: Mr. HENRY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. KLUG, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LARROCCO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. MCCURDY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. GRADISON.

H.R. 789: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 793: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.R. 797: Mr. BRYANT and Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 811: Mr. MILLER of Washington and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 821: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 824: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. ECKART, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 827: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. GAYDOS.

H.R. 828: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 830: Mr. ECKART, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 841: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 858: Mr. JACOBS and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 862: Mr. PENNY and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 865: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 866: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 867: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 888: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 905: Mr. CARR and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 908: Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 915: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 916: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 919: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 951: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 960: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 999: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 1004: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1007: Mr. COYNE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ZELIFF, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 1013: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1016: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 1025: Mr. HYDE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1052: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LENT, Mr. DERRICK, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1059: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MFUME, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1063: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. OLIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1067: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. LENT, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1074: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1088: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1093: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1107: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEVA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. HORN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LONG, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr.

MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REED, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 1135: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SABO, Mr. PRICE, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 1149: Mr. BLAZ and Mr. McGRATH.

H.R. 1156: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1163: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1164: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1171: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1184: Mr. OLIN and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1190: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, and Mr. PERKINS.

H.R. 1197: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 1218: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SABO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1240: Mr. EVANS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 1263: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1264: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1285: Mr. STARK, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1292: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 1296: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. DICKINSON, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. OLIN, Mr. REED, Mr. HENRY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. APPLIGATE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LUKEIN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. GEREN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. STUMP, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. EM-

ERSON, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAW, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 1302: Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. VIS-CLOSKEY, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MINK, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. McDADE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. CARR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. STARK, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FROST, Mr. LUKEIN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. PICKLE.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. HOYER.

H.J. Res. 87: Mr. COBLE, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.J. Res. 88: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. PENNY.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. OWENS, of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROE, Mr. WASHINGTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. HYDE.

H.J. Res. 92: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SABO, Mr. PERKINS, and Ms. LONG.

H.J. Res. 95: Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.J. Res. 109: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GILCHREST,

Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PRICE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.J. Res. 123: Mr. WEISS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. FROST, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.J. Res. 130: Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. DIXON, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. HARRIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.J. Res. 141: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ERDREICH, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WISE, Mr. LENT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ECKART, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COX of Illinois, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. JONTZ and Mr. LANCASTER.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BEILSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LANCASTER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. MFUME.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. STOKES and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. JONTZ.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H. Con. Res. 85: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. APPLIGATE.

H. Res. 42: Mr. RITTER, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H. Res. 99: Ms. LONG, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. HEFLEY.