

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 10, 1991

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GEPHARDT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 10, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

We know, O gracious God, that the marvel of creation manifests itself in many voices and tongues and in all the ambitions of the human family. As we recognize our differences we pray this day that You would make us one in the spirit of a shared concern for one another. We acknowledge the power that is shown by the feelings and attitudes of the heart and we pray that each person will learn respect for each other and so fulfill Your commandment to us. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. ZELIFF] will lead the House of Representatives in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ZELIFF led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 92

Whereas, the Honorable John Heinz served Pennsylvania in the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives with devotion and distinction; and

Whereas, his efforts on behalf of Pennsylvania and all Americans earned him the esteem and high regard of his colleagues; and

Whereas, his tragic and untimely death has deprived his State and Nation of an outstanding lawmaker.

Resolved, That the Senate expresses profound sorrow and deep regret on the death of the Honorable John Heinz, late a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate recesses today, it recess as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution designating the Week of April 21-27, 1991, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week"; and

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to establish April 15, 1991, as "National Recycling Day."

NOTIFICATION CONCERNING RULES COMMITTEE'S PLANS FOR BUDGET RESOLUTION

(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 for this year's budget resolution.

As you know, the Budget Committee completed its markup Tuesday evening and, allowing 3 days for additional views, will file on Friday. The Rules Committee plans to meet next Monday, April 15, to take testimony on the resolution.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the text of the resolution will be available at the Budget Committee.

In order to provide for fair and timely consideration, the committee is considering a rule that may structure the offering of amendments.

Mr. Speaker, any Member contemplating an amendment to the resolution should submit 55 copies of the amendment and a brief explanation by 12 noon on this Friday, April 12. The committee offices are in H-312 in the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, as in the past the committee looks more favorably on amendments in the nature of a substitute than on cut-and-bite amendments. The

latter raise the same issues that will be decided in the authorization and appropriation process.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to all offices explaining our intentions on the budget resolution. We appreciate the cooperation of all Members in our effort to be fair and orderly in granting a rule.

FISCAL YEAR 1991 BUDGET RESOLUTION DESERVES SUPPORT

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, next week we will continue the fiscal year 1992 budget resolution adopted yesterday by the Committee on the Budget. This budget merits the strong support of all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It maintains strict fiscal discipline. It is fair. It makes needed investments in programs affecting working families in this country and in the economic future of this country.

The President has spoken of the need for a new world order abroad. This budget speaks to the need to develop a new American order at home. It is true that both budgets strictly adhere to the spending limits in the budget agreement established last year, and they should. However, beyond that, there are great differences.

The budget adopted by the committee rejects the unfair cuts in benefit programs included in the President's budget, including his \$25 billion cut in Medicare, his \$3.5 billion cut in veterans' programs, and reductions affecting farmers, students, children, and the needy.

Third, in addition, this budget makes vital investments in programs like education, Head Start, WIC, health care, antidrug abuse programs, and a number of others that relate to economic security for the future.

If anyone thinks that these changes are insignificant, let them ask the people affected. Ask the elderly; ask the veterans; ask the child who is affected by those kinds of reductions.

Members will have the opportunity next week to decide what set of priorities are most important for this Nation in the future.

CBS NEWS SEGMENT—PAID FOR BY THE AFL-CIO?

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

□ 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.

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Dan Rather and CBS Evening News became the newest advocates for the so-called striker replacement bill, H.R. 5, a proposal to put an end to the use of replacement workers during a strike.

Last week, Dan Rather introduced the lengthy feature on the subject with the phrase "One Strike, You're Out." Surprise, surprise—this is the title of the AFL-CIO slick and pricey video on H.R. 5.

Dan Rather provided supporters of H.R. 5 with millions and millions of dollars of free advertising and a wide viewer audience to promote the opinions of organized labor on an extremely controversial bill. Furthermore, to ensure the AFL-CIO commercial articulated all of big labor's views, more than 95 percent of the segment explained why organized labor wants the bill passed.

As usual, nobody at CBS bothered to report that 54 percent of the American public opposes firing replacement workers at the end of a strike. Or that many Americans believe H.R. 5 will lead to higher labor costs, hurt the economy, and lose jobs to foreign workers. We can only hope that CBS and Dan Rather plan to do a second feature that will allow the other side to be heard.

But more than likely big labor's network will continue to utilize their abilities to aid and abet the goals of the AFL-CIO. Too bad the rest of the story will not get a more balanced and fair airing by Dan Rather and CBS. The American people deserve better.

WRITE A BUDGET RECOGNIZING REAL AMERICAN NEEDS

(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, in the past few months we have all read about the families in California who have been restricted to the use of a few gallons of water per day to help conserve. Last night I watched a news report showing the owners of Beverly Hills mansions watering their estate lawns during rainstorms. Rich movie producers can water their streets, and working people can shower with the runoff. A fine example of trickle-down economics if I have ever seen one.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, this reminds me very much of the President's budget. The President's budget says let's shower the big guys with a capital gains tax break, and let the little guy take a bath. This is Robin Hood in reverse.

The President's budget says to pay for the gains of the rich we will take \$25 billion from the elderly, we will take a million scholarships from poor

kids, we will take the money for infant mortality for rural families and give it to 10 big cities and call it progress. We will welcome our troops home from the gulf with smiles and handshakes and a \$3.5 billion cut in veterans programs. We will take and take until working people drown in the wealthy's pool of excess.

Enough is enough. Our working families cannot keep their heads above water if we continue to flood them with kind words and hollow promises. Let us as the peoples representatives take a stand and write a budget that recognizes the real needs of working America.

□ 1410

DEMOCRATIC BUDGET PROVIDES LEADERSHIP

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, during my 2 weeks at home I came to the realization that Americans are ready to take stock of where we are as a nation—to reexamine our priorities.

My constituents have told me what they are concerned about: Jobs, the economy, the cost of living. Americans want us to tackle the serious domestic problems facing our country. They want to know what our domestic priorities will be.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic budget resolution presents an agenda that provides many of the answers Americans are asking for.

In these days of limited economic resources, the budget represents a test of priorities. The fewer dollars we have at our disposal, the more care we must take to ensure that those dollars get to those who need them the most.

Our priority must be to help those hit hardest by the recession: the middle class, working Americans, seniors, veterans. We must control skyrocketing health care cost, invest in housing and energy, create jobs while improving our infrastructure, and continue to fund those programs that are working for people—like Head Start and WIC. We must also invest in the future by educating our young people, and helping students finance the astronomical cost of a college education.

What are the administration's priorities? The President's budget cuts Medicare programs more than \$25 billion over 5 years, reduces the number of Pell grant recipients, cuts school lunch programs, and provides a capital gains tax cut for our Nation's wealthy.

This is a lesson in priorities. The Democratic budget provides more opportunity and makes a greater investment in the future, identifying new ways of stimulating growth. Instead of a capital gains tax cut, we should be

creative in finding ways to reduce the tax burden on the middle class, those who are financially squeezed.

Mr. Speaker, what I am hearing at home is that Americans want leadership on a domestic agenda that reflects their needs. The Democratic budget provides this leadership.

THE 1992 BUDGET RESOLUTION FAIRER AND BETTER FOR KIDS THE MIDDLE CLASS, THE ELDERLY, AND THE FUTURE

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, we know the new budget rules greatly limit our ability to move boldly to meet America's needs. That makes the Budget Committee's striking improvements to the President's budget all the more remarkable. And they show how much more we can do, than the administration proposed, to give working, middle-class Americans a fair shake.

Most workers and families in America did not enjoy rising incomes and falling taxes these past 10 years. They're counting on Congress to do something about the ground they've lost. The committee's budget puts us on a better course toward a brighter future for our children and families, improved economic security, and needed protection for society's most vulnerable members, our kids and our elderly.

In rejecting unfair and thoughtless cuts in the President's budget, Chairman PANETTA and his committee have properly looked to increase spending on cost-effective programs that we know work, and that let us get more done with limited resources. Our budget targets the key areas of child health and nutrition, taking the WIC Program to full funding by 1996, and boosting funds to fight infant mortality and expand childhood immunizations. It will enable significant growth for Head Start, nearly quadrupling the President's proposed increase for this proven way of getting kids ready for school.

We all know this country has to have a competitive work force. So, we need to ensure that every child starts school ready to learn and has the resources required to stay in school. This budget will increase funding for elementary, secondary, and higher education by \$2 billion over the President's proposal, and bolster such imperiled programs as student aid, vocational and adult education, and the TRIO Program.

In addition to promoting growth, Federal policies must assure basic fairness in the U.S. economy. Injecting the budget with a dose of fairness means, for example, killing the President's Medicaid cuts. The Democrats' budget—complying with the spending-control agreements of last year—is fairer to America, to working Americans, to

middle-class Americans, to young Americans.

COMMENDING WORK OF BUDGET COMMITTEE

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

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, as we begin to focus on writing a new Federal budget, I want to commend the work of the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. PANETTA and the Budget Committee. While I certainly do not agree with every item included in his budget, I do think that it sets the right tone for the coming debate.

The committee budget conforms with the budget discipline required by the 1990 budget agreement, and it sets many of the right priorities with respect to working families, economic strength, and fairness.

From the perspective of my congressional district, the committee budget does a lot of the right things. The budget provides for a \$1.1 billion increase in veterans medical care, which is \$221 million more than the President's request. The budget also includes \$704 million more than the President's proposal for rural programs.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the spending cuts in the committee budget. We all like to talk about balancing the budget, but it is hard to find where to save the money. This budget proposes an across-the-board cut in a variety of Federal programs and specific cuts in other areas. The committee bill would also eliminate several low priority programs and commissions. More will need to be done, but this is certainly a step in the right direction.

THE 1992 BUDGET RESOLUTION

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, once again the President is saying no to Medicare, no to education, and no to health care. Congress, however, is saying yes to these vital programs and addressing the vital needs of the family.

Mr. Speaker, now that the war in Iraq is over, it is time to turn our attention to the issues and problems in our own back yard. Here at home, we have thousands of homeless families on our streets, millions of Americans without any kind of health care coverage, and countless others are unable to afford the rising cost of continued education.

The President, however, proposes drastic cuts in Medicare, in student aid and in other social programs designed to help those in our society that are in

need. The President's proposal is targeting cuts to those populations that can least afford them—the elderly, minorities, and low-income families.

I am proud to report, Mr. Speaker, that the House budget resolution does not ignore these critical issues—it invests in our Nation's future by recognizing the needs of our children and working families and it does so without violating the caps set in last year's historic budget package.

I urge my colleagues support of the House budget resolution.

COMMENDING GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE FOR SPECIAL DESERT STORM SCHOLARSHIPS

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

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, many college students in the Guard and the Reserve and some who were previously in the service left their studies and classes to serve America in Desert Storm.

Today I want to recognize and commend a college located in the Third Congressional District of Georgia, Georgia Southwestern College, for confronting these issues and these worries for their students who served in the Middle East.

Georgia Southwestern College organized a fund raising effort with the college alumni and the local business community and created special Desert Storm scholarships. This fund will insure the returning students that they will be able to complete their educational goals. It is a generous way for the college to say, "Thank you", to their students for their contribution in freeing Kuwait from Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Georgia Southwestern College and its President, Dr. William Capitan, for their patriotism and the commitment they have shown in supporting their students and the country and for setting an example for colleges around the country, including Washington State.

CBS BECOMES INVOLVED IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, CBS television news has decided to help its viewers by becoming involved in the legislative process. Last week, the evening news, anchored by Dan Rather, did an extensive feature on H.R. 5, the so-called striker replacement bill. It was outrageously one-sided.

Mr. Rather just could not help himself. He actually used the title of the AFL-CIO's slick video, "one strike, you're out" to introduce the segment.

Mr. Rather was joined in celebrating the virtues of labor strikes by correspondent Ray Brady who worried about the terrible prospect of an American tradition—strikes, often violent and always costly to both sides—coming to an end.

Beyond the exuberance for the AFL-CIO's position on the proposed legislation, CBS displayed a disregard for the longstanding journalistic traditions of fairness and balance. Aside from one sentence from an opponent, no mention was given to why so many Americans oppose this drastic proposal. Hopefully, CBS will remedy the problem by giving opponents their chance to explain to viewers of the Evening News why this law would be bad for workers, their families, and the American economy.

□ 1220

GOLDEN PARACHUTES

(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, the Federal National Mortgage Association, also known as Fannie Mae, was originally created by Congress to promote housing in America. FNMA was not created by Congress to provide and promote golden parachutes. But, ladies and gentlemen, David Maxwell, chairman of FNMA, is getting a \$27 million retirement bonus. Let me repeat that: \$27 million retirement bonus.

Now, I represent steelworkers who lost their pensions or had their pensions reduced, some of them lost their medical insurance and life insurance benefits, and Congress and nobody really could give them a hand.

Well, let me tell you something, folks: Something is wrong with America when \$27 million can go to that retiree but the average working man can get screwed.

Listen to this and feel reassured, because the second man on the totem pole says, "David Maxwell earned every penny."

Now, if you were No. 2 in line, getting ready to walk away, I think you would say the same thing.

No wonder our housing is so screwed up in America.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise our friends in the gallery that they are welcome and we are happy to have them with us, but they should not take active part in the discussion on the House floor.

IN SUPPORT OF HUMAN LESSONS OF DESERT STORM ACT

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

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, for the first time this century, the United States committed an All-Volunteer military to a major conflict. For the first time in American history a significant portion of that military force was female. And for the first time in 50 years, hundreds of thousands of reservists were called to active duty for prolonged commitments.

This caused a great deal of debate in this country as to whether the human factor was being properly considered. The images of mothers leaving their newborn children tugged at Americans heartstrings. Several families were faced with both parents being sent in harm's way in the desert. Rural areas saw their medical care eviscerate as the only doctors in the region were called up with their Reserve units. Based on these individual circumstances, many demanded the policy be immediately changed.

I recognize that the military's first priority is the accomplishment of the mission. Rewriting their deployment policies in the middle of a war was a bad idea. But now that peace has returned, the questions are legitimate. I have no preconceived notions as to what the right answers are, but I think they should be found.

So today, I am introducing the Human Lessons of Desert Storm Consideration Act. It directs the Department of Defense to examine its policies concerning single parents, dual-service couples, and reservists who are the only professional in a rural area, and report to Congress as to whether any policy changes should be made with regard to deploying or recruiting such personnel. More importantly, it requires DOD to provide Congress with the rationale as to why the policies should be what they are.

General Powell has said the Pentagon needs to look at its policies toward deploying single parents and dual-service couples with children, but opposes Congress dictating a solution. He said the Department of Defense is capable of solving the problem by itself. I agree with that 100 percent. This bill will just make sure DOD conducts the study and informs Congress how and why it reaches its conclusions regarding its personnel policies so that Congress is not tempted to second guess and micromanage the Department.

I ask all my colleagues to support this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO JIM BORGMAN

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Jim Borgman of the Cincinnati Enquirer for winning the 1991 Pulitzer Prize for editorial cartooning. We are all proud of Jim at this great moment in his career, and I am delighted that I am able to applaud him for this paramount achievement.

Jim's commentary on both local and national events has become a staple feature in the Enquirer. Jim's cartoons provide a consistently fresh and honest point of view that are enjoyed by all. Having more than once been at the mercy of Jim's pen, I can say that he has a true talent with a knack of getting to the heart of the matter.

Like me, Jim is a native of Cincinnati. His career began while he was a student at Elder High School. He has been with the Enquirer for 15 years, having joined the staff after graduation from Kenyon College in 1976.

Although this is indeed the crowning achievement for many journalists, success is no stranger to Jim Borgman. For three consecutive years (in 1987, 1988, and 1989) Jim was also named the "best in the Nation" by the National Cartoonist Society, and his work is distributed to more than 200 newspapers through King Features Syndicate.

Mr. Speaker, we are all proud of the many fine writers who have worked so diligently and have been awarded the most coveted prize in literature. All of Cincinnati joins me in congratulating Jim and wishing him the very best in the future.

THE TRAGIC SITUATION OF THE IRAQI KURDS

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, a crisis exists in which thousands of Iraqi Kurds could die of starvation and disease almost immediately. It is a tragic situation that was clearly avoidable.

The United States bears much of the blame for what has happened to these innocent people. We set the stage for the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, but failed to deliver once these brave men and women rose to the challenge. As a result, some estimate that at least 30,000 civilians may have perished at the hands of Saddam's war machine.

To many Americans, this is an unacceptable conclusion to a war that was fought on behalf of human rights and freedom. By failing to reply to their cries for help, a moral wrong was done. Now we must take responsibility to correct it.

A safe haven must be established to protect these persecuted people—adequate relief must be provided to stop the children and elderly from dying—

and Saddam Hussein must be made to understand that this brutality will be challenged wherever it exists—both inside and outside Iraq.

Unless we face this human tragedy now, we risk witnessing a modern holocaust. Unless we act on this moral disgrace at once, people a hundred years from now, will be talking about a new film entitled "Dances With Kurds."

We are now in a position to influence events in the Middle East—let us not waste this opportunity—let us save the real victims of this war.

WHO REALLY WANTS A TRADE WAR?

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Wall Street Journal reported that the Japanese have just instituted a new tariff on United States meat products of 70 percent. While we are busily putting everything up for grabs in the Mexico Free-Trade Agreement and the GATT Agreement, our largest trading partner is raising even more barriers and accusing anyone who suggests that some American industry should be protected—of threatening a trade war.

I call your attention to this action because we are into the umpteenth negotiation with the Japanese on electronics or is it rice or beef—no, remember—we won the beef negotiations several years ago. Or did we? Evidently not.

How long is it going to take us to learn that the Japanese are so polite that they never want to disappoint or offend by saying no. It's a matter of culture. It is also a matter of history that they talk one way and act another.

Trade war? Remember, Japan fired the first shot.

THE U.N. CEASE-FIRE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, with the world watching in horror, Iraq is still reeling and churning from the turmoil caused by Saddam Hussein's selfish grab for power. Beaten but not repentant, Saddam continues to lash out in unspeakable ways at his own people. In this environment of unrest, violence, and uncertainty, the U.N. cease-fire resolution marks an important watershed in the righting of some of the terrible wrongs committed by this brutal dictator.

In addition to mandating the complete dismantling of Iraq's arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, the resolution squarely addresses the question

of Iraq's liability for the tragic consequences of this crisis, including the monumental environmental degradation caused by the dumping of millions of gallons of oil into the Persian Gulf and the deliberate torching of hundreds of Kuwaiti oil wells. By holding Iraq liable under international law for all losses and damages associated with its invasion and occupation of Kuwait, the United Nations has made it painfully clear to the Iraqi dictator that his uncivilized and inhuman behavior will not go unpunished.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago this House unanimously approved a resolution specifying that any calculation of Saddam Hussein's liability include the environmental costs of his actions—today the United Nations stands behind that principle. Tragically, as the people of the Persian Gulf region continue to suffer—we are faced with the reality that settling the peace is often more difficult than winning the war.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION APPROPRIATING \$150 MILLION FOR KURDISH AND SHIITE REFUGEES

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that authorizes and appropriates \$150 million in emergency humanitarian funds for Kurdish and Shiite refugees escaping from Iraq.

As all of you surely know, more than a million Kurds and Shiites are fleeing the genocidal persecution of the Iraqi Army. Women, children, and the elderly continue to be the target of Saddam Hussein's ruthless campaign against these populations. Those fortunate enough to escape violent death, now face starvation, freezing temperatures, and disease. Because of the primitive environment, it is impossible to know how many refugees are currently seeking protection in the mountain passes of northern and eastern Iraq, but the need for humanitarian aid is critical. Two days ago, Secretary of State Baker received a firsthand look of the horrific living conditions the refugees must endure. Clearly, the living conditions and the pleas of its inhabitants were extremely disheartening to the Secretary as they are to all of us here in this chamber. I believe former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was correct when she said:

It should not be beyond the wit of man to get planes there with tents, food, and warm blankets. It's not a question of legal niceties. We should do it now.

It is important to note that Britain has already pledged \$40 million to help the refugees. This legislation allows the President to demonstrate the sympathy of the American people, as well

as our flexibility to act quickly before the refugee conditions decay further. It provides a total of \$150 million—immediately—to the President to use as the U.S. contribution to the international relief effort. We cannot hesitate another day, the lives of thousands depend on this Government to take action, and I urge your support for this measure.

FCC DECISION ON FISR

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Federal Communications Commission modified the financial interest and syndication rule [FISR] that governs the relationship between the television networks and independent program producers. That relationship is important because it determines much of what Americans see on prime time television. And prime time television has a lot to do with how Americans see themselves and their society.

Unfortunately, the FCC changes are going to put enormous pressure on small and aspiring producers of TV programming. A generation of women and minority producers whose careers have been nurtured by the rule are going to have a very difficult time maintaining their independence. If they disappear, so will the new and different ideas they bring to America's living rooms.

I am particularly concerned about the FCC's permitting the networks to sell the rerun or syndication rights to TV shows they broadcast. Because the networks remain the gatekeepers to prime time television, they will be able to say to producers, "We'll put you on prime time if you let us distribute your show." While the threat may not be as blunt as that, independent producers assure me that that message comes through loud and clear during the negotiations for one of the coveted slots on network prime time television.

As a practical matter, the independent producer cannot afford to make the show without the money she earns by selling the rerun rights—especially the foreign rerun rights. Without those moneys, the producer can either stop producing or close up shop and go to work as an employee of one of the networks.

Diversity has long been a primary goal of our communications laws. The financial interest and syndication rule has contributed significantly to diversity by giving minority and women producers a greater chance to compete in the television program production market. Last month, over 40 leading black television producers sent a letter to the FCC in support of the Rule. They said, in part;

FISR gave African-Americans their first opportunity to overcome the entrenched network power structure. The result has been a steady growth in the number of minority producers and a more realistic portrayal of our life and culture on television. Weakening the rule turns back the clock on progress.

I had hoped the FCC would come up with a solution that gave the networks much of the deregulation they sought without sacrificing diversity and the public interest. I am sorry they were unable to do so.

Finally, I want to note that I am disturbed by the unfair criticism and accusations leveled at the single female member of the Commission. I understand what it is like to be the lone woman on a committee. I understand what it is like to bring a different perspective to an issue because of one's background. It is unfortunate that personal attacks have found their way into the debate undertaken by the Commission and interested parties.

THE BRADY BILL CAN PASS THIS YEAR

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice passed the Brady bill out by a vote of 9 to 4, greater than a 2-to-1 margin, and now it moves to the full Committee on the Judiciary, and then to the floor of the House.

My colleagues, I believe this is the year the Brady bill can pass this House and land on the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, the Brady bill calls for one simple thing, a 7-day waiting period before one receives a handgun when going into a gun shop. It makes sure that those who are legally entitled to guns get them. But it also makes sure that felons, the mentally infirm, do not get guns. Right now thousands of people who have committed other crimes walk into gun shops and walk away with guns.

Mr. Speaker, the Brady bill is essential, and there are lots of thanks to go around today, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the original sponsor who started this out way in the beginning, to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime who blazed so many trails, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee who has been so strong and forthright for the bill, and most of all to the Brady's, Jim and Sara Brady, who have fought this lonely and courageous fight for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the fight is not over. It will be a close vote in the

House, but with President Reagan's endorsement, with the increasing violence on our streets, and with the realization that sometimes the gun lobby is just plain wrong, this bill has a real chance of passing, and I would urge my colleagues to study it on the merits.

Today to Jim and Sara Brady we say, "Thumbs up. We won one."

THE FOODSAFE PROGRAM

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, the issue of food safety has become increasingly important to the American people. Providing leadership in reacting to this concern is the Texas Agricultural Extension Service, a part of the Texas A&M University system, which has developed a program called FoodSafe.

The FoodSafe Program is based on science and the simple workable process of communicating the facts about food safety to the American consumers. The FoodSafe Program stresses the importance of having each link of the food marketing chain—production, distribution, and consumption—share in the responsibility of the safety of the food supply. The FoodSafe Program is designed to reach all phases of the food marketing system utilizing the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point Program, and to address the concerns of consumers and the scientific community on food safety issues.

Mr. Speaker, the National Agricultural Extension Service is helping agriculture to be a leader in addressing public interest and concern regarding food safety. I commend them for their efforts in this endeavor.

□ 1440

ADMINISTRATION BUDGET HURTS WORKING FAMILIES

(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, last week, I held open meetings across the Third District of Indiana. I had the opportunity to listen to more than 500 working men and women who pointed to the need for more and better jobs, stronger schools, safer communities, and affordable health care.

These men and women urged me and the U.S. Congress to tackle our problems here at home with the same can-do spirit we showed during the Persian Gulf war.

I left my district with a greater determination to work to make a better Third District of Indiana and a better America for our working men and women.

That determination is why I cannot support the administration budget. The budget is more of the same, old policies of the 1980's that favored the wealthy—at the expense of the middle class, at the expense of our working men and women.

The administration's budget proposes cutting \$25.2 billion from the Medicare Program. Already, billions have been cut from the Medicare budget during the 1990 summit negotiations.

I say enough is enough. With the state of health care in this country, middle class, elderly Americans can endure no further cuts in Medicare.

Also, the administration budget calls for a windfall capital gains tax break—a tax break that does not help middle class men and women, a tax break that assists only the rich.

And, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am particularly concerned about the administration proposal to restrict higher education grants that, if enacted, threaten to exclude middle class Americans from the programs altogether.

I could go on and on with examples I find distressing about the administration budget.

I know that in an era of tight budgets, Congress must be careful about where we spend every penny. I know that tough decisions have to be made. Cuts have to be made.

But let me make certain that when making cuts, we do not disproportionately harm our working men and women, our heart and soul.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 10, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit two sealed envelopes received from the White House at 4:06 p.m. on Tuesday, April 10, 1991 as follows:

(1) Said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the Seventh Annual Report of the National Endowment for Democracy, which covers fiscal year 1990 and

(2) Said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the Annual Report of the ACTION Agency for fiscal year 1990.

With great respect, I am,
Sincerely yours,

DONALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 Foreign Affairs:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of yesterday, Tuesday, April 9, 1991, at page S4227.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ACTION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 Education and Labor:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of yesterday, Tuesday, April 9, 1991, at page S4227.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall vote, if postponed, will be taken on tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 1991.

VETERANS' BENEFITS PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1047), to amend title 38, United States Code, to make miscellaneous improvements in veterans' compensation and pension programs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1047

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Benefits Programs Improvement Act of 1991".

(b) REFERENCES TO TITLE 38.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. PENSION BENEFITS FOR INSTITUTIONALIZED VETERANS.

(a) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Section 3203(a)(1)(C) is amended by striking out "\$60" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$90".

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if contained in section 111 of Public Law 101-237.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS, BEQUESTS, AND DEVISES.

Section 5101 is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The Secretary may also accept, for use in carrying out all laws administered by the Secretary, gifts, devises, and bequests which will enhance the Secretary's ability to provide services or benefits."

SEC. 4. FREQUENCY OF PAYMENT OF PARENTS' DIC.

Subsection (a) of section 415 is amended to read as follows:

"(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), dependency and indemnity compensation shall be paid monthly to parents of a deceased veteran in the amounts prescribed by this section.

"(2) Under regulation prescribed by the Secretary, benefits under this section may be paid less frequently than monthly if the amount of the annual benefit is less than 4 percent of the maximum annual rate payable under this section."

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO COLLECTION OF CERTAIN INDEBTEDNESS TO THE UNITED STATES.

(a) **DEPOSIT OF COAST GUARD AMOUNTS.**—Section 3101(c)(4) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "or to the Retired Pay Account of the Coast Guard, as appropriate".

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to funds collected after September 30, 1990.

SEC. 6. PRESERVATION OF RATINGS WHEN CHANGES MADE IN RATING SCHEDULES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 355 is amended by adding at the end the following: "However, in no event shall such a readjustment in the rating schedule cause a veteran's disability rating in effect on the effective date of the readjustment to be reduced unless an improvement in the veteran's disability is shown to have occurred."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with regard to changes in rating schedules that take effect after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. PRESUMPTIVE PERIOD FOR OCCURRENCE OF LEUKEMIA IN VETERANS EXPOSED TO RADIATION.

(a) **CHANGE IN PRESUMPTIVE PERIOD.**—Section 312(c)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", except that" and all that follows through "leukemia".

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—No benefit may be paid by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE-CONNECTION FOR CERTAIN RADIATION-RELATED DISEASES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of chapters 11, 13, 17, 23, 24, and 35 of title 38, United States Code—

(1) an individual described in subsection (b) shall be deemed to be a veteran; and

(2) the disease of such an individual described in subsection (b)(2) shall be deemed to have been contracted in line of duty in the active military, naval, or air service.

(b) **INDIVIDUALS COVERED.**—This section applies to any individual who—

(1) while a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces participated onsite in a test involving the atmospheric detonation of a nuclear device during a period of active duty for training or inactive-duty training, and

(2) has contracted a disease listed in section 312(c)(2) of title 38, United States Code, which became manifest to a degree of 10 percent or more within the presumption period specified in subsection (c).

(c) **PRESUMPTION PERIOD.**—The presumption period for purposes of subsection (b)(2) is the 40-year period beginning on the last date on which the individual participated onsite in a test involving the atmospheric detonation of a nuclear device during a period of active duty for training or inactive-duty training.

(d) **PRESUMPTION REBUTTABLE.**—The provisions of section 313 of title 38, United States Code, shall apply to subsection (a)(2) in the same manner as to a presumption under section 312 of such title.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the term "reserve component" has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 9. LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) **MORTGAGE PROTECTION LIFE INSURANCE.**—Section 806(b) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking out "initial"; and

(2) by striking out "\$40,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$90,000".

(b) **NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE.**—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 722 are amended—

(1) by striking out "one year" each place it appears in such subsections and inserting in lieu thereof "two years"; and

(2) by striking out "one-year" each place it appears in such subsections and inserting in lieu thereof "two-year".

SEC. 10. PAYMENT OF SERVICE DISABLED VETERANS' INSURANCE IN LUMP SUM.

(a) **PAYMENT IN LUMP SUM.**—Section 722(b) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 717 of this title, insurance under this subsection shall be payable to the beneficiary determined under paragraph (2) of this subsection in a lump sum"; and

(2) by striking out paragraph (5).

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to deaths occurring before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act. In the case of insurance under section 722(b) of title 38, United States Code, payable by reason of a death before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall pay the remaining balance of such insurance in a lump sum as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. OPEN SEASON FOR USE OF DIVIDENDS TO PURCHASE ADDITIONAL INSURANCE.

Section 707(c) is amended—

(1) by striking out "before February 1, 1973" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "during the one-year period beginning July 1, 1991"; and

(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentences: "After July 1, 1992, the Secretary may, from time to time, provide for further one-year periods during which insureds may purchase additional paid up insurance from existing dividend credits and deposits. Any such period for the pur-

chase of additional paid up insurance may be allowed only if the Secretary determines in the case of any such period that it would be actuarially and administratively sound to do so."

SEC. 12. SAVINGS PROVISION FOR ELIMINATION OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN REMARRIED SPOUSES.

The amendments made by section 8004 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) shall not apply with respect to any individual who on October 31, 1990, was a surviving spouse or child within the meaning of title 38, United States Code, unless that individual after that date marries or lives with another person, holding himself or herself out openly to the public as that person's spouse.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter on H.R. 1047, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the final bill left over from the committee's legislative agenda last year.

At the outset let me say that the committee is aware that this bill contains \$5 million per year over the next 5 years in direct spending. As we have done with other bills adopted in the House this session, this measure is brought before this body today with the understanding that before this session adjourns, legislation will be enacted to offset the cost. I have given that assurance to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve my time. I understand the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] has another obligation, and before I yield time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLIGATE] to explain the bill, I will reserve my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1047, as amended, the Veterans' Benefits Programs Improvement Act of 1991.

I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLIGATE], the chairman of the Subcommittee on

Compensation, Pension and Insurance, for explaining the bill's provisions.

As he indicated, most were contained in H.R. 5326, which passed the House last year with the able assistance of BOB MCEWEN, who was the ranking member of the Compensation Subcommittee.

These provisions should enhance the delivery of benefits and services to our deserving veterans and their dependents.

I personally wish to thank my good friend, Chairman MONTGOMERY, for bringing this measure to the floor in such a timely manner, and to recognize DOUG APPLGATE for his continued service to veterans.

Also I wish to thank our ranking member of the full committee, Mr. STUMP, for his leadership and for co-sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1047, as amended, as I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE], who will give us a full explanation of the bill.

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT] for his complimentary remarks.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1047, as amended, would make needed improvements to several aspects of the compensation, pension, and life insurance programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Most of the provisions of this bill were passed by the House last year as title II of H.R. 5326, last year's failed compensation COLA bill. For this reason, we have brought the bill directly to the floor for early consideration this session. The provisions of the bill are not controversial and, for the most, part are technical or clarifying in nature.

Briefly stated, the bill, as amended would make technical corrections regarding payments of non-service-connected pension to certain veterans in nursing homes or domiciliaries and authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay parents' DIC benefits on a less frequent basis than that provided under current law.

It would give the Secretary greater latitude in accepting gifts or bequests for the Department that would enhance the administration of benefits. It would also protect individual veterans' disability ratings from reductions due solely to revisions in the rating schedule. The bill would also conform the manifestation period applicable to leukemia with other radiogenic conditions covered under the atomic veterans presumptions and expand applicability of these radiogenic presumptions to in-

clude certain members of the Guard and Reserves who may have participated in the atmospheric testing of atomic weapons.

In addition, the bill would increase coverage under the Veterans Mortgage Life Insurance Program from \$40,000 to \$90,000; liberalize the manner in which service disabled life insurance benefits may be applied for or paid; and authorize an open season for certain veterans to purchase additional paid up additions of national service life insurance.

Finally, the bill would clarify a provision in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 regarding benefits eligibility of certain surviving spouses and children of veterans.

A more detailed explanation of the bill follows:

Section 1 indicates that this act shall be cited as the Veterans' Benefits Programs Improvement Act of 1991.

Section 2 corrects an error made in connection with the enactment of section 111 of Public Law 101-237 which increased the applicable maximum rate of pension payable to veterans in nursing homes or domiciliaries. The technical corrections would increase the rate in section 3203(a)(1)(C), which applies to readmissions within 6 months of discharge, from \$60 per month to \$90 per month, with an effective date as if the amendment had been made in section 111 of Public Law 101-237.

Section 3 would expand the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests, that will enhance the Secretary's ability to provide services or benefits for veterans. Under current law, pursuant to sections 1006, 1007, and 5101 of title 38, the Secretary has authority to accept certain gifts for the benefit of national cemeteries and the Department's hospitals. However, no broad authority exists which would allow other DVA activities, such as the regional offices of the Veterans Benefits Administration, to benefit from the generosity of veterans and service organizations or other parties, in the form of donations of office equipment or similar materials. The committee believes this expansion of gift-acceptance authority can only work to the benefit of the Nation's veterans.

Section 4 would amend section 415 of title 38 to permit payment of dependency and indemnity to parents—also referred to as "parents" DIC—on a less than monthly basis. The committee has been advised that, in certain instances, payment of this benefit on a monthly basis can adversely affect certain beneficiaries' eligibility for other Federal needs based benefits. This amendment simply authorizes the Secretary to provide the same options under this program to needy parents of veterans whose deaths are service connected as are available to beneficiaries under the improved pension program.

Section 5 would make a technical amendment to section 3101(c) of title 38 to authorize the deposit of amounts collected for unpaid survivor benefit plan premiums from Coast Guard members into the retired pay account of the U.S. Coast Guard. Current law requires that all such sums now collected through offsets of compensation and pension payable to these individuals be deposited into the Department of Defense military retirement fund under chapter 74 of title 10. The Coast Guard, however, as a component of the Department of Transportation, maintains a separate fund, the retired pay account, for the receipt of these payments or collections. The committee believes enactment of this provision will ensure that the collected funds will be deposited into the proper account.

Section 6 would amend section 355 of title 38 to provide that no readjustment in the schedule for rating disabilities shall cause a veteran's disability rating in effect on the date of the readjustment to be reduced unless an actual improvement in the veteran's disability has been shown to have occurred. The committee is aware of cases, particularly with respect to adjustments in the rating schedule pertaining to the evaluation of hearing loss, in which individual veteran's ratings have been reduced although no improvement in the veteran's disability has occurred. Enactment of this provision is necessary to protect veterans' ratings, especially in light of forthcoming future readjustments to the rating schedule which otherwise could have resulted in similar reductions.

Section 7 would amend section 312(c) by conforming the manifestation period applicable in the case of a radiation-exposed veteran suffering from the disease of leukemia to the manifestation period of 40 years which is applicable to other cancer related diseases for which presumptions of service connection were provided under Public Law 100-321. This amendment is consistent with a recommendation submitted to the committee by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs Advisory Committee on Environmental Hazards and with conclusions reached as to the long-term effects of exposure to low levels of ionizing radiation set forth in the BEIR V committee report followup to the BEIR III committee report.

Section 8 would expand applicability of presumptions found in section 312(c) of title 38 for veterans exposed to low levels of ionizing radiation during atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons or the occupation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II to certain members of the National Guard and Reserve who also participated in the tests but were not on active duty. The committee has been advised that as many as 1,500 such individuals may have participated in these tests. The

general counsel of the DVA has determined that such individuals, not having been on active duty, are not covered by these presumptions. The expansion of eligibility for certain benefits would, however, be limited in application to chapters 11, 13, 17, 23, 24, and 35 of title 38.

Subsection (a) of section 9 would increase the maximum amount of coverage under the Veterans Mortgage Life Insurance [VMLI] Program for severely disabled veterans who are eligible for specially adapted housing grants from \$40,000 to \$90,000. Subsection (b) would extend the time period for applying for additional life insurance coverage under the Service-Disabled Life Insurance [SDLI] Program from 1 year following a determination of service connection of a disability to 2 years after that date.

Section 10 would revise the manner in which payments of service disabled veterans life insurance are made in the case of certain incompetent service-connected disabled veterans. Under current law, payments to a beneficiary determined in accordance with statute must be made by a minimum of 120 equal monthly payments. This provision would require that such payments be made in a lump sum to the first beneficiary and that, in a case in which monthly payments had commenced prior to the enactment of this provision, the Secretary shall pay the remaining balance in one lump sum.

Section 11 would establish a 1-year period beginning on July 1, 1991, during which veterans with accumulated dividends on account could purchase additional amounts of paid up national service life insurance. Under current law, only current annual dividends may be applied for this purpose. This provision would also authorize the Secretary, from time to time, to provide for additional 1-year open seasons.

Section 12 would make a technical correction to section 8004 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 which repealed certain portions of title 38 affecting consideration of an individual as the unremarried spouse of a veteran—particularly for dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] and burial eligibility—or the child of a veteran. This provision would clarify the effect of the reconciliation provision to accurately reflect the intent of Congress that the change in law shall not serve to deny, reduce, or terminate benefits to any individual who, on October 31, 1990, was, or would have been considered, as the unremarried spouse or child of the veteran, as long as no subsequent marriage has occurred.

There follows an estimate of the cost of H.R. 1047, as amended, prepared by the Congressional Budget Office, dated April 8, 1991:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 8, 1991.

Hon. G.V. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate of H.R. 1047, the Veterans' Compensation Programs Improvement Act of 1991, as introduced and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 21, 1991, but with modifications provided by the Committee staff on April 3, 1991.

Because the bill would affect direct spending, we also have enclosed the estimate required by clause 8 of House Rule XXI.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST
ESTIMATE

1. Bill number: H.R. 1047.
2. Bill title: Veterans' Compensation Programs Improvement Act of 1991.

3. Bill status: Section 1 through 9 are from the bill as introduced and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 21, 1991. Sections 10 through 12 are based on draft language provided by the committee staff on April 3, 1991.

4. Bill purpose: To amend title 38 to make miscellaneous improvements in veterans' compensation and pension programs and for other purposes.

5. Estimated cost to the Federal Government:

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Budget authority	(1)	5	5	5	5	5
Outlays	(1)	5	5	5	5	5

¹ Less than \$500,000.

The costs of this bill fall within budget function 700.

Basis of Estimate: The following section-by-section cost analysis addresses only those sections of the bill that could be expected to have a significant budgetary impact.

Section 6. This section would protect a veteran's disability rating from reduction if that reduction were the result of a revision of the disability rating schedule. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is in the process of reviewing and revising the disability rating schedule. The CBO baseline does not assume changes in the rating schedule; therefore, this provision has no cost when measured against the baseline. Moreover, there is no way of estimating in advance which changes may be made in the rating schedule.

Section 8. This section would extend a presumption of service-connection for certain radiation-related diseases to reservists who were exposed to ionizing radiation during military service.

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Budget authority	1	1	1	1	1
Outlays	1	1	1	1	1

According to the Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA), it is estimated that approximately 2,000 National Guard and military reservists were called to active duty for training during nuclear test programs. Under this provision, certain radiation-related diseases would be presumed to be service-connected when occurring in members of this group. Af-

ected reservists and their survivors and dependents would become eligible for benefits including compensation, pension, medical care, burial benefits, and educational assistance.

Section 9. This section would increase from \$40,000 to \$90,000 the maximum mortgage life insurance coverage available to severely disabled veterans under the Veterans Mortgage Life Insurance (VMLI) program.

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Budget authority	2	2	2	2	2
Outlays	2	2	2	2	2

More than 40 percent of all VMLI policies and over 60 percent of all policies issued during the last 10 years insure mortgages in which the initial balance exceeded \$40,000, the current maximum coverage on a VMLI policy. The above estimate assumes that approximately 25 percent of current policyholders would apply for additional coverage.

Section 12. This section would extend eligibility for benefits to remarried survivors whose remarriage terminated before October 31, 1991.

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Budget authority	2	2	2	2	2
Outlays	2	2	2	2	2

Before enactment of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-508) veteran's survivors would lose benefits if the surviving spouse remarried, but could apply for reinstatement if the subsequent marriage was ended. Public Law 101-508 prohibited such reinstatement for new cases after October 31, 1990. This section would allow remarried survivors to receive benefits if the remarriage was terminated before the change in law and if the claim for reinstatement of benefits had not been filed by that date.

6. Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts through 1995. This bill would have the following pay-as-you-go impact:

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Budget authority	1	5	5	5	5
Outlays	1	5	5	5	5

¹ Less than \$500,000.

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

8. Estimate comparison: None.

9. Previous CBO estimate: None.

10. Estimate prepared by: Sandra Clark (226-2820).

11. Estimate approved by: C. G. Nuckols (for James L. Blum, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis).

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE ¹

The applicable cost of this Act for all purposes of sections 252 and 253 of the Balanced

¹ An estimate of H.R. 1047, to amend title 38 to make miscellaneous improvements in veterans' compensation and pension programs and for other purposes, as introduced and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 21, 1991. Sections 10 through 12 are based on draft language provided by the Committee on April 3, 1991. This estimate was transmitted by the Congressional Budget Office on April 8, 1991.

Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be as follows:

(By fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Change in outlays	1	5	5	5	5
Change in receipts	2	2	2	2	2

¹ Under \$500,000.

² Not applicable.

Mr. Speaker, as always, I want to commend the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the full committee for their excellent leadership in bringing this measure to the Floor so quickly. I might add that Mr. STUMP is now the ranking minority member of our subcommittee on compensation, pension and insurance. I also want to thank the Gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, the former ranking minority member of the committee for his support of this bill. I would also like to thank the Gentleman from Alabama, Mr. HARRIS, and the Gentleman from Georgia, Dr. ROWLAND, for their assistance in putting together this bill. As a final note, I want to thank the former ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. BOB MCEWEN, who has left the Veterans Affairs Committee to serve on the Rules Committee, for all of his good work over the past several years and for his support of this bill.

I urge all Members to support this measure.

□ 1450

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE] for his explanation of the bill, and to thank the gentleman for those kudos where he mentioned Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama, Judge/Colonel HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 1991. This omnibus bill contains many needed improvements in veterans' benefits. I am especially pleased with the atomic test provision.

Last Congress I sponsored a bill that would have provided selected veterans' benefits to a small group of National Guardsmen and reservists who participated in the atmospheric tests of nuclear devices in the open-air tests during the 1950's and 1960's. These benefits have been incorporated into this omnibus legislation.

This disability rating provision will grant the same service connection to these National Guardsmen and reservists as that provided for active duty personnel under Public Law 100-321, the Radiation-Exposed Veterans Compensation Act of 1988. It will provide eligibility for service-connected disability compensation, dependency in-

demnity compensation, hospital and medical care, burial and memorial benefits, and survivors' educational assistance. It does not provide readjustment benefits like VA home loans, GI bill educational assistance, or vocational rehabilitation as most of these guardsmen and reservists are more than 65 years old.

To me, these benefits are a matter of equity. Every man who served during these experiments was equally exposed to radiation and is now equally deserving of fair treatment.

As a member of the Alabama National Guard, I am especially pleased to help guardsmen who so faithfully served our Nation. I am pleased that surviving family members of these guardsmen and reservists will also be granted compensation and educational assistance.

I would like to thank Chairman MONTGOMERY for including this important provision in the omnibus bill and would urge my colleagues to support passage of this resolution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS] for his support of this legislation, as well as his kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who has been a great supporter of veterans. He is not a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, but I wish he was. I wish to thank him for the good work he has done over the years on behalf of veterans and their dependents.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to rise in support of this measure and to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE], the chairman of the Subcommittee of Compensation, Pension, and Insurance, for the concern for and dedication to our Nation's veterans.

This legislation, in addition to improving a number of veterans' benefits, extends the period of time in which service-related leukemia must manifest itself from 30 years to 40 years of exposure and links service connection for certain radiation-related diseases for reservists involved in nuclear tests. Additionally, the measure increases the level of mortgage protection life insurance coverage for serving disabled veterans from \$40,000 to \$90,000. These provisions represent significant steps in helping our severely disabled veterans to adapt their homes to their handicap.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure. With recent conclusion of hostilities in the Persian Gulf, it is an appropriate time

to reflect on the sacrifices made by our men and women who have served so courageously and loyally in the Armed Forces over the years.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE], the chairman of the subcommittee, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and also one of the ranking minority members, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT], for the work they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLGATE], who has worked so diligently on this piece of legislation. I appreciate very much what the gentleman has done to expedite its movement through Congress.

Mr. Speaker, during the 100th Congress, the Honorable JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT and I sponsored legislation, H.R. 1811, that was eventually enacted as Public Law 100-321. Under section 312(c) of title 38, there is a presumption of service connection for 13 diseases suffered by veterans who were exposed to high levels of radiation during the occupation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki or in the atmospheric testing of nuclear devices during the forties, fifties, and early sixties.

With the exception of leukemia, the law requires that the disease suffered by one of these veterans must have become manifest to a degree of ten percent or more within 4 years of exposure. For leukemia, the manifestation period is 30 years. At the time Congress enacted Public Law 100-321, the most reliable scientific information available suggested a 30-year period during which an elevated risk of contracting leukemia could be expected. The same expectation was not observed with regard to the other conditions.

Since that time, additional data, based largely on the life span study of the Japanese atomic bomb survivors, showed leukemia arising in these victims later in life. As a result, the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Environmental Hazards recommended to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the manifestation period for leukemia be deleted. The Secretary has proposed, rather than deleting the manifestation period, that the Congress simply conform the manifestation period for leukemia to the other 12 presumptive conditions—that is, 40 years.

Last year I introduced legislation to accomplish this purpose which was approved by the House and stalled in the other body. The same language is included in the bill we are considering today, the Veterans' Programs Improvement Act of 1991. I would like to

thank the chairman and DOUG APPLE-GATE, chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee on Compensation, for their assistance with including this language in H.R. 1047. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

□ 1500

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance, Mr. APPLIGATE, and the ranking minority member, Mr. STUMP of Arizona, who is also the ranking minority member of the full committee.

We had hoped that this measure could have been adopted and sent to the President last year; however, the Senate was unable to move the bill before the Congress adjourned.

The changes in this bill will benefit many veterans and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1047, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES ON GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have here an advance copy of the National Academy of Sciences report on the policy implications of global warming, scheduled for release at 3 p.m. today. Now I've never been one to violate an embargo on releasing information, so I won't tell you what's in this report. But I will say this. This report will be a time bomb. It lays out the harsh reality of global warming. It is an indictment of the inadequate energy policy advocated by the administration.

In short, it says if we wait, it will be too late. We must end our consumption driven energy practices or risk an environmental cataclysm.

Next week I will introduce a resolution calling for the United States to take the lead in setting specific goals for reducing carbon dioxide emissions both in the United States and abroad. I

am urging my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in introducing this resolution, which follows.

H. RES. —

Whereas human activities substantially increase the atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane, chlorofluorocarbons, and nitrous oxide, which are known as the greenhouse gases;

Whereas an increase in the concentration of greenhouse gases enhances the natural greenhouse effect, resulting in an additional warming of the Earth's surface and an excess of radiative energy that alters the climate;

Whereas, in August 1990, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that, if current trends for emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases continue, a global warming of 5 to 10 degrees Fahrenheit above preindustrialized levels is likely by the end of the next century, bringing the Earth to its warmest level in at least 150,000 years;

Whereas many scientific studies show that global warming of 5 to 10 degrees per century would create grave risks of precipitous climate shifts, with effects such as extreme heat waves, droughts in agricultural and urban areas, amplified warming at the poles, a rise in the sea level and resultant flooding of coastal areas, an increase in the frequency and severity of hurricanes and other extreme weather events, and the destruction of forests over broad expanses;

Whereas massive environmental stresses can cause unprecedented agricultural, economic, and social disruptions;

Whereas the ministerial declaration of the Second World Climate Conference, adopted in November 1990 by more than 100 governments, including the United States, calls for the negotiation of a treaty to limit climate change in order to quickly protect society and the environment using the best methods currently available and to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations at a global level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with climate;

Whereas the ministerial declaration further provides that the potentially serious consequences of climate change justifies the adoption of response strategies even if the benefit of the strategies is uncertain;

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly has established the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is responsible for negotiating an international climate protection agreement that can be signed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in June 1992;

Whereas, in February 1991, the 1st negotiation session of the Committee was hosted by the United States, in order to agree on a draft convention that could serve as the basis of future negotiations on the final framework convention;

Whereas the negotiators at the 1st session of the Committee failed to agree on a draft convention, partly due to resistance from the United States to setting specific targets and timetables for greenhouse gas reductions;

Whereas the failure of the Committee's 1st negotiation session to produce a draft convention has delayed the progress of the negotiations and could prevent agreement on a final framework convention by June 1992;

Whereas the United States emits more carbon dioxide than any other nation and has the highest per capita emissions of carbon dioxide of the major industrialized nations;

Whereas the control of a large fraction of the emissions of carbon dioxide from the United States could be accomplished at little or no cost and would contribute to the competitiveness of United States businesses and the overall economy; and

Whereas the President's National Energy Policy Plan anticipates increases in carbon dioxide emissions of 20 percent over the next 20 years, and contains neither targets nor significant policy initiatives to reduce carbon dioxide emissions: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) it should be the policy of the United States to reduce the national emissions of carbon dioxide in the next 10 years by 20 percent from the 1990 baseline level; and

(2) the United States should assume a leadership position in negotiating an international climate protection treaty that includes—

(A) an agreement by industrialized nations to reduce their current emissions of carbon dioxide in the next 10 years by 20 percent;

(B) an agreement by developing nations to reduce their growth in carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel combustion so that total emissions from the industrialized and developing world are significantly reduced in the next 10 years;

(C) an agreement by all countries to take available measures to reduce emissions of other greenhouse gases;

(D) the establishment of an international fund, financed in proportion to the level of carbon dioxide emissions of industrialized countries, to assist developing countries in achieving such objectives; and

(E) the establishment of a mechanism of continuing international cooperation for the development of efficient policies for future emissions reductions that are necessary to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions at safe levels.

THE CONTINUED PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw the attention of my colleagues to the continued plight of the American Indians. Too few Americans know the true status of most of the Indians who live on or off reservations. Too few Americans know of the broken treaties, the 43-percent high school graduation rate among American Indians, the 45-percent poverty rate, and the 35-percent unemployment rate of native Americans on our national economic scale. I am afraid most Americans, having seen Indians under the influence of alcohol or drugs, are convinced Indians are drunks and there is nothing the Federal Government can or should do about it.

Mr. Speaker, the heightened awareness about American Indians resulting from the movie "Dances With Wolves" to create programs which will help Indians improve their own existence. In the Senate, Senators INOUE and MCCAIN and 14 other Senators lead the way. Here in the House, Congressman

MORRIS UDALL, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been a strong proponent of Indian programs for years. Now, with the help of Vice Chairman GEORGE MILLER of California and Congressmen JOHN RHODES, BILL RICHARDSON, and BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, I look forward to seeing considerable legislative action in this Congress.

Chairman MILLER recently wrote an editorial commentary piece published in the Los Angeles Times last month which cogently sets forth what needs to be done. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, and submit a copy of the piece for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I rise today to introduce legislation which will establish a national university for native Americans.

For too long our country has neglected its trust, treaty, and moral obligations to provide critically needed education for the indigenous people who once possessed this great land from which this Nation has developed.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to make a larger effort to help today's native Americans address today's problems. Native Americans are no different from the rest of us, if educational opportunities and materials are presented in a manner to which they can relate.

Mr. Speaker, the bill being introduced today will give native Americans a new opportunity to move themselves forward through higher education.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 26, 1991]

PROGRESS FOR INDIANS IS A FILM FANTASY
(By George Miller)

Twenty years have passed since Marlon Brando used the Academy Awards as a platform to draw national attention to Hollywood's exploitation of American Indians in films. Last night, the Oscars drew attention to Indians again; this time with "Dances With Wolves," a powerful film about 19th-Century Indian life and 19th-Century U.S. Indian policy.

Unfortunately, the progress American Indians made in film this year is unmatched by improvement in the utter impoverishment of contemporary Indian life. Regrettably, government policy, while considerably more enlightened than in the 1870s, continues to undermine the potential of Native Americans.

Indians today are little better, and, in some cases, worse off than when they were fighting the cavalry or when Brando made his stand. According to the most recent data, the high school graduation rate among Indians is 43%, the poverty rate is 45% and the unemployment rate is 35% nationally and more than 80% on some reservations.

While the United States gives nearly \$10 billion per year to help developing countries improve basic living conditions and promote economic modernization, more than 20% of American Indian homes lack toilets and more than 50% do not have telephones.

Federal agencies responsible for implementing Indian policy have attempted to respond to skyrocketing rates of alcoholism, youth suicide, tuberculosis and incarceration, but the efforts too often have been feeble and ineffective.

The two principal agencies responsible for Indian matters—the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service—are severely underfunded despite their huge mandates. President Bush requested only \$12 million for 1992 for the construction of badly needed health and sanitation facilities—a cut of \$154 million from 1991. The budgeteers operated on the theory that all new health services for Indians would be covered by private health insurance, with the payments funneled to the Indian Health Service. The Administration estimated these payments to be \$129 million. But in 1990, only \$3.7 million was collected.

Under treaties and federal law, the United States promised to uphold the rights of Indian tribes and became the trustee of Indian land and resources. The United States vowed that Indian people would be housed, educated and provided with decent health care. Unfortunately, as the statistics show, the United States has failed on nearly every count. And virtually every treaty signed with an Indian tribe has been broken.

Indians in the 1970s and '80s saw more and more decisions go against them—in religious freedom cases, taxation and zoning cases and cases involving criminal jurisdiction.

A positive development worth noting is in the area of self-governance. Congress enacted the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act in 1975 to give tribes the freedom to carry out additional federal responsibilities on their own. And though the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service for the most part retain great authority over the tribes, their grip was loosened when in 1990 seven tribes negotiated self-governance compacts directly with the Interior Department. This experimental program was aimed at circumventing the bureau, an agency within the department.

One thing we have learned is that the tribes themselves possess many of the answers to these pervasive problems.

In California, with the second-largest Indian population in the country, the potential for change is enormous. Federal officials have acknowledged that many of the state's Indian citizens are being denied services they deserve because they lack federal tribal recognition. Efforts are now under way to expedite the unbearably slow and unresponsive tribal recognition process for dozens of long-established Indian tribes in California, continuing the move toward Indian self-determination.

At a time in U.S. history when moral suasion counts for less than political muscle, Indians have a bumper crop of the former but are starved for the latter. Indians are too few and too scattered to have an impact on the political process. In only the rarest of cases do congressional hearings on Indian issues draw the media or the public.

"Dances With Wolves" is a landmark artistic achievement. It has educated many Americans to the positive values of Indian culture. It would be a tragedy if we failed to act on this heightened awareness. Twenty years from now, let's not be looking back from the same sad reality we accept today.

H.R. 1690

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 "Native American University Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) the percentage of Native Americans completing high school is deplorably low, despite continued attempts to improve the situation;

(2) the abuse of alcohol and drugs continues to pose a serious threat to health and safety of Native Americans;

(3) studies have shown a strong correlation between improved scholastic success and a sense of cultural identity in Native American students;

(4) a focal point is needed at which Native Americans could pursue higher degrees within the context of a system which promotes strong cultural identity;

(5) current Federal and tribal programs to improve the well-being of Native Americans through increased awareness of cultural identity are showing significant progress but these programs are still in need of a central location from which bachelor and post graduate degrees can be obtained; and

(6) the establishment of a national university for Native Americans is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be established, in accordance with the provisions of this Act, a national university to provide a program of undergraduate education for Native American youth in the arts and sciences, to be known as the "National Native American University" (hereinafter in this Act referred to as "the University").

(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—

(1) MEMBERSHIP.—The University shall be incorporated and administered under the direction of a Board of Trustees composed of 9 members appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, of whom—

(A) 3 shall be American Indians,
(B) 1 shall be a Native Alaskan or Eskimo, and

(C) 1 shall be a Native Hawaiian.

(2) TERMS.—Members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of 4 years, except that—

(A) of the Members first appointed—

(i) 2 shall be appointed for term of 1 year;
(ii) 2 shall be appointed for terms of 2 years;

(iii) 2 shall be appointed for terms of 3 years; and

(iv) 3 shall be appointed for terms of 4 years;

(B) a Member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of a predecessor's term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term;

(C) a Member may continue to serve after the expiration of his or her term until a successor is appointed; and

(D) no Member shall serve more than 10 consecutive years on the Board.

(c) BOARD AUTHORITY.—The Board is authorized—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain and defend, in its corporate name and through its own counsel;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use the corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) to adopt, amend, and repeal by its Board of Directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations as may be necessary for the conduct of its business;

(4) to conduct its business, carry on its operations, and have officers and exercise the power granted by this section in any State without regard to any qualification or similar statute in any State;

(5) to lease, purchase, or otherwise acquire, own, hold, improve, use, or otherwise deal in and with any property, real, personal, or mixed, or any interest therein, wherever situated;

(6) to accept gifts or donations of services, or of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes of the Association;

(7) to sell, convey, mortgage, pledge, lease, exchange, and otherwise dispose of its property and assets;

(8) to appoint such officers, attorneys, employees, and agents as may be required, to determine their qualifications, to define their duties, to fix their salaries, require bonds for them, and fix the penalty thereof; and

(9) to enter into contracts, to execute instruments, to incur liabilities, and to do all things as are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

SEC. 4. SELECTION OF SITE; AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.

(a) **SITE SELECTION.**—The Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with, and with the consent of, the Board, shall designate a site or an appropriate land area for the establishment of the University. The Secretary of the Interior and the Board shall make every effort to provide a land area to be located within the continental United States that affords the maximum opportunity for Native American students to attend the University and to successfully complete their undergraduate and graduate programs.

(b) **ACQUISITION BY PURCHASE OR DONATION.**—The land may be obtained through purchase or donation by the Federal Government, a State Government, or by private citizens or corporate ownership.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of land and construction and operation of the University—

- (1) \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 1993; and
- (2) \$20,000,000 for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 5. REQUIRED PROGRAM OF STUDY.

The University shall establish and operate a program of study on Native American culture and the care and management of Native Americans by the United States Government, including the care and allotment of Indian lands by the Government.

□ 1430

FIRST-TIME HOMEBUYERS' ACT OF 1991

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation designed to help young persons make that all-important first home purchase.

Home ownership, as many of my colleagues are aware, is on the decline. We have just completed the first decade of decline in home ownership since World War II. A recent Congressional Research Service report noted that while the home ownership rate rose from 44 percent in the 1940 census to 65.5 percent in 1980, that rate had declined to 63.8 in 1989.

Last year, Congress approved Federal Housing Administration [FHA] reforms as part of the housing authorization bill. While needed to protect the FHA's soundness, these reforms place a new burden on potential first-time home

buyers by increasing their monthly insurance premiums and raising their closing costs.

The decline in home ownership among younger persons is especially pronounced. According to a study by Harvard University's Joint Center for Housing Studies, 43.6 percent of young Americans between the ages of 25 and 29 owned homes in 1973. In 1989, however, that age group's home ownership rate had fallen to a mere 35.5 percent. At this point, I conclude in the RECORD a table reflecting the decline in home ownership included in that study.

The material follows:

HOME OWNERSHIP RATES BY AGE OF HEAD (PERCENT)

Age	1973	1976	1980	1983	1987	1989
Under 25	23.4	21.0	21.3	19.3	16.1	17.6
25 to 29	43.6	43.2	43.3	38.2	35.9	35.4
30 to 34	60.2	62.4	61.1	57.7	53.2	53.6
35 to 39	68.5	69.0	70.8	65.8	63.8	63.9
40 to 44	72.9	73.9	74.2	74.2	70.6	70.8
45 to 54	76.1	77.4	77.7	77.1	75.8	75.3
55 to 64	75.7	77.2	79.3	80.5	80.8	80.2
65 to 74	71.3	72.7	75.2	76.9	78.1	78.2
75 and over	67.1	67.2	67.8	71.6	70.7	70.3
Total	64.4	64.8	65.6	64.9	64.0	64.0

Source: American Housing Survey, 1973-1980; Consumer Population Survey, 1983-1989.

One of the biggest roadblocks to first-time home purchase, especially for younger purchasers who can afford the monthly mortgage payment, is assembling the hefty downpayment required for even a moderately priced home. This obstacle keeps many would-be first-time home buyers out of the buying market.

The First Time Homebuyers' Act of 1991, which I introduce today, is designed to give a hand to those saving toward the purchase of a first home. Specifically, it allows withdrawal of funds from an IRA—\$5,000 per individual; \$10,000 per couple—without initial tax penalty if those funds are applied toward the downpayments of a moderately priced first home.

First-time home buyers need a hand. Several States have recently experienced a modest increase in first-time home ownership due to low interest rates and a softened market for lower priced houses. This legislation will complement these favorable economic conditions by assisting prospective first-time home buyers in saving for a downpayment. However, the Federal Government simply cannot afford a handout. No housing legislation will become law in the 102d Congress if it results in substantial loss to the Treasury—nor should it. Unlike other related measures, however, this legislation provides for a tax recapture mechanism upon the sale of the first home so the treasury won't suffer substantial revenue loss. This legislation is designed to help put people into their first homes without draining the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, the First-Time Homebuyers' Act received support from over 100 cosponsors during the 101st Congress. I urge support for this legisla-

tion during this Congress. At this point, I will include in the RECORD a recent article on this topic from the New York Times. The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 1991]
FIRST-TIME BUYERS HELPING TO REVIVE HOUSING MARKET
(By Richard D. Hylton)

Lower interest rates and a backlog of unsold low-priced homes are making it possible for many first-time buyers to enter the housing market for the first time in many years.

Their buying is adding to the small spurt in real estate activity that was detected first in the sluggish Northeast late in January and that has now spread across the country. The influx of first-time buyers is also making it possible for some homeowners to sell and move up to bigger homes.

"We are seeing a resurgence of the first-time buyers in the market," said Pall Spera, head of Pall Spera Realtors in Stowe, Vt., whose comments were echoed by brokers from Los Angeles to Miami.

Typical of the first-time buyers are Ketty and Jean Felix Day, who recently bought a three-bedroom, two-bath house in north Miami for \$75,000. The couple, who got a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage at 9 percent, had been looking for about a year and a half.

The Days who together earn about \$43,000, said the key to their purchase was monthly mortgage payments of no more than \$800. Six months ago, they said, the house would have cost at least \$80,000, and interest rates were higher. As both came down, so did the mortgage cost; their monthly payment is \$728.

"We were just looking last year, but the interest rates were very high, and I knew that the interest rates would go lower," said Mrs. Day, a 32-year-old editorial assistant for an airline magazine.

While there are no specific measures of activity by first-time home buyers like the Days, real estate agents say such buyers have been out in force. Moreover, home sales have been strongest at the lower end of the market, typically the province of the new buyers.

First-time buyers have been among those most hurt by high housing prices because they have been unable to save enough money for a down payment.

High interest rates compounded their problems, because even if they could raise the down payment, they often were unable to make the monthly mortgage payments.

This picture has changed sharply in recent months. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation this month pronounced the current housing market the most affordable since 1977. The agency looks at affordability in terms of average family income, housing prices and mortgage rates.

SINGLE-DIGIT RATES HELP

Fixed-rate mortgages are now being offered at about 9% percent, while adjustable-rate mortgages are available at about 7% percent. Adjustable-rate mortgages are reset—usually annually—depending on other interest rates.

"I think the psychology of single-digit rates have very, very positive connotations," said Dick Ritchey, regional director and owner of Century 21's south Florida office in Miami.

The Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation, one of the nation's leading private mortgage insurance companies, is also reporting that houses are now more affordable for first-time buyers than they have been in

several years. And by paying a premium of several thousand dollars for mortgage insurance, buyers can often secure a home with a small down payment.

The apparent uptick in activity is too recent to have shown up in national figures on home sales, which still appeared to be falling in January. According to preliminary figures from the National Association of Realtors, owners sold 2.91 million houses in January, down from 3 million plus in December and the 3.47 million sold in January 1990.

Statistics on newly built houses which usually trail the sale of older homes especially when the economy is coming out of a slump, also showed a decline. In January 408,000 new homes were sold, down 12 percent from 465,000 in December, and down 35 percent from 627,000 in January 1990.

SIGNS OF RECOVERY

But Leland C. Brendsel, the chairman of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, said last week that he thought the recession in the housing market had bottomed out and that it should show clear signs of recovery by midyear.

Another encouraging sign for the housing industry is the increase in traffic at new subdivision sites. Many subdivisions consist of lower-priced homes aimed at new buyers. According to a monthly survey by the National Association of Homebuilders, 42 percent of the 300 builders surveyed reported that traffic was in the high to average range in February, up from 24 percent in January. Both months are generally the worst time of the year for home sales.

PHH Homeequity Inc., a Wilton Conn., firm that handles relocation of employees for corporate clients, is also seeing improvement in some housing markets, including Fairfield County, Conn.; northern New Jersey, Washington, DC, and in San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Jose, Calif. It said its offers for homes are now being outbid by other potential buyers.

The relocation firm, which deals with homes in the upper-middle-income segment of the residential market, said it saw a 7 percent increase seasonally adjusted, in its housing market indicator, which tracks the rate of sold and unsold inventory and the rate at which sellers accept first bids. It maintains a data base of 10,000 houses across the country.

"A SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT"

"Although a month does not a trend make, in January we saw a significant improvement after seeing a decline for the previous six months," said Stephen Fragapane, president of PHH.

While Mr. Fragapane and others are encouraged, they caution that the revival is a far cry from a fully recovered market. The January figures underlined how weak the market has been, with existing homes selling at their lowest rate in seven years and sales of new homes at their lowest in nearly nine years.

Nevertheless, the real estate industry is optimistic that the recent surge signals the start of a turnaround.

The median sales prices of existing homes in most regions of the nation are down significantly from their 1989 highs. In the Northeast, for example, which still has the highest median sales prices of any section of the country, the median is now \$141,200 down from \$148,800 in 1989, according to the National Association of Realtors.

People shopping for houses are also finding themselves in heated competitive bidding situations.

"MULTIPLE OFFERS"

"A couple of our managers are talking about multiple offers again, and our inventory is decreasing," said Gail Carriero, a marketing representative in the San Francisco office of the Coldwell Banker Residential Group.

Similar reports are coming from brokers in the Los Angeles area, Dallas, Phoenix and in southern Florida, as well as in Boston, Vermont and elsewhere in upper New England.

The Midwest is a different story. The drop in prices and consumer demand did not hit that region as hard last year as it did other sections of the country, and now brokers say they have not seen a sharp increase in sales since January. In Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois and Indiana, brokers did not see the precipitous fall in sales and consumer demand last year that buffeted their colleagues in other regions. They have been experiencing a slow decline in sales and demand but that has not been interrupted by a sharp rise in the last few weeks.

"I don't think there's been an increase," said Steven Pew, head of Max Brooch Realtors in Bloomfield Hills, Mich., and regional vice president of the National Association of Realtors. "There has been a slight downturn over the past few months, but it has been in the single digits," said Mr. Pew, who said the situation might worsen quickly if car sales did not improve soon.

IMPROVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA

In California, where the weakening of the housing market was not as severe as on the East Coast, brokers from San Diego to San Francisco are reporting improved activity at the lower end of the market.

Brad and Kifa Nantz, a young professional couple in the San Francisco Bay area, are among those who did not think they would soon see the confluence of low prices and low rates again. Although they had been looking for more than a year, the couple stepped up their search in January and put their condominium on the market. A few weeks ago they sold their one-bedroom condo for \$193,500 (they bought it in 1989 for \$157,000) and bought a three-bedroom, three-bath house on a golf course in San Ramon, Calif., for \$310,000. In San Ramon, such prices put the young couple at the lower-middle end of the market.

The Nantzes got a 30-year mortgage that is fixed at 8½ percent for the first three years and then becomes adjustable.

"We had our open house the day the war started," said the 29-year-old Mr. Nantz, who said that at first he and his wife thought the timing was a disaster. But their condo sold within weeks. The Nantzes got a mortgage for \$191,000 on their new house.

"We felt that this was a good time and the rates had a lot to do with it," Mrs. Nantz said.

COMMITTEE BUDGET ESTIMATES

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, some time ago it was called to my attention that several House committees do not formally approve the budget estimates they are required to submit to the Budget Committee. Instead, the estimates are devised by staff and then unilaterally transmitted to the Budget Committee in a letter from the chairman. And this is usually

done without the prior knowledge of or consultation with the full committee, let alone its formal approval.

While I am sure many Members would just as soon not be bothered by such seemingly routine housekeeping matters so early in the session, and probably would have no problem delegating this authority to their chairmen, the fact remains that these budget views and estimates constitute an important source of information for the Budget Committee in developing a budget resolution.

The Budget Committee, the budget resolution and the overall budget process are all convenient scapegoats for authorizing committees which do not get all they want out of the process. And yet ironically, many committees are apparently forfeiting their right and obligation to have early and formal input into the process.

Mr. Speaker, the original 1974 Budget Act, at section 301(c), required that, "On or before March 15 of each year, each standing committee of the House of Representatives shall submit to the Budget Committee of the House * * * its views and estimates" with respect to matters within its jurisdiction which are to be included in the budget resolution, including the total amounts of new budget authority or outlays to be provided or authorized in the upcoming fiscal year.

In 1985, in the debt limit Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law, that provision became section 301(d), the date for submission was changed to February 25 due to a new accelerated budget timetable, and the references to the specific contents of the reports was dropped in favor of the following language: " * * * its views and estimates—as determined by the committee making such submission—with respect to all matters set forth in subsections (a) and (b) which relate to matters within the jurisdiction or functions of such committee."

The joint explanatory statement of the conferees on the Budget Act changes made by that bill made clear that the language was based on the reforms recommended by the Task Force on the Budget Process of the House Rules Committee, the so-called Beilenson Task Force—see House report 98-1152, part I. The cited report of the Rules Committee which accompanied the task force's bill (H.R. 5247), said the following of the new section 301(d) at page 90 of the report:

This subsection is similar to section 301(c) of the Act. The date for submission of views and estimates is changed from March 15 (in the Act) to February 25 (in H.R. 5247). Since the President's budget will also be submitted earlier, it should not be difficult to meet this deadline. In addition, the required content of the views and estimates is simplified and left in large part to the determination of the committees submitting the views and estimates. [Emphasis added.]

Importantly, though, the inclusion of the parenthetical phrase, "(as determined by the committee making such submission)," helps to underscore the intent that committee submissions are to be just that, the product of committee action, and not just the chairman's views and estimates.

In last fall's budget summit agreement, and the reconciliation bill which codified that agreement, section 301(d)'s submission date was again changed, this time to "within 6 weeks

after the President submits a budget. * * * But the remainder of the subsection language remains unchanged.

The important parliamentary principle involved here is eloquently stated in "Jefferson's Manual" as follows:

A committee * * * can only act when together, and not by separate consultation and consent—nothing being the report of the committee but what has been agreed to in a committee actually assembled.

Mr. Speaker, given the confusion, misunderstanding and different practices of various House committees on the matter of the submission of views and estimates to the Budget Committee, I wrote to the House Parliamentarian seeking a clarification that might guide our committees in the future. The conclusion of the Parliamentarian reads as follows: "a committee 'determination' requires committee action."

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include this exchange of correspondence with the Parliamentarian. The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 1991.

HON. WILLIAM HOLMES BROWN,
Parliamentarian, Speaker's Office, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR BILL: I am writing to request clarification on section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, which requires that within six weeks of the submission of the President's budget, "each committee of the House of Representatives having legislative jurisdiction shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House . . . its views and estimates (as determined by the committee making such submission) with respect to all matters set forth in subsections (a) and (b) which relate to matters within the jurisdiction of functions of such committee."

It has always been my understanding that this provision requires the formal action by committees on such views and estimates prior to their submission to the Budget Committee. This is based on the principle enunciated in sec. XXVI of Jefferson's Manual: "A committee . . . can only act when together, and not by separate consultation and consent—nothing being the report of the committee but what has been agreed to in committee actually assembled."

This principle is reflected in House Rule XI, clause 2(1)(2)(A): "No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any committee unless a majority of the committee was actually present."

While the budget views and estimates are not filed as a committee report to the House, they nevertheless are represented as the views and estimates of each committee based on determination of ("as determined by") the committee. This language is nearly identical to that contained in section 310 relating to committee recommendations pursuant to reconciliation directives: "each such committee shall promptly make such determination and recommendations and submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of its House. . . ." It is my understanding that there is no question that such reconciliation recommendations must be approved by formal committee action.

I raise this question for clarification because I have been informed that there are still a few committees which do not formally approve the budget views and estimates submitted to the Budget Committee and that these are instead simply submitted by the

chairman without even consulting with the full committee membership.

I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience so that we might inform the House of the proper procedure to be followed. Sincerely yours,

GERALD B. SOLOMON,
Member of Congress.

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 1991.

HON. GERALD B. SOLOMON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SOLOMON: In your letter of this date, you ask for clarification of the committee action required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act. That section specifies that within six weeks of the submission of the President's budget, each committee of the House having legislative jurisdiction "shall submit to the Committee on the Budget * * * its views and estimates (as determined by the committee making such submission) with respect to all matters set forth in subsections (a) and (b) which related to matters within the jurisdiction or functions of such committee." You suggest that this provision requires some formal action by committees on such views and estimates prior to their submission to the Budget Committee.

I note that the language of the statute [Sec. 301(d) of the Budget Act] differs from that of the House rule [Rule XI, clause 4(g)]. The rule does not contain the parenthetical phrase "as determined by the committee making such submission." However, I do think that the admonition in Jefferson's Manual, that a committee can act only when together, and not by separate consultation and consent, identifies a necessary prerequisite for committee action. While I do not believe a formal report is required by Sec. 301(d), or the rule, I think that the basic tenet of Jefferson's Manual does require some collegial action by the committee.

Having reviewed the submissions sent to the Budget Committee in the last Congress, I note that several committees do formally meet and approve their submissions under 301(d). Others have followed a less formal approach and have circulated and submitted letters from both the Chairman and the Ranking Member. Some submissions have included minority or separate views.

In conclusion, I think your point is well taken: a committee "determination" requires committee action. I have suggested that the Budget Committee include such a suggestion when it writes the committees to solicit reports under Section 301(d).

I appreciate your calling the discrepancy in the procedures followed by committees to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

BILL BROWN.

CHICAGO MURDER TOLL UNDERSCORES NEED FOR BRADY BILL

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, once again, I feel I must add my voice to the growing chorus of Americans who are appalled by the mounting death toll from handgun violence that is occurring daily across our Nation.

In recent weeks even former President Reagan, who is hardly an advocate of gun control, has come to grips with this problem and endorsed H.R. 7, the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act. As most Americans are aware, the Brady bill is named after Mr. Reagan's Press Secretary Jim Brady, who was seriously injured during a 1981 assassination attempt on President Reagan. The Brady bill calls for a nationwide, 7-day waiting period for handgun purchases. This bill will not force law-abiding gun owners to give up their constitutional right to own firearms.

However, if enacted, the Brady bill will give police officers a chance to attack the gun-related crimes perpetrated daily by robbers, hit men, drug dealers, and other thugs against innocent Americans.

A waiting period for handgun purchases is already in force in Illinois and several other States. In 1989, Illinois' 3-day waiting period led to the rejection of nearly 3,000 handgun sales after checks with police turned up records of felonies or mental illness on the part of the potential buyers. Officials in other States, including California and New Jersey, have reported similar results since they began requiring waiting periods for handgun sales.

The Brady bill would extend this life-saving law to all 50 States. Most Americans are aware that the Brady bill died at the end of the last Congress and was recently reintroduced. The bill was approved today by a 9 to 4 vote by the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice, and is now awaiting action before the Judiciary Committee.

Regrettably, while Congress debates this bill, the list of handgun victims keeps growing. For example, in the city of Chicago, police last month reported the highest number of March homicides in nearly a decade. Several of last month's 67 victims were killed by criminals armed with handguns. The increased violence seems to be continuing in April. Just last weekend, a warm-weather shooting spree in the Windy City left another eight people dead from gunshot wounds in separate incidents.

For the year to date, Chicago police have reported a total of 220 homicides. The pace of this year's killing is now 20 victims ahead of last year's rate, and the 1991 death toll is threatening to surpass the city's 1981 record of 877 homicides. Ironically, Chicago's last record-setting year for murders was the same one in which Jim Brady was struck down by a bullet from a handgun. Clearly, this is not a problem that will go away anytime soon.

I am encouraged, therefore, that the Brady bill at last has passed the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice. I hope it also is approved by the Judiciary Committee and the full House. It is vital that we act as soon as

possible to curb the flow of handguns to criminals who are terrorizing citizens across this country. I am now looking forward to the passage of this bill so that we can begin reversing the death toll produced by the criminal use of handguns.

HILDA WILLIAMSON HONORED AS CITIZEN OF YEAR

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an honor that has been given to one of my constituents. Hilda Williamson of Philadelphia, MS, has been named Citizen of the Year by the Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms.

She was cited for her activities with this organization in support of second amendment rights to keep and bear arms. Hilda has been a member of the Citizens Committee for 15 years.

I want to congratulate her for this honor and to enter into the RECORD this article about the award which was printed in the Nesoba Democrat in Philadelphia, MS.

PRO-GUN ACTIVIST RECEIVES AWARD

The Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms announced that Mrs. Hilda G. Williamson of Philadelphia has been selected to receive a citizen of the year award.

She has been selected to receive this citizen of the year award because of a dedication to the efforts to preserve the right of the people to keep and bear arms as guaranteed by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution, according to committee officials.

"If it weren't for people like her, our Constitutional rights would have been eroded years ago," said Alan Gottlieb, chairman of the Citizens Committee.

Criteria for selection of the Citizen of the Year Award is based upon the activities of individual members, such as being active in local, state and national gun rights issues, by writing editors of newspapers, contacting elected officials or appearing for public testimony. It is not necessary that individuals meet all the criteria.

The Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms is a national organization with nearly 500,000 members as well as more than 130 members of Congress serving on their National Advisory Council.

A NEW PERSONNEL SYSTEM FOR THE DEFENSE LANGUAGE INSTITUTE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CENTER

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to be able to reintroduce, on behalf of the employees and administration of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Languages Center [DLIFLC], the Department of Defense and the National Federation of Federal Employees [NFFE], legislation to establish

a new personnel system [NPS] for the center's employees.

At my request, representatives of the Department of Defense [DOD], the Defense Language Institute and the National Federation of Federal Employees provided me with drafts of legislation to establish a new personnel system at DLI and responded ably to my requests for assistance in shaping a new personnel system that brings DLI into the 1990's as a truly modern place of scholarship in the languages. The faculty, NFFE, DOD, DLI, and I can take pride in the fact that each of us strongly supports the final product of our labor on this bill, for it represents good government and labor-management cooperation in the truest sense of the words.

I want to express special thanks in particular to Josh Neiman and Alfie Khalil of NFFE, Craig Wilson of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Col. Donald Fischer, Provost Ray Clifford, and Lt. Col. Peter Kozumplik of the Defense Language Institute and Bob Cover and Ed Leong of the House Legislative Counsel's staff. Each of these gentlemen contributed valuable expertise and a good deal of labor to the final draft of the legislation.

We have responded to the administrative needs of DLI, to the financial and human concerns of the faculty, and the institutional concerns of the Department of Defense. Indeed, I believe that this bill also represents progress in education personnel management within the Federal establishment.

Mr. Speaker, by now it has become a truism that the United States faces a vastly altered world, a world in which our national security requirements are changing rapidly, more rapidly than we have been able to gauge. I would submit that the Defense Language Institute will be playing an ever more important role in the Defense Department's national security apparatus in this decade and the next. Clearly, the ability of our Defense personnel to communicate in the scores of languages our allies and potential foes speak must be bolstered just as surely as they will be required to cooperate with Central and Eastern European defense personnel.

The Defense Language Institute is a critical national asset, serving as the Department of Defense's academically accredited institute for foreign language instruction. The Department and NFFE believe the legislation is necessary to allow DLI to encourage the growth at the Institute of personnel management practiced at successful private and public educational institutions.

Under this legislation, DLI would be able to structure a personnel system to resemble those of comparable educational institutions, such as colleges and universities, rather than administrative agencies of the Federal Government. It is our hope that the legislation, if enacted, will lead to greater professionalization of instruction at DLI and of the faculty themselves, with our final goal being higher student language proficiency.

Our legislation would accomplish several very important tasks. It would provide for the first time a statutory charter for the operation of the Institute, it would establish in law a personnel system for its civilian faculty, and it would mandate a proper transition period from the current to the new system. The new per-

sonnel system contained within our bill sets forth tenure requirements for civilian faculty, the range of compensation of civilian faculty, conditions for the provision of assistance to faculty interested in enhancing their academic credentials and guidelines for the awarding of degrees.

We intend DLI to evaluate instructors for tenure not only on the basis of the quality of their instruction, but also their curriculum development, training, proficiency, research, and other academic activities specified in the legislation. Further, it is our intention that the system vest rank among civilian faculty specifically in person rather than in position. During the transitional year it is our intention that the DLI administration formally apprise all faculty members of the full meaning of the new personnel system in a quarterly letter.

The faculty of DLI are very anxious to implement their new personnel system. Their current improvised personnel system is entirely inadequate by every expert's account. This legislation would enable the "best and brightest" to remain with DLI for many years to come, and it would attract more of the same. The only current avenue for advancement, unfortunately, has been from the classroom to the administration. It is about time we provided to the DLI faculty the chance to progress as high as their talents will take them.

I urge my colleagues to examine this legislation carefully as an essential step to support for programmatic improvements at the Defense Language Institute and as a wise investment in an increasingly important aspect of our national security, and I call for its expeditious enactment into law.

Following are explanatory notes prepared at my request by the Department of Defense on the purpose of the legislation, background on the needs it addresses, reasons for its exemption from certain chapters of title 5 of the United States Code, a detailed description of the Institute itself, and proposed policies to accompany the new system.

WHERE IS THE UNITED STATES IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

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

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the question: Where is the United States since January and February? Since the Congress went into session a little over an hour ago, over a thousand people have died, Kurdish refugees trying to avoid helicopter gunships under the control of Saddam Hussein.

America stood against that 30 days ago, and yet we have the capacity to stop it and are not doing it. We have on location, in sight, enough water, bottled water for 500,000 troops. We have enough food for 500,000 troops. We have enough medical supplies for 500,000 troops. We have blankets, we have tents, we have transportation. We have the C-130's. We have the maps in the helicopters and in the cockpits and we have the pilots. We have the capacity

to take those supplies to them, and I do not know why we are not.

Three weeks ago they were chanting, "God bless George Bush." We encouraged them to stand firm and to assert their independence. We encouraged them to stand against the miserable tyrant, Saddam Hussein, and I do not know where we are.

Pilots and soldiers coming back for their parades at home break down in tears about seeing those poor refugees being gunned down in their sights, and they can do nothing. The euphoria of 3 weeks ago is being wiped out by a policy that I am at a loss to understand. I would encourage the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reassess what we are and what we are standing for, the lack of leadership that the United States is exerting today. The leadership that George Bush exerted from August 2 to March 3 is unprecedented in history. I submit there is not another person on this planet who could have held the coalition of forces, from Syria to Israel, from the Soviet Union to China to stand together against tyranny in the Middle East. George Bush and the United States had a bright and shining moment.

Now, in this lack of action by our country, we see the Prime Minister of Britain stepping forth, we see the President of France stepping forth, five flights yesterday by the French. We see the Foreign Ministers of all of the European nations speaking this morning about starting refugee aid and efforts.

The United States is standing idly by and I do not understand why. I call upon our Nation to take those supplies that are there, those soldiers who wish to deliver them. I am not calling for troops. I do not want to instigate a war. I have no desire to send troops. I have no desire to take American marines and drop them between Sunnis and Shiites and Kurds.

I simply am saying that Saddam Hussein is in his bunker. We should have been allowed the additional 12 hours to finish him, but that is history. He is there, and we control the air. If we allow them to use the air to do that, then we are culpable. It is our airspace, and it will be for a year. We should say to Saddam Hussein, park your helicopters, read my lips, do not fly again, and do not shoot those people.

Then what I think we should do is to take those blankets, and those tents, and that food, and those medical supplies and that water and drop them to those dear people who are sitting there with their children dying of starvation, a thousand an hour every day as we speak. Unless someone can give me a reason why we should not, then we should have done it yesterday.

MISGUIDED INTERNATIONAL
TRADE COMMISSION REC-
OMMENDATION ON PEANUT
IMPORTS

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

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this special order to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a very serious problem facing our agricultural sector.

On Friday March 15, the International Trade Commission voted on a proposal to increase the allotment of peanuts being imported into this country by an additional 300 million pounds.

The vote, taken by four ITC Commissioners, was not unanimous. Two Commissioners recommended that the current import quota on peanuts be immediately raised to 300 million pounds for a period ending on July 31 of this year. The acting chairman recommended an indefinite suspension of the import quota. The fourth Commissioner, however, after reviewing the same set of data, said, and I quote:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture did not pursue the clear statutory route provided for emergency action on this quota, nor did it recommend an increase in this investigation. I am unpersuaded that there is a shortage of peanuts sufficient to warrant any action on current quota levels.

I, along with my colleagues Congressman LINDSAY THOMAS and Congressman CHARLES HATCHER, visited our new Secretary in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Secretary Ed Madigan. Because all of the ITC Commissioners claim to have based their findings on data provided by the USDA, one might expect the Secretary to be an advocate of increased peanut importation.

We found that *not* to be the case. Secretary Madigan clearly understands the peanut industry, and the adverse effect that importation at this time in the growing season will have. Toying with the peanut program will have very serious, negative implications for the American peanut producers and the American taxpayer. The peanut program, which operates at virtually no cost to taxpayers, is one of the most efficient, well-crafted farm programs we have. Moreover, there is no indication that there is a shortage of peanuts in the United States.

The last time an increase in the import quota was recommended was in 1980 when American peanut production was down 42 percent due to a nationwide drought. In contrast, the latest figures indicate that last year's domestic peanut production was down only 10 percent. Mr. Speaker, we have no shortage of homegrown peanuts to satisfy consumer needs.

In addition, importing foreign peanuts into the United States, especially in midseason, disrupts the delicate

planting and contracting balance upon which the livelihood of our producers depends.

The mere mention of an importation of this magnitude at this date has brought contracting to a standstill. There is one other concern to peanut farmers and consumers which is often overlooked. Importing peanuts from such areas as China significantly increases the risk of infecting American peanuts with stripe virus.

If infected peanuts were to enter the U.S. seed market, yields could be reduced by as much as 20 percent. American peanut farmers have worked too hard, and invested too much of their time, their money, and their expertise to have an ill-conceived recommendation by the International Trade Commission destroy their business.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand by and watch a sound American business be destroyed. The American peanut producers, processors, and consumers have a stake in preserving the peanut program.

The policy recommended by the International Trade Commission has the potential to cost taxpayers thousands of dollars, and if the reaction to the proposed recommendation is any indication, implementation of the ITC's proposal will have a severe impact on the American peanut industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President and the executive branch advisers to disregard this misguided recommendation and leave our peanut program alone.

□ 1510

ARMS SALES TO PROMOTE PEACE
IS AN OXYMORON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARNARD). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, there is a term which we find in the dictionary or in a Roget's Thesaurus. The term is oxymoron. It is a fancy term, but it simply is a term which describes a phrase or a concept or a combination of words which are inconsistent, which are incompatible one with the other. The common example of an oxymoron given is "a quiet riot." There is no such thing as a quiet riot. We cannot have an "ugly rose," for example. In more governmental terms, we sometimes hear an oxymoron is "a busy bureaucrat," or some have said an "effective Congress," though I would dispute that those are necessarily oxymorons.

Mr. Speaker, I have come upon an oxymoronic phrase, and I think we need to discuss it. I hope we will continue to discuss it in the months, and possibly years, ahead. That oxymoronic phrase is: arms sales to nations in the Middle East will promote a lasting

peace in the region. Arms sales promote peace? I think that is an oxymoron.

I think what we need in the Middle East is control of arms sales, particularly so recently after coming out of a shooting war which claimed the lives of relatively few Americans, but certainly claimed the lives of Americans and Coalition people, and claimed tens of thousands of lives of both the combatants and noncombatants from the other side. It just seems to me the height of folly for anyone at this point to contemplate seriously, as the United States seems to be doing, sending arms, particularly sophisticated arms, into that very same area.

Just a few feet from where I am now speaking, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States addressed this Chamber and the world. He made his report on the activities of Operation Desert Storm, and I was extremely pleased, sitting as I was up in the aisle there, to hear the President talk about nonproliferation of arms. Nonproliferation of arms, in effect, to reduce, if not totally ban, and end arms sales to the area. Then that phrase was qualified, later on by the President who said that what was meant was nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, which is a euphemism for nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

So in effect, instead of nonproliferation we have proliferation, sales, and movement, at least of conventional arms, which as we saw in the recent Operation Desert Storm, which was a conventional battle in which quite a few lives were taken, that mass destruction is entirely possible with conventional weapons.

I believe what is really needed, Mr. Speaker, when all is said and done is an absolute total ban on sales of arms of all types. I think we ought to declare an absolute vacation from arms sales into any of the areas of the world, but particularly into the area of the Middle East. This should include even our friends Egypt, and even Israel. No arms to everybody, until the dust settles down and until we can see exactly how the area will look, and see exactly what this peaceful process might yield.

To use the analogy of the some 500 plus fires which are raging right now in Kuwait, which are being put out very, very painstakingly, it seems to me that sending arms, however selectively done into the Middle East, is not pouring water on those raging fires to put them out, but is pouring gasoline on those fires to make them burn higher and burn hotter.

□ 1520

I just do not see how provision of arms to the Middle East can really solve the region's problems. I was therefore extremely pleased when, on April 8 of this month just a few days ago, the majority leader of this House,

the Honorable RICHARD GEPHARDT of Missouri, along with other distinguished Members of this body, including Chairman DANTE FASCELL, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Honorable LEE HAMILTON who is my neighbor across the Ohio River in southern Indiana, Chairman DAVID OBEY and Chairman SAM GEJDENSON, signed and sent a letter to the President of the United States urging the President to declare a unilateral pause in arms sales, not just of the weapons of mass destruction, but all weapons into the area.

I will add at the end of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the full text of the majority leader's letter, the report of the press conference announcing the letter, and a pertinent article on arms control published in the New York Times on March 27, 1991.

Let me show, Mr. Speaker, just a few parts of Mr. GEPHARDT's letter. I think it is very important that we have this on the RECORD. Let me just conclude my remarks by putting into the RECORD these words from our majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT]:

Curbing arms sales is a prerequisite to avoiding further wars in the region and it would be unthinkable to begin the process of rearming countries in the region after having just sacrificed American lives in the conflict against Saddam Hussein.

So I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has summarized it, Mr. Speaker. I think what we ought to do is have an arms moratorium, a total ban until we see exactly what happens in the Middle East. I urge the President to accede to the majority leader's request. It just seems to me that the best way we can have peace in the area is not to provide it with arms of destruction.

[News from the House Majority Leader]

GEPHARDT JOINS OTHER HOUSE LEADERS IN APPEAL TO BUSH FOR "PAUSE" IN MIDDLE EASTERN ARMS SALES

WASHINGTON, DC.—Congressman Richard A. Gephardt, the House Majority Leader, issued the following statement today accompanying a letter he sent last week to President Bush advocating a 'pause' in arms sales to the Middle East:

"I am releasing today, with the help of House leaders in the areas of arms control and foreign policy, an appeal to the President of the United States for a pause in arms sales to the Middle East. This pause should be a first step in an effort to achieve a multilateral, comprehensive and enforceable agreement to curb arms sales to the Middle East.

"Secretary Baker, in his travels this week, should assure our allies that the United States is willing to take a leadership role in building a sound peace in the Middle East. Curbing arms sales is a prerequisite to avoiding further wars in this region, and it would be unthinkable to begin the process of rearming countries in the region after having just sacrificed American lives in the conflict against Saddam Hussein.

"During my recent trip to the Middle East, I found significant support for this kind of

policy. Mr. Moshe Arens, the Israeli Defense Minister, went so far as to advocate a total ban on future arms sales to the region. He and others recognize that a peaceful future for the Middle East cannot be founded on ever escalating sales of weapons to this volatile region."

Joining Congressman Gephardt in signing the letter to President Bush are: The Hon. Dante Fascell, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; Hon. Lee Hamilton, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East; Hon. David Obey, Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations; and Hon. Sam Gejdenson, Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

A copy of the letter is attached.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, April 4, 1991.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to urge you to declare a unilateral pause in arms sales to countries in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. We believe a temporary pause is necessary in order to facilitate multilateral negotiations on agreements to restrain the flow of sophisticated conventional weapons systems and other weapons technologies into this region.

Countries in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf are the recipients of roughly one-third of all international arms transfers, making this region the world's leading arms import market. These sales, in our view, help promote an arms race and raise tensions in a region characterized by instability. The proliferation of arms—including chemical, biological, nuclear, and conventional weapons and missile technologies—poses a serious threat to peace in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. The arms race is absorbing resources badly needed for regional economic development.

We believe that a brief pause on arms transfers will not affect the security of nations in the Middle East and Persian Gulf. Such a pause can be used effectively to bring supplier nations and regional states together to pursue a range of arms reduction and arms control proposals, including an arms moratorium.

The United States has a unique opportunity to use its new influence to make progress in this area, an opportunity which should not be squandered. We believe the impressive military victory achieved by the United States and its coalition partners last month needs to be buttressed by postwar agreements that enhance long-term peace and security.

We appreciate your consideration of this matter and look forward to working with you on these issues. We are, of course, available to meet with you to discuss these issues further.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,
Richard A. Gephardt, Majority Leader,
U.S. House of Representatives; David R. Obey, Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs; Dante B. Fascell, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs; Lee H. Hamilton, Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East; Sam Gejdenson, Chairman, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1991]

ARMING THE NEW ORDER
(By Tom Wicker)

Wouldn't it be ironic if the resounding defeat of Iraq, led by the high-tech forces of the U.S., resulted in a third world newly armed to the teeth with smart bombs, ballistic and cruise missiles, helicopter gunships, Patriot-style interceptors and radar-invisible aircraft?

That would make wars between third-world rivals more likely, if one thought it had gained a qualitative advantage over another. Such wars would certainly be more lethal and destructive, and might be more likely to draw in forces from industrialized nations guarding their interests or promoting their weaponry.

Even without wars, the increased cost of arms buildups and rivalries among nations that could ill afford such weaponry would divert resource that could better be spent to encourage economic growth and fight endemic poverty.

Yet, just such a third-world race for the latest and best in lethal devices seems in prospect—encouraged, in all probability, by the Bush Administration's inexplicable decision to aid U.S. military contractors in promoting overseas sales of their hardware.

The war itself, of course, has done the most to stir interest in the acquisition of high-tech weapons. Even the most backward and isolated national leader can hardly be unaware today that Iraq's vaunted army—said to be the world's fourth-largest—was quickly blown to pieces by the advanced armaments the U.S. and its allies used so effectively.

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif of Pakistan, for one, drew the obvious lesson. "To undermine the science, technology, research and modern advances in defense is disastrous," he said in a speech in which he emphasized the need to make Pakistan "an impregnable fortress." If Pakistan goes that way, can India be far behind? Or vice versa?

The U.S. Director of Naval Intelligence, Adm. T.A. Brooks, has said that at least 40 nations are seeking radar-evading "stealth" technologies, and that by the end of the century nine more states will join the six that already deploy reconnaissance satellites. Numerous countries now have the ability to build cruise missiles and their guidance systems.

Israel is acquiring submarines from Germany. France does an active arms-export business. China and others have ballistic missile programs, and the Chinese are willing to sell. The Soviet Union, in its need for hard currencies, continues to make available advanced jets and other weapons to third-world countries.

But name-calling does little good, for Uncle Sam himself is one of the world's biggest arms merchants—peddling \$10.8 billion in conventional arms in 1989, second only to Moscow's \$11.7 billion. Thus these two accounted for \$22.5 billion in such sales out of a world total of \$31.8 billion.

Now the Bush Administration has informed Congress that it wants to sell high-tech weapons worth \$18 billion—including F-16's, Patriots, M-1 tanks and multiple rocket launchers—to five Persian Gulf allies. With such weapons going to Arab nations, Israel's

defense worries are bound to increase; and Israel already is one of the largest recipients of the Pentagon's grants and low-interest loans for foreign nations' arms purchases.

The Administration also is siding with arms contractors who have been lobbying for restoration of government authority—unavailable since the late 1970's—to underwrite up to \$1 billion in arms sales abroad. The proposal, if approved by Congress, would permit the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial bank loans made to overseas buyers of U.S.-made arms.

Administration spokesmen insist that there's no conflict with its stated aim of limiting arms sales to the third world. The guarantees, they say, would be available only to the NATO allies, Japan, Israel and Australia, unless—a very big unless—the President found it in the national interest to include other nations.

Those spokesmen must be kidding. Only a few years ago, President Reagan found it in the national interest to sell arms to Iran. U.S. weapons sold to legally authorized countries, moreover, often have been resold to unauthorized third parties. Any way you look at it, the Bush proposal would encourage the proliferation of weapons—including high-tech weapons, perhaps ultimately to third-world nations.

How can that help Mr. Bush build that stable new world order to which he pays such ardent lip service?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. KASICH, for 60 minutes, on May 7.
Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes each day, on April 23, 24, and 25.

Mr. SOLOMON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, on April 11, 16, 17, 18, 23, 24, and 25.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MAZZOLI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. WYDEN, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. LENT in three instances.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. MACHTLEY in 10 instances.
Mr. DOOLITTLE.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. GREEN of New York.
Mrs. BENTLEY in three instances.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in two instances.
Mr. DUNCAN.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.
Mr. SERRANO.
Mr. CLEMENT in two instances.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mr. MAZZOLI in two instances.
Mr. PENNY.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. KOSTMAYER.
Mr. HERTEL in two instances.
Mr. FUSTER.
Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. VISCOSKY in three instances.
Mr. ENGEL.
Mr. MOODY in two instances.
Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.
Ms. OAKAR in two instances.
Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
Mr. DARDEN.
Mr. SKELTON in two instances.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 16. Joint resolution designating the Week of April 21-27, 1991, as "National Crime Victims' Rights Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to establish April 15, 1991, as "National Recycling Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 11, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the fourth quarter of 1990 and the first quarter of 1991, as well as reports of various miscellaneous House groups for 1990 and the first quarter of 1991, in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. William J. Hughes	11/9	11/10	Chile		171.00						171.00
	11/10	11/13	New Zealand		657.00						657.00
	11/13	11/21	Australia		1,475.00		827.00		29.86		2,331.86
	11/21	11/23	Hong Kong		492.00						492.00
Military transportation							9,600.49				9,600.49
Hayden Gregory	11/9	11/10	Chile		171.00						171.00
	11/10	11/13	New Zealand		657.00						657.00
	11/13	11/21	Australia		1,475.00		827.00		29.86		2,331.86
	11/21	11/23	Hong Kong		492.00						492.00
Military transportation							9,600.49				9,600.49
Committee total					5,590.00		20,854.98		59.72		26,504.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JACK BROOKS, Chairman, Feb. 14, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bob McEwen	11/9	11/12	Spain		825.00						825.00
	11/12	11/15	Syria		606.00						606.00
	11/15	11/17	Saudi Arabia		199.00						199.00
	11/17	11/21	United Kingdom		873.00						873.00
Military transportation							3,541.50				5,415.00
Commercial transportation							1,965.00				1,965.00
Committee total					2,503.00		7,380.00				9,883.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Amount shown is equivalent first-class/commercial rate.

⁴ Stayed over 1 night and flew home commercially at the first-class commercial rate.

G.V. MONTGOMERY, Chairman, Jan. 31, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1991

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Howard Berman	1/4	1/8	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Military transportation							2,829.40				2,829.40
John Bryant	1/4	1/8	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Military transportation							2,829.40				2,829.40
Martin Sabo	1/4	1/8	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Military transportation							2,829.40				2,829.40
Linda Gene Smith	1/4	1/8	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Military transportation							2,829.40				2,829.40
Jean Woodward	1/4	1/8	Mexico		760.00						760.00
Military transportation							2,829.40				2,829.40
Committee total					3,800.00		14,147.00				17,947.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HOWARD L. BERMAN, JAN. 28, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1991

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Steny Hoyer	2/10	2/9	United States				3614.00				614.00
	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
Hon. Albert Bustamante	2/9	2/9	United States				3614.00				614.00
	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
Hon. Ben Cardin	2/9	2/9	United States				3614.00				614.00
	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
Hon. Christopher Cox	2/12	2/14	Latvia		292.00						292.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
Hon. Richard Durbin	2/9	2/9	United States				3614.00				614.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1991—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Dennis Hertel	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Hon. Tom Lantos	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Hon. Don Ritter	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Hon. Bill Sarpalius	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Hon. Louise Slaughter	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Hon. Chris Smith	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Hon. Craig Thomas	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
David M. Evans	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
John J. Finerty	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Jane S. Fisher	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Mary Sue Hafner	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Jim Hutcheson	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Keith Jewell	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Michael Ochs	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
R. Spencer Oliver	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
James S. Ridge, Jr	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Samuel G. Wise	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Sam Wynkoop	2/10	2/11	Sweden		327.00						327.00
	2/11	2/14	Latvia		438.00						438.00
	2/14	2/15	U.S.S.R.		262.00						262.00
	2/9	United States					3614.00				3614.00
Committee total					23,148.00			13,508.00			36,656.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military aircraft/commercial.

STENY HOYER, Apr. 1, 1991.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1990

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
E (Kika) de la Garza	2/23	2/25	United States		347.70						347.70
Dante B. Fascell	2/22	2/26	United States		285.54		222.86				508.40
Bill Frenzel	2/22	2/26	United States		280.75		222.86				503.61
Sam Gejdenson	2/22	2/26	United States		299.37		222.86				522.23
Sam Gibbons	2/22	2/26	United States		284.31		222.86				507.17
Lee Hamilton	2/22	2/26	United States		282.25		222.86				505.11
John LaFalce	2/22	2/24	United States		140.00		108.42				248.42

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 10 AND FEB. 15, 1991—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Ron Lasch	2/10	2/12	France		544.00						
	2/12	2/13	Brussels		241.00						
	2/13	2/14	Germany		753.00						
George Stephanopoulos	2/10	2/12	France		544.00						
	2/12	2/13	Brussels		241.00						
	2/13	2/14	Germany		753.00						
Committee total				7,146		1,408				5,478	

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHARLIE ROSE, Mar. 5, 1991.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1021. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report on foreign investment in U.S. agricultural land through December 31, 1990, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 3504; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1022. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting notification to retain the commissary storage and issue function as an in-house operation at Fort Meade, MD, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1023. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting notification to retain the warehouse function as an in-house operation at Fort Leavenworth, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1024. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting notification to retain the warehouse function as an in-house operation at Redstone Arsenal, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1025. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report on research development, test and evaluation activities conducted under the Biological Defense Research Program (BDRP), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2370; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1026. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting notification to retain the commissary storage and issue function as an in-house operation at Fort Monroe, VA, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1027. A letter from the Director, Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Department of Energy, transmitting notice that the report on research and technology development activities supporting defense waste management and environmental restoration will be delayed until April 1, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 101-189, section 3141(c) (1), (2) (103 Stat. 1660); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1028. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting notification that the Department was unable to meet the February 1, 1991 date for submission of the report on remanufacture of nuclear stockpile weapons, and find that additional time is required; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1029. A letter from the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the per-

sonal property appraisal study, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 1122(e) (103 Stat. 519); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1030. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the study on issuance of U.S. Government securities to small investors, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1818 note; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1031. A letter from the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the NCUA schedules of compensation; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1032. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on barriers to resident management in public housing; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1033. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the Council's fiscal year 1990 report, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1221e(c)(3); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1034. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting the 1990 quarterly report and annual summary on U.S. coal imports, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7277(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1035. A letter from the Department of Transportation, transmitting the 15th annual report on the Automotive Fuel Economy Program, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2002(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1036. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's annual energy outlook for 1991; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1037. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, transmitting the Commission's report on HIV disease in correctional facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1038. A letter from the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 19th annual report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for the year 1989, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78ggg(c)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1039. A letter from the Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 91-24, authorizing the furnishing of assistance from the emergency refugee and migration assistance fund for unexpected urgent needs of refugees and other persons in the occupied territories and Sri Lanka, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1040. A letter from the General Accounting Office, transmitting the fiscal year 1990 annual report of the Comptrollers General retirement system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1041. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1042. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on the relative costs and benefits of the tribal self-governance project, pursuant to Public Law 100-472, section 209 (102 Stat. 2298); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1043. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1044. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1990 annual report for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1211(f), 1267(g), 1295; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1045. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the final report on the demonstration program of mandatory drug testing of criminal defendants, pursuant to Public Law 100-690, section 7304(f) (102 Stat. 4465); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1046. A letter from the Under Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution's "Annual Proceedings of the Ninety-Ninth Continental Congress," pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 18b; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1047. A letter from the Maritime Administration, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1048. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting notification of the third amendment to the Pacer Share personnel management demonstration project; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1049. A letter from the Department of the Army, transmitting copies of 16 potential water resources projects; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1050. A letter from the Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for the period October 1990 through January 1991, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Small Business.

1051. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1990, and the Veterans' Advisory Committee on Rehabilitation annual report, fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 214, 221(c), 664; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1052. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the initial estimate of the applicable percentage increase for fiscal year 1992 for hospitals subject to the Medicare prospective payment system [PPS] and for excluded hospitals and units; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1053. A letter from the Department of Agriculture, transmitting an informational letter in accordance with section 401(b) of Public Law 480; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

1054. A letter from the Department of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of an amendment to the Kuwait assets control regulations; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations and Foreign Affairs.

1055. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the results of the audit of the Resolution Funding Corporation's 1989 financial statement, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

1056. A letter from the Executive Director, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's status report for the month of February 1991: Review of 1988-89 Assistance Agreements; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Appropriations.

1057. A letter from the President, U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting the report of the audit of the Institute's accounts for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4607(h); jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Foreign Affairs.

1058. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification for Pakistan under section 574(b) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Act, 1991; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Appropriations.

1059. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the results of the audit of the Resolution Funding Corporation's 1989 financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1060. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting status of actions taken to reduce adverse impact from aircraft overflights of national park units; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Interior and Insular Affairs.

1061. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled Omnibus Nuclear Power Safety and Security Enhancement Act of 1991; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Judiciary.

1062. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting health

care services provided as a result of section 716(c)(1) of Indian Health Care Amendments of 1988, pursuant to Public Law 100-713, section 710 (102 Stat. 4833); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs.

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. GILMAN (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 1681. A bill to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that group life insurance benefits under such chapter may, upon application, be paid out to an insured individual who is terminally ill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 1682. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reduce the amount of non-Federal funds required to be provided to obtain Federal funds under subpart 1 of part E of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 1683. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct an inquiry into cellular telecommunications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. MFUME, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUSS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois):

H.R. 1684. A bill to acknowledge the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States and the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865 and to establish a commission to examine the institution of slavery, subsequent de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African-Americans, and the impact of these forces on living African-Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 1685. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide a statutory charter for the operation of the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and to establish a personnel system for the civilian faculty at that institute; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKORSKI (for himself and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 1686. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 relating to grievance proceedings under the act; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASPIN (for himself, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. HEFLEY):

H.R. 1687. A bill to provide for the striking of a gold medal to be presented on behalf of the Congress to Gen. Colin L. Powell, U.S. Army, and to provide for the production of bronze duplicates of such medal for sale to

the public; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DE LUGO (for himself, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 1688. A bill entitled the "Omnibus Insular Areas Act of 1991"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DICKS:

H.R. 1689. A bill making urgent supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1991 for emergency refugee and migration assistance for the people of Iraq who are displaced as a result of civil conflict; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA:

H.R. 1690. A bill to establish a native American university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1691. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to exclude from coverage any service performed by election officials or election workers only on election days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1692. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for expanded long-term care services under the Medicare Program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for taxpayers with certain elderly dependents in their households, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 1693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of long-term care insurance and accelerated death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1694. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to ensure that title VII of such act applies to the employment of U.S. citizens by certain employers in foreign nations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 1695. A bill to limit the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to close, consolidate, automate, or relocate any National Weather Service Office or National Weather Service Forecast Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H.R. 1696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an individual to withdraw up to \$5,000 from an individual retirement account for the purchase of a principal residence by a first-time home buyer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 1697. A bill to provide for the implementation of certain elements of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative; jointly, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Agriculture.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 1698. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to allow all recipients of grants for treatment works to use dedicated ad valorem taxes in order to meet the requirement of the act that such recipients adopt user charges to pay for operation and maintenance of treatment works; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to the construction and operation of certain treatment works which are subject to regulation under international treaties; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 1700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for sewer taxes, rents, and other similar sewer charges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANCASTER:

H.R. 1701. A bill to extend until January 1, 1991, the existing suspension of duty on Cefixime; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENT:

H.R. 1702. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEVINE of California (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BYRANT, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1703. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a criminal penalty for interfering with access to and egress from a medical facility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 1704. A bill to direct the Secretary of State, together with the Attorney General, to enter into negotiations with other countries to provide for the incarceration in those countries of illegal aliens in the United States imprisoned for Federal offenses; jointly to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1705. A bill to extend for 3 years the existing suspension of duty on stuffed dolls, certain toy figures, and the skins thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.R. 1706. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report describing the lessons learned from the Persian Gulf conflict with respect to military personnel family policies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 1707. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to maintain the current Federal-State funding ratio for certain formula grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 1708. A bill to prohibit arms transfers to certain countries unless the President certifies that a state of war does not exist between such country and Israel and that such country has accorded formal recognition to the sovereignty of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 1709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for gifts to the families of members of the Armed Forces killed while serving in Operation Desert Shield or Operation Desert Storm; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKEEN (for himself, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1710. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of certain historic military forts in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLATTERY (for himself and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota):

H.R. 1711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow farmland sold during the same taxable year as the farmer's principal residence to be eligible for the \$125,000 exclusion of gain on sale of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Florida (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GOSS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 1712. A bill amending the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act with respect to procedures for the cancellation of leases, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1713. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, to extend the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions, to impose a windfall profit tax on such drugs if they become excessively profitable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1714. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to extend benefits under the Child Care Food Program to children aged 13 to 15; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 1715. A bill to establish the Harriet Taylor Upton National Historic Site in Warren, OH; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution designating the week of June 1 through June 7, 1991, as "National Polio Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. OAKAR (for herself and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.J. Res. 212. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning February 16, 1992, as "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PENNY (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. SLATTERY):

H.J. Res. 213. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H. Con Res. 114. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should enforce the U.S. Security Council cease-fire resolution, provide humanitarian assistance to the Kurdish and other oppressed Iraqi resistance forces and encouraging other countries to provide such assistance, and promote the establishment of refugee enclaves within the southern and northern borders of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY of New York:

H. Res. 120. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the U.S. policy on carbon dioxide emissions; jointly, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

61. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Idaho's dairy production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

62. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the Piscatinny Arsenal in Rockaway Township, Morris County; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Idaho's water resources; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

64. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, relative to the Israeli's Prime Minister's restraint in not exercising Israel's right to retaliate against Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the equal recognition of the Spanish and English languages in the administrative and legislative procedures of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

66. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to the desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

67. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to rescinding previous applications calling for a constitutional convention; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

68. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to an amendment to the Constitution with respect to the desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

69. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relative to the Supreme Court decision in *Pennsylvania v. Davenport*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

70. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the international boundary between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

71. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to Idaho's sheep stock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

72. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, relative to recreational boating user fees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

73. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the method of allocating Federal highway funds; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

74. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Idaho, relative to the national forests in Idaho; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND
RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LAFALCE introduced a bill (H.R. 1716) for the relief of Alice Koshian; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. REED, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. DIXON, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 8: Mr. FORD of Tennessee.

H.R. 20: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LUKE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. QUILLLEN, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 53: Mr. WEISS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. ROE, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 78: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 108: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 110: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 258: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 303: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 304: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 330: Mr. BENNETT and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 381: Mr. WEISS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 384: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 385: Mr. WEISS and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 413: Mr. ROE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SPRATT, and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 430: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 431: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 441: Ms. WATERS, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WOLPE, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. MINETA, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 565: Mr. WEISS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 573: Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 576: Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 583: Mr. YATRON and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 606: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. DELAY, Mr. COX of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr.

CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 617: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 632: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 652: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 663: Mr. PETRI, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 676: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 680: Mr. MACHTLEY and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 687: Mr. KYL, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. SANTORUM.

H.R. 694: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 738: Mr. SWIFT and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 783: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 785: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 798: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 811: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 828: Mr. FORD of Michigan and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 830: Mr. JONTZ and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 841: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FISH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.R. 856: Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 919: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 960: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 975: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1000: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1039: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1047: Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 1079: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1110: Mr. CLAY, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1120: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1125: Mr. STOKES and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1126: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. AUCOIN.

H.R. 1134: Mr. FROST, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1161: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1179: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr.

CAMPBELL of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. STOKES, Mr. REED, Mr. DICKS, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 1191: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FASCELL, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 1193: Mr. MOODY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. REED, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1196: Mr. BEILSON, Mr. FISH, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 1201: Mr. FISH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 1226: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 1250: Mr. PETRI, Mr. ASPIN, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1277: Mr. KYL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. DELAY, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. LENT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BLAZ, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 1278: Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HYDE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1308: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ROE, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1343: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. PENNY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1344: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 1397: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1400: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 1412: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. YATES, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. CARR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OLIN, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1430: Mr. VENTO, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1450: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1456: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LENT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. REED, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SLATTERY and Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 1458: Mr. BUNNING, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1460: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 1473: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FISH, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. McGRATH, and Mr. DeFAZIO.

H.R. 1502: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 1504: Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1516: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 1546: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1547: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1568: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1574: Mr. WALSH and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1575: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 1649: Mr. UPTON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 1655: Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DANMEYER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 1669: Mr. STOKES, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1675: Mr. HUGHES.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. HYDE.

H.J. Res. 94: Mr. STUMP, Mr. LENT, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DANMEYER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. COX of California.

H.J. Res. 107: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 134: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BRYON, Mr. DANMEYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SOLARZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SHAW, Mr.

SKAGGS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. TAUZIN, and Mr. CLAY.

H.J. Res. 141: Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ORTON, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LENT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LUKE, Mr. McCANDLESS, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.J. Res. 169: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. Andrews of New Jersey, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WYLIE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MINK, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. GORDON.

H.J. Res. 185: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. TALLON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FISH, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, and Mr. HASTERT.

H.J. Res. 195: Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. YATES, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KYL, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DANMEYER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HYDE, Mr.

SWETT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. HENRY.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. SHAW, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. LUKE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. SWETT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. VENTO.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. RITTER, Mr. ECKART, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 26: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. RIGGS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H. Res. 99: Mr. FISH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 100: Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 101: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. TALLON.

H. Res. 115: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. PEASE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

53. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, city of Boston, relative to supporting the full participation of minority and women owned businesses in the redevelopment of Kuwait and the Persian Gulf; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

54. Also, petition of the town council of Blades, DE, relative to an amendment to the Constitution relative to the desecration of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. Also, petition of the township of Wakefield, Gogebic County, MI, relative to the western upper peninsula of Michigan; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.