SENATE—*Monday, June 3, 1991*

The Senate met at 2 p.m., and was called to order by the Honorable WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverston, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

* * * *my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.*—Jeremiah 2:13.

Gracious God, perfect in love and grace and mercy, the prophet Jeremiah reminds us that we are incurably religious. We must worship, even if it is no god. He reminds us that we become like the God we worship—worship pleasure, we become giddy, superficial; worship wealth, we become selfish, greedy, materialistic; worship power, we become arrogant and proud. Worshipping hollow gods we become hollow souls.

Eternal Father, help us to find our way back to the God of our fathers, the God we profess we trust on our coins. Forgive us for fattening the flesh while we starve the spirit. Help us to remember we are a nation "under God," that our freedoms, our values, our greatness are derived from the God of our fathers. Forgive our indifference and awaken us as a people to the incalculable possibilities when God is the fountain at which we drink, rather than broken cisterns.

In His name who is Light and Life. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1991.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. FORD thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the majority leader's time is reserved. The time for the Republican leader is reserved.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 5 minutes each.

The distinguished Republican leader not only has that time but he has his leader time.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

H.R. 7

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bills on the calendar for the second time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7) to amend title 18, United States Code, to require a waiting period before the purchase of a handgun.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I object to further reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

S. 1151

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the second bill on the calendar.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1151) to restore an enforceable Federal death penalty, and so forth, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

H.R. 1: STILL A QUOTA BILL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, tomorrow, perhaps later, but sometime this week, the House of Representatives will conduct a vote on H.R. 1, which is virtually identical to the quota bill vetoed by President Bush last year.

It is not that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have failed to propose any changes to H.R. 1.

Earlier this year, for example, they attempted to shift the focus of the quota debate by giving H.R. 1 a fancy new name: The Civil Rights and Women's Equality in Employment Act of 1991.

Fortunately, the American people were not fooled: They took a quick look at H.R. 1 and saw the same design, same bill, same quotas.

Now, fearing a nosedive in public credibility, my House colleagues have resorted to two more Madison Avenue PR gimmicks by proposing a so-called cap on punitive damages and by trumpetting a phony antiquota amendment.

Mr. President, once again—on both counts—my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have flunked the truth-in-advertising test.

The cap on punitive damages is a lidless cap, at best.

Despite some of the best intentions, a few convenient word changes simply will not strip the quotas out of a quota bill.

THE "LIDLESS" CAP ON PUNITIVE DAMAGES

Mr. President, H.R. 1's cap on punitive damages is identical to the one in last year's vetoed bill—"$150,000 or an amount equal to the compensatory damages awarded, whichever is greater."

Under this standard, if $1 million in compensatory damages are awarded, then a jury could award $1 million in punitive damages as well, which is obviously a frightening prospect for most employers, large and small, but particularly the small- and middle-sized employers in America.

THE PHONY ANTIQUOTA AMENDMENT

The proposed antiquota amendment to H.R. 1 is equally as cynical, and perhaps equally as frightening.

First of all, the amendment does absolutely nothing to change the other provisions in H.R. 1 that will force employers to hire by the numbers.

As a result, it puts employers in a lose-lose situation: Adopt quotas, and get sued; do not adopt quotas and get sued again.

More importantly, the definition of "quota" in the antiquota amendment has so many loopholes that the loopholes become the rule.

For example, the amendment specifically allows quotas so long as jobs are filled by individuals who have the necessary qualifications to perform the job. As a result, the so-called antiquota amendment would still allow employers to adopt quotas with less qualified

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

persons of a particular race, sex, or religion, so long as these persons were marginally qualified.

In addition, the amendment specifically authorizes all quotas that were adopted in accordance with existing employment discrimination law.

Any past judicial decision or consent decree permitting quotas would, therefore, be a complete defense to the quota-ban proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

DEMOCRATS ARE PLAYING RACIAL POLITICS

So, Mr. President, it is pretty clear who has been playing politics—raw, cynical politics—on civil rights.

It is not President Bush, who, last year, walked the extra mile in an effort to reach a compromise with the Democrats in Congress and who, this year, has proposed his own fair and responsible civil rights package.

The real cynics in this debate are my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have resorted to ad hominem attacks on the President as a way to divert attention from the real issue at stake—quotas in hiring, quotas in promotions, quotas throughout the American work force.

Those are the issues. It is not somebody getting on a talk show or somebody making a statement on the floor attacking George Bush and accusing George Bush of racial politics.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been playing class warfare with the budget. Judging by some of the rhetoric these past few days, they are also playing racial politics with the civil rights of all the American people.

COMPROMISE IS POSSIBLE

Mr. President, as I have said on a number of occasions, Senate Democrats and Republicans could fashion a responsible civil rights bill in a single day.

I hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will stop negotiating with themselves and maybe start negotiating with Members on this side and with others who have an interest in civil rights legislation, particularly small- and middle-sized business men and women. It is not the Business Roundtable that is going to be affected by what happens. They probably are already doing what they want to do. It is the thousands and thousands of small business people in my State and States across the country that are going to be affected if this legislation passes.

If there is good faith on both sides, and if the self-annointed civil rights experts who have dominated the debate so far are kept out of the negotiating room, we can have a civil rights bill—and we can get this divisive issue behind us, once and for all.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MFN FOR CHINA

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I rise to support President Bush's policies toward China. I know that the decision concerning a further extension of most-favored-nation status for China is a very difficult question. I am very concerned about the Chinese human rights situation, and have long been a strong supporter of human rights. We must continue to pressure Chinese leaders to respect basic human rights.

It is my judgment that President Bush is in a unique position to understand China. He was our first Ambassador to China after resumption of diplomatic relations with that country. He has had many years of experience dealing with China and Chinese officials. He has good judgment regarding China.

It is my feeling that denial of most-favored-nation [MFN] status to China would be a mistake because United States opportunities to send Americans to China would diminish. This would lessen our influence inside that country.

I think it is very important to have our businessmen present and working in China. Sometimes we forget how important our businessmen are in spreading the ideals of American free enterprise and democracy. They are at the cutting edge in telling the story of America abroad.

Too often we are rather critical of our businessmen who work to sell products abroad. But I think, as the President has pointed out, having United States businessmen, students, and others present in China is a very, very important way to exert positive influences on that society. If we cut off most-favored-nation status for China, we would also lose the opportunity to encourage prodemocracy forces and greater respect for human rights. China would take its business elsewhere, including major purchases of agriculture commodities. According to a recent Congressional Research Service issue brief by Vladimir N. Pregelj, depending on how China would retaliate against the loss of MFN, "* * *the annual loss of United States exports to China could be in the range of $2 billion to $3 billion * * * most likely affecting United States exports of grain, power generating machinery, aircraft, and fertilizer products."

I could perhaps sound like I am beating the drums of my own State, and indeed I am, but a recent United States Government study says that not granting most-favored-nation status to China could result in the United States losing $155 million in wheat sales. China would take its business to Australia and to other countries, and they would become China's grain suppliers. We would lose markets that have been built up very carefully.

We also have many manufacturing and merchandising concerns in my State and elsewhere in the Nation that do a lot of business with China. You do not just turn trade on and off like a faucet. Once these business relationships are lost, they can be lost permanently. Other suppliers take over the market. Japan and European countries automatically grant MFN to China. They simply would take over that portion of the Chinese market we would forsake by denying MFN status to China.

I will speak later on this subject when the Senate arrives at debate on this issue. I know that the House of Representatives will deal with this most-favored-nation case first. But it is my strongest feeling that we should support President Bush at this time because of his experience with China, because of his good judgment in foreign policy, generally, and especially with China; and because of the overall negative impact of a denial of MFN status. I do not think we would achieve our objectives in human rights by denying MFN status to China. As Senator DOLE so aptly noted on this floor last week when he defended President Bush's decision on MFN status for China, "I think we will be able to show that this is a case of feel good versus do good." He is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a Heritage Foundation background paper written by Andrew Brick printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR RENEWING CHINA'S TRADE STATUS

(Updating Asian Studies Center Backgrounder No. 104, "Washington's Agonizing Decision: To Extend or Revoke China's Most-Favored-Nation Status," May 8, 1990.)

The Washington-Beijing relationship is beset by problems. The People's Republic of China's 1990 trade surplus with the United States was $10.4 billion, up $4.2 billion from 1989, and could leap to $15 billion by the end of this year. This would make the U.S. deficit with China greater than with any country except Japan. The trouble with the mushrooming trade deficit with China is that there is a growing feeling that it is caused in part by Beijing's refusal to open China's markets fully to American goods. To make matters worse, the Chinese refuse to protect U.S. patents and copyrights, and apparently use prison labor to lower the price of their exports. Then there is significant evidence that the Chinese are peddling missiles and nuclear technology to Algeria, Pakistan and other Third World customers in defiance of multilateral efforts to ban such sales. And Beijing has yet to make a

full accounting of what has happened to the pro-democracy demonstrators arrested after the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre.

It is in this environment that George Bush will be challenged to decide by June 3 whether to renew China's most-favored-nation (MFN) trading status. Such status, granted to China in 1980 and approved annually since then, gives Chinese goods exported to the U.S. the same tariff treatment as that received by the some 180 other nations to which Washington accords MFN status, including Iraq and Syria and a host of other unpleasant regimes.

EQUAL TREATMENT

Although the expression "most-favored-nation" suggests that a country is accorded special trading privileges, the term actually means something quite different. Specifically, a country that receives MFN status merely is entitled to those trade benefits and concessions granted to any other MFN country. MFN thus confers no special trading status; it simply treats all MFN recipients equally.

Generally, MFN is a permanent status. The only exceptions are communist countries which, under the Trade Act of 1974, either annually or semi-annually must seek renewal. Specifically, Title 4 of the Act, known as the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, named after the late Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington and former Representative Charles A. Vanik of Ohio, both Democrats, states that MFN status can be given to "non-market economies" if their countries permit substantially free emigration of their citizens. The law works like this: If the President wants to extend MFN status he must either certify to Congress that the country under consideration is not in violation of the Amendment's human rights criteria or waive the criteria for the country involved on an annual basis because such a move would "substantially promote the objectives" of Jackson-Vanik. Once George Bush certifies that China over the past year has allowed free emigration, Congress effectively has ninety days to approve or disapprove China's MFN status. Their vote is then subject to presidential veto.

America's problems with China thus fall into two categories—the economic and the political. Washington should deal with them accordingly: economic problems should be addressed with economic mechanisms; political problems with political ones.

TRADE RETALIATION

If Beijing refuses to assure copyright, patent and trademark protection to American business, for instance, then China should be identified under the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act as a so-called "priority" country that has established "systematic" barriers to U.S. exports. This law sets procedures for dealing with unfair "priority" foreign trade practices through trade retaliation. The Bush Administration, in fact, on April 26 cited China as a "priority" nation for pirating U.S. copyrights and patents.

Conversely, the current political problems in the Sino-American relationship should be addressed through political mechanisms. China's continuing human rights abuses in Tibet, its likely use of some prison labor to manufacture goods for export and its sales of advanced weapons to dangerous nations should elicit vigorous condemnation from the highest levels of the U.S. government. Under Secretary Robert Kimmitt, the State Department's third-ranking official, traveled to China this week to convey U.S. dismay over Beijing's trade practices and human rights violations. Even tougher American political and diplomatic actions against China may be warranted by Beijing's transgressions.

What is not warranted is mixing the economic and political issues. China no more should be punished economically for its unacceptable political actions than Japan should be exempted for political reasons from economic punishment for its unacceptable economic actions against American products.

If Beijing violates the Jackson-Vanik amendment's "freedom-of-emigration" provision, then China's MFN status should be revoked. Otherwise, the issue should be subject to the same considerations by which Washington has deemed it proper to extend MFN to 180 other nations.

Other factors also argue against ending China's MFN status. To do so would:

Dramatically raise duties on Chinese exports to America and thus hike the prices that working class and other Americans pay for these goods. Products from China now account for one-third of the American toy market, 10 percent of the American footwear market and 15 percent of the imported American apparel market.

Cost of export industries of South China up to two million jobs. It is this area in which the free market and pro-democratic forces are strongest. Ending MFN thus would penalize those Chinese whom American policy ostensibly seeks to help.

Reduce China's access to hard currency, further squeezing Beijing's ability to service its $45.8 billion international debt.

Close Chinese markets to American exporters. Last year, U.S. exports to China totaled $4.8 billion. Among the biggest American losers would be wheat growers, whose 1990 sales approached $1 billion; commercial aircraft manufacturers, for whom China has become a dependable $500 million a year market; and phosphate fertilizer manufacturers, who consistently sell one-sixth of their entire annual output to China.

Create enormous new problems for Hong Kong at a time when the colony can least afford anything that undermines confidence in its future. Some 70 percent of American imports from China are shipped through Hong Kong. As Hong Kong's largest foreign market and one of its principal investors, U.S. interests lie in a politically assured and economically healthy Hong Kong. Uncertain about their future, 60,000 Hong Kong citizens leave the territory each year. Denying China MFN status may well speed the exodus.

Increase Beijing's dependence on arms sales for cash. Cutting off American markets to Chinese goods could force Beijing to rely even more on the international weapons market for hard currency.

Threaten to abandon the China market to the Japanese, the Europeans and others who automatically give China MNF status.

Almost two years after the violence in Beijing, Washington policy makers confront a recalcitrant, unapologetic and defiant China. A long and potent list of U.S. grievances daily increases. In such light, it is emotionally easy to make a case for punishing Beijing. If so, then appropriate punishment should be sought, and inflicted. Yet ending China's MFN status is not appropriate. If it is, then Washington must review the domestic political behavior of scores of other countries and prepare to revoke their U.S. MNF status. To end MFN for mainland China, moreover, barely will pinch Beijing's aging leaders who are the authors of the repression. Instead, it will hurt reformers in China, consumers in America and deal a heavy blow to Hong Kong.

Washington should recognize this. It should separate the economic and political issues at stake. And then it should conclude that there are no grounds for revoking U.S. MFN trade status for China.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOUNT RUSHMORE POSTAGE STAMP

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, nestled in the beautiful Black Hills of South Dakota, the four granite faces carved on Mount Rushmore symbolize the freedom for which past and present generations of Americans have fought so courageously to protect. Indeed, in this time of revived patriotism, our shrine of democracy stands as a beacon of hope throughout the world. The monument, and the principles it embodies, prove that a country based on freedom and democracy can, and will, stand fast against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Unfortunately, when this majestic monument was completed in 1941, it did not receive a formal dedication. The death of its sculptor, Gutzon Borglum, and the United States entry into World War II precluded a proper tribute to the monument. On the Fourth of July of this summer, however, Mount Rushmore will be recognized with a 50th anniversary celebration it so well deserves.

Mr. President, I am pleased to note that Mount Rushmore recently was commemorated on an official U.S. postage stamp. This marked only the third time our shrine of democracy has been featured on a U.S. postage stamp.

The new stamp, which features an American flag flying over the monument was formally dedicated at Mount Rushmore earlier this year. It honors the principles of our Nation by spreading the likeness of Mount Rushmore's famous faces on letters and packages throughout the United States.

Mr. President, I first made the proposal for a Mount Rushmore stamp to the U.S. Postal Service and the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee back in 1984.

After earlier rejections, I resubmitted the proposal and later led a petition drive to support the proposal for a Mount Rushmore stamp, eventually submitting over 15,000 signatures backing the proposal. I was pleased when the Postal Service finally issued a

stamp to commemorate Mount Rushmore earlier this year.

Mount Rushmore has inspired millions of visitors during its first half century. I am pleased that it now is receiving the national recognition it deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the South Dakota magazine chronicling the history of the Mount Rushmore stamp be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Dakota magazine, May–June, 1991]

MOUNT RUSHMORE AS SEEN ON STAMPS

(By Michael Samp)

For the third time in its 50-year history, Mount Rushmore has been featured on a U.S. postage stamp. On both occasions, it took some political muscle to get the presses rolling with likenesses of the four presidents.

In 1952, the front cover of the Senate Highway Map featured a colorful photograph of the Shrine to Democracy, set against a blue sky and dark green pines. In the foreground of the photo, a young mother and her son gazed at the huge sculpture from a park bench.

The photo, which soon became the inspiration of the first Rushmore stamp, was taken by a young University of South Dakota law student, Robert Frankenfeld, while he was employed as part-time publicity director for the S.D. State School of Mines. The models were his wife, Phyllis, and their small son, Donald.

A.H. "Pank" Pankow, then director of publicity for the State Highway Commission, conceived of the idea for a stamp to honor the 25th anniversary of the August 10, 1927 ceremony at which President Calvin Coolidge handed Gutzon Borglum the tools to start the mountain carving. Pankow, with help from U.S. Rep. E.Y. Berry and Senator Francis Case, formed a committee to gain postal approval for a stamp.

Nila Lee Berry, daughter of the congressman, used Frankenfeld's photograph as a model to create an illustration for a stamp. The politicos added "Black Hills South Dakota" for publicity's sake.

Case and Berry persuaded the Bureau of Engraving and postal authorities to print the design on a three-cent stamp, which was the first class letter stamp of the era. The initial printing was 110 million, which prompted Senator Case to remark, "That's a sizeable quantity of stickers to put into circulation advertising South Dakota. There will also be at least a quarter of a million special Rushmore envelopes printed. The cost of this publicity to South Dakota will be zero."

The '52 stamp's background was bright green. The illustration was a darker green.

Case said the vertical shape of the stamp conveyed "the great height and grandeur that rightfully goes with Gutzon Borglum's historic figures. A mother and her son looking at the mountain suggests the inspirational character of the memorial. Pine trees reflect the natural setting and avoid the cliff-like appearance given by the rocks alone."

Robert Frankenfeld, the photographer, went on to complete his law degree. He is now retired from his law practice and lives in Rapid City with Phyllis. Their son, Don, the child on the stamp, is a Rapid City forensic economist. He is a former state senator and was an unsuccessful GOP candidate for U.S. Congress in 1990.

South Dakota's four presidents appeared on a postage stamp again in 1974, but the stamp was a 26-cent airmail stamp and it didn't garner the attention of a regular first-class stamp.

Now, for the third time in 39 years, the U.S. Postal Service has printed a Mount Rushmore commemorative stamp. The 1991 stamp, a first class 29-center, marks the 50th anniversary of the completion of the mountain carving by Borglum.

U.S. Senator Larry Pressler proposed the stamp as a means of commemorating the anniversary but postal officials initially rejected his proposal. However, when Pressler embarked on a petition drive and collected 15,000 signatures from South Dakotans who wanted the stamp, the Postal Service succumbed.

Called "Flag Over Mount Rushmore," the stamp was designed by Clarence Holbert of Washington, D.C. It features the faces of the presidents with an American flag flying overhead. Colors are red, blue and maroon and, while the total press run is not yet known, the Postal Service is making the stamps available singly and in coils of 100, 500 and 3,000—which will generate increased business use and, consequently, more exposure for the South Dakota mountain carving.

It was introduced at a ceremony March 29 at Keystone. Among the dignitaries present were Governor George Mickelson, Susan Alvardo of the Postal Service's Board of Governors, and James Ridenour, director of the National Park Service.

(Michael M. Samp is an Augustana College student who works for Creative Services of Sioux Falls on special projects promoting the Rushmore anniversary.)

WORLD WAR II NATIONAL OBSERVANCE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this morning I had the privilege of participating in the ceremonies which opened the "week for the National Observance of the 50th Anniversary of World War II."

This commemoration was designated last year by a joint resolution passed by this body and our colleagues in the House of Representatives.

The National Archives, under the leadership of our outstanding Archivist, Dr. Don Wilson, has done a superb job in organizing this week's activities, as well as 4½ years of programs across the country.

I thought my colleagues might be interested in reading the remarks I delivered on behalf of Congress as honorary cochairman of the commemoration, as well as those delivered by Gen. Robert McDermott, chairman and CEO of the U.S. Automobile Association.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR BOB DOLE, WW II NATIONAL OBSERVANCE

Whatever else you say about old soldiers, they never forget. Today, we assemble at this shrine of democracy to insure that they are never forgotten.

We recall an earlier war, even as we commemorate the quick and successful completion of another conflict halfway around the world. Later this week, Washington will welcome home the men and women of Desert Storm. It's hard to believe, but some people question this outpouring of national pride. Maybe they are embarrassed by the cheering and the chants—the flagwaving and the unabashed love of country that inspired America's Volunteer Army and that sustained it in the bleak deserts of Arabia.

Surely no one can mistake this week's observances as a glorification of war—least of all the soldier, who must suffer the scars and terrors of battle.

No: What we celebrate this week are the human qualities that lend nobility to the battlefield. The courage and selflessness. The sacrifice and the professionalism. Qualities exhibited by American fighting men and women on the road to Kuwait and on the sands of Iwo Jima.

Chiseled into the front of this building is the phrase, "What is past is prologue." If the Smithsonian is America's attic, then the National Archives is America's strongbox. Here are enshrined the charters of our nationhood. The declaration that made us independent. The Constitution that made us whole. And the Bill of Rights, which after two centuries remains a guidepost in humanity's age old struggle to be free.

There is not a way of putting a value on such documents—or on the national character they define. Wars shape character. They also express it. Fifty years ago, Americans from every walk of life stopped what they were doing on a Sunday afternoon in December. I was in college at the time, waiting tables in a University of Kansas frat house. Truth is, I didn't take the world very seriously before December 7, 1941.

Nor was I alone. For most of us, the events in Europe existed dimly in radio broadcasts or newspaper stories. The news from half a world away served to remind Americans of why we had abandoned the old world 300 years earlier. After all, why should we worry about a continent that seemed bent on self-destruction? Weren't we protected from harm's way by two oceans, gigantic moats behind which even the largest country could take shelter?

All that changed on December 7, 1941, when American isolation was blasted along with the Navy outpost at Pearl Harbor. In a single afternoon, the term "national security" was redefined to read "International obliations." Soon, ten million of us went off to fight a total war against dictators from whom a declaration, a constitution, or a bill of rights would be anathema.

Many never came home. They rest on foreign soil: In the chalkfields of Northern France, the jungles of Asia, or on the floor of the deep Pacific. Some came home physically or psychologically scarred for life. To this day, they wear their injuries as proudly as their medals, because both were earned in a noble cause. Still others returned to a very different land from the one they left to avenge the boys of Battan and Pearl Harbor. For if the war changed those who fought it, it changed America even more.

This, too, is part of the 50th anniversary observance that begins this week. A war that shattered artificial barriers of race and sex. A war that took American women out of the home and ushered them into the workforce. A war that paved the way for the modern women's movements, a quiet revolution that insists, "we, the people" who wrote a Constitution, must live up to the promises of equal treatment that it contains.

World War II was an equal opportunity conflict. The enemy shot equally at white, black, or brown targets. On a battlefield, the blood of black soldiers and white all flows together, in a crimson stream of mutual valor.

Fortunately, the young G.I.'s who returned home to America in 1945 could not reconcile the fight against Hitler with acceptance of Jim Crow. So in defeating the scourge of Nazi racism, we also declared war on bigotry—beginning in our own backyard.

During the next four and a half years, millions of war stories will be told. Some of the most moving will form the heart of a major traveling exhibit opening December 7 in San Antonio. For making it possible for today's Americans to experience an earlier generation's rendezvous with destiny, we are all indebted to the United States Automobile Association, and to the exhibit planners of the national archives.

Between now and 1995, we will examine what has been called "the last good war." At special exhibits, conferences, reunions, film festivals, educational workshops, and a host of other events, we will remember the war and those who fought it. Not only giants like Eisenhower, Patton, MacArthur, and Bradley—but the nameless heroes who went to their deaths known only to God.

We will recall places like Casablanca, Anzio, Normandy, and Midway. We will marvel over a Nation united in defense of all that we hold most sacred. But we will not forget the abuses that occurred when wartime emotions ran amuck and some of our own people were punished for the simple fact of their national ancestry.

Hopefully, we will draw lessons from the war before the war—from the intense battle of words waged between those who thought it was possible in the 1930's to isolate America from global mainstream and those who accepted the responsibilities that accompany international leadership.

Great nations measure their greatness in the obligations they honor and in the ideals they uphold. America is no exception.

Fifty years later, for example, we all wish that nations would leave their neighbors undisturbed. We wish the world might build fewer tanks so it could spend more fighting poverty and disease. We wish that no young American would ever again be forced to leave his loved ones and take up arms in some far off killing field.

Yet if these past fifty years have taught us anything, it is the danger of wishful thinking. In the modern world, wishes are no substitute for will. That is something we learned at terrible cost in fighting what Winston Churchill called the most unnecessary of all wars.

And because we learned it, we were willing and able to respond quickly when an Iraqi dictator tried to swallow a tiny neighbor. Like the warriors of my day, the troops of Desert Storm fought, not for territory but for justice, not for plunder, but for righteousness. The ideals for which they fought have yet to be implemented in every American home. But then, that's what sets us apart. Thanks to the documents displayed in this building's rotunda, we are a Nation that has never become, but it is always becoming.

The people of the National Archives know that where you come from says a lot about where you're going. So if you want another reason to remember the war that began fifty years ago, consider this: By recalling a world at war, we might hasten a world where children recall only peace.

That could be the greatest of all legacies from the citizen soldiers who rescued civilization itself from a long, starless, night of the soul.

REMARKS OF GEN. ROBERT F. MCDERMOTT

What do Richard Bong, James Rudder and Chester Nimitz have in common?

One thing they have in common is that few Americans have every heard of them; another is that they were all American heroes in World War II.

As some of you present today may know:

Major Richard Bong shot down 40 aircraft and was America's top air ace.

Colonel James Rudder led the 2nd Ranger Battalion to scale the cliffs and capture Pointe du Hoc that commanded the Normandy beaches.

And five-star Admiral Chester Nimitz was the architect of our victory in the Pacific.

While it is sad enough that most Americans do not recognize the names Bong, Rudder and Nimitz, it is that tens of thousands of Americans don't know what World War II was that is amazing to me.

As an afterthought, I wonder if General Schwartzkopf, who will be marching down this avenue on Saturday, is aware that the shelf life of most military heroes in America is very short indeed.

As a service academy dean, I think we should revisit our wars to learn about our accomplishments and yes, even our mistakes.

Unfortunately, many Americans do not understand World War II because they did not live it. Over 70 percent of Americans alive today were not even born when the war ended.

It is hard for them to imagine a war where one of every 10 Americans was in the service. For men only, obviously the percentage was much higher.

Today, over 9 million World War II veterans and their families still live and do remember.

They remember World War II casualty rates. The odds of being killed or wounded were one in 16, more then double the rates experienced in Korea and Vietnam.

They remember the more than 120,000 American POWs and thousands more who still remain unaccounted for. That 120,000 figure is more than 12 times the number of POWs in the Korean War and more than 120 times the number of POWs in the Vietnam War.

We want everyone to remember the World War II generation and their sacrifices.

The concept of commemorating World War II fits in perfectly with the beliefs of USAA's 2 million officer-members and their families.

So, when Don Wilson offered USAA the chance to work with the Archives on this national exhibition, we wanted to be a part of it.

We were especially excited about the educational thrust of the exhibition—the chance to tell our youth what World War II meant and still means to America.

First, we will honor all those who served overseas and at home, those who lived, and those who died serving their nation.

Second, we want to remind ourselves and to tell our youth as well, about the courage, character and values that bound us together.

The faces and scenes of Norman Rockwell's World War II paintings underline the innocence and values that have somehow slipped away from us.

We hope the exhibition will rekindle some of this that we have lost.

Third, we want to show how Americans pulled together on the battlefield and off—how men and women, people of all colors, religions and ethnic backgrounds, served with a common purpose. Every group contributed:

Rosie the Riveter symbolized the contribution of women to the work force and to the war effort.

Indians, speaking Navajo over battlefield radios, passed information that remained unbroken by enemy experts.

Japanese-American units established enviable fighting records in Italy.

Black Tuskegee airmen proved their abilities in the skies over Europe.

Four chaplains of different denominations gave their lives to save fellow shipmates. Their actions symbolized that all religious groups worked and died together.

The youth of America fought and died for all of us.

We hope that all Americans will join in the commemoration and that the remembering will bond us together again.

Our experience in San Antonio in getting ready for the December 7, 1991 opening shows that the entire community is working together to set a model for the rest of the nation. The enthusiasm and cooperation have exceeded our expectations. During the period from December 7, 1991 to March 29, 1992:

Every San Antonio museum will have World War II displays.

All the schools will have special World War II programs.

Our five military bases are planning commemorative activities.

Theater groups, bands, and even the San Antonio Symphony have special entertainment planned.

Libraries and universities will have special displays, programs and speakers.

San Antonio newspapers, public TV and other news media are in full support.

If you want to learn about World War II, what it meant to the people of that time who lived through it, and what it means to the world today, I hope that you will visit the exhibitions at one of its stops around the country over the next four years.

And, of course, we would be delighed to welcome you to San Antonio for the grand opening. I'm sure it will be an unforgettable experience.

ORIGINS AND MEANINGS CONTAINED IN U.N. RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I have received a most thoughtful letter written by Ira Wolfe and Liane White to the editor of the New York Times. The letter discusses the significance of specific terms and phrases in U.N. resolutions relevant to the Arab-Israeli dispute. As we approach this complex and difficult situation, it is important to keep the origins and precise meanings of these resolutions in mind. All too often extravagant claims are made concerning these resolutions. I commend this letter to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, NY,
April 22, 1991.

SOMA GOLDEN,
National News Desk, The New York Times, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MS. GOLDEN: Clifford Krauss, in his April 16 article concerning Secretary of

State James Baker's trip to the Middle East, incorrectly states that "United Nations Resolutions 242 and 338 . . . call on Israel to return Jordanian and Syrian lands it has occupied since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war."

Despite Mr. Krauss' characterization to the contrary, these resolutions do not specify withdrawal from Syrian or Jordanian territory. Resolution 242, adopted on November 22, 1967, calls for the "(w)ithdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict" and the right of every state in the area to live "within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force." Resolution 338, adopted on October 22, 1973 following the unprovoked Syrian and Egyptian attack on Israel during the Jewish holiday of Yom Kippur, calls upon all parties to immediately implement resolution 242.

Although Mr. Krauss implicitly assumes that the resolutions require Israeli withdrawal from apparently all territories occupied in 1967, the resolutions significantly do not specify withdrawal from "the territories" or "all territories." As Lord Caradon, the British ambassador to the United Nations who drafted resolution 242, told the House of Commons on December 9, 1969, "the omission of the word 'all' before the word 'territories' is deliberate. Arthur Goldberg, the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations when 242 was adopted, explained on May 8, 1973: "The notable omissions—which were not accidental—in regard to the withdrawal are the words 'the' or 'all' . . . the resolution speaks of withdrawal from occupied territories without defining the extent of withdrawal." Ambassador Goldberg has also noted that the phrase in the resolution calling for the right of every state in the region to "live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries" was specifically included because the parties were expected to make "territorial adjustment in their peace settlement encompassing less than a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, inasmuch as Israel's prior frontiers had proved to be notably insecure."

Arguably, Israel has already complied with 242 and 338 by withdrawing—as part of its peace treaty with Egypt—from over 90% of the land it captured. Any Israeli decision to return additional territory to Jordan or Syria must be based on those countries' unconditional and unequivocal recognition of Israel's right to exist, direct negotiations between the parties and detailed security arrangements. To assume that Israel is *a priori* obligated by 242 and 338 to return the territory it still occupies is not only incorrect; it would establish the dangerous precedent that nations could wage genocidal war—as the Arabs attempted in 1967—without fear of penalty. On May 18, two weeks before the six day war, Cairo Radio proclaimed, "the sole method we shall apply against Israel is a total war which will result in the extermination of the Zionist existence." On May 31, 1967 President Aref of Iraq declared, "The existence of Israel is an error which must be rectified . . . Our goal is clear—to wipe Israel off the map." The Golan Heights and West Bank provide crucial strategic depth, allowing Israel to absorb an Arab attack—as in 1973—regroup and counter-attack while mobilizing reserves. After centuries of Arab oppression, the extermination of European Jewry and wars in 1948, 1967 and 1973 aimed at the destruction of Jewish sovereignty, it is understandable if Israel hesitates to return areas of immense strategic importance to a Syrian despot who claims Israel as part of "southern Syria" or a Jordanian monarch recently allied with the "Butcher of Bagdad."

Mr. Krauss also errs in referring to the West Bank as "Jordanian land." Jordan invaded and brutally annexed the West Bank following its attempt to destroy the newly proclaimed State of Israel in 1948. Neither the United States nor any other country in the world (except Britain and Pakistan) has ever recognized this illegal occupation. It is absurd for The New York Times to refer repeatedly in its articles to the "Israeli-occupied" West Bank while describing the same territory as "Jordanian land" rather than land "seized by Jordan in the 1948 war" or "occupied by Jordan prior to 1967."

Efforts by New York Times correspondents to explain the importance of U.N. resolutions 242 and 338 and to provide historical context in articles on the Middle East are laudable. However, when these resolutions are mischaracterized and language describing the region subtly distorted, the result is a disservice to your readers—and the truth.

Sincerely,

IRA B. WOLFF.
LIANE R. WHITE.

TERRY ANDERSON

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to inform my colleagues that today marks the 2,270th day that Terry Anderson has been held captive in Lebanon.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT RESEARCH AND MANUFACTURING COMPETITION ACT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, when we undertake consideration of S. 173, the Telecommunications Equipment Research and Manufacturing Competition Act of 1991, I shall propose an amendment on behalf of myself, Senators GRASSLEY, SASSER, BAUCUS, BURDICK, CONRAD, and others. I shall explain what that amendment is now and again when I offer the amendment. But I wanted to let my colleagues know of this amendment.

A number of small and rural telephone companies have expressed concerns to us about enacting S. 173 without adequate safeguards to ensure that rural areas continue to be served by a first-rate public telecommunications infrastructure. In 1988, I wrote an article in the UCLA Federal Communications Law Journal concerning universal telephone service which emphasized the need for a coordinated telecommunications policy between urban and rural and small city areas of this country.

Without universal service as a fundamental premise of our national telecommunications policy, we in rural parts of the country will be left far behind in the advancing information age. Of course, a manufacturing bill alone will not do the whole job. But, the universal service premise is at the heart of this amendment.

The manufacturing restriction relaxation envisioned in S. 173 should be accompanied by clear, explicit and enforceable statutory safeguards which would guarantee small and rural local exchange carriers nondiscriminatory access to the equipment and software they need.

This amendment would do the following:

First of all, it would require the Bell companies to make software and telecommunications equipment available to other local exchange carriers without discrimination or self-preference. S. 173 currently does not contain language requiring the Bell companies to sell software, which is the heart of modern telecommunications equipment, to other local exchange carriers. It would make any reciprocal requirements for other local exchange carriers that manufacture telecommunications equipment truly reciprocal.

S. 173 requires Bell company affiliates to make equipment available only to other local telephone companies and only for use with the public telecommunications network; other local telephone companies must make available any telecommunications equipment they or any of their affiliates manufacture to any Bell company that sells them equipment and to any of its affiliates, for any use.

Second, our amendment would require Bell companies that manufacture equipment to continue making available telecommunications equipment, including software, to other local telephone companies so long as reasonable demand for it exists. S. 173 contains no requirement to maintain availability to satisfy the reasonable continuing demand of other local telephone companies.

Small and rural companies are concerned that if the Bell companies are allowed into manufacturing, they would be much more likely to buy existing manufacturing operations than to start new ones. This is particularly true for switch manufacturing, which is very capital intensive. If the Bell companies refuse to supply software to independents, they can prevent the independents from providing new services. Then the Bell companies could market such services to the small company's large customers, emphasizing that the small company was unable to offer the service.

The concern we have is that the Bell companies could divert the traffic of selected large customers to their own facilities. This would leave behind costs that remaining residential customers would have to absorb through higher rates. A Bell company also could use this leverage if it wanted to acquire a neighboring small independent in a growing area. It could further its acquisition objective by depriving the target company of technology, thus stimulating consumer complaints to regulators.

Small and rural companies are also worried that a Bell company could ac-

quire an existing manufacturer, change the product line to meet Bell plans and needs, and cease to support equipment and software installed by small companies. If new software is not made available, a rural company might have to choose between installing a new switch or depriving its subscribers of new services.

Third, our amendment would require the Bell companies to engage in joint network planning, design and operations.

S. 173 undercuts joint planning and widespread infrastructure availability because it only requires the Bell companies to: First, Inform other local telephone companies about their deployment of equipment; and second, report changes to protocols and requirements. The bill's requirements are too little too late. They will not lead to a nationwide, information-rich telecommunications infrastructure.

Small companies need a voice in the process to assure that the network is designed, implemented and operated jointly by all local telephone companies to meet the goal of nationwide access to information age resources.

Finally, our amendment calls for strong district court enforcement procedures, including damages. S. 173 provides only for FCC common carrier authority, which proved inadequate to remedy past refusals to provide equipment to small local telephone companies. If independents do not have the ability to go to district court with their complaints, they cannot reasonably have any confidence that the essential safeguards will be effective.

We are currently discussing this amendment with the authors of the bill and we hope we can include this as part of the package we bring to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that rural companies have reasonable, enforceable and continuing access to the equipment and joint network planning they need so that all Americans, urban and rural alike, can share in a nationwide, information-rich telecommunications network.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT RESEARCH AND MANUFACTURING COMPETITION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. REID). Under a previous order, the hour of 3 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 173, which the clerk will now report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 173) to permit the Bell Telephone Companies to conduct research on, design, and manufacture telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 173

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 "Telecommunications Equipment Research and Manufacturing Competition Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that the continued economic growth and the international competitiveness of American industry would be assisted by permitting the Bell Telephone Companies, through their affiliates, to manufacture (including design, development, and fabrication) telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment, and to engage in research with respect to such equipment.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.

Title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"REGULATION OF MANUFACTURING BY BELL TELEPHONE COMPANIES

"SEC. 227. (a) Subject to the requirements of this section and the regulations prescribed thereunder, a Bell Telephone Company, through an affiliate of that Company, notwithstanding any restriction or obligation imposed before the date of enactment of this section pursuant to the Modification of Final Judgment on the lines of business in which a Bell Telephone Company may engage, may manufacture and provide telecommunications equipment and manufacture customer premises equipment, except that neither a Bell Telephone Company nor any of its affiliates may engage in such manufacturing in conjunction with a Bell Telephone Company not so affiliated or any of its affiliates.

"(b) Any manufacturing or provision authorized under subsection (a) shall be conducted only through an affiliate (hereafter in this section referred to as a 'manufacturing affiliate') that is separate from any Bell Telephone Company.

"(c) The Commission shall prescribe regulations to ensure that—

"(1) such manufacturing affiliate shall maintain books, records, and accounts separate from its affiliated Bell Telephone Company which identify all transactions between the manufacturing affiliate and its affiliated Bell Telephone Company and, even if such manufacturing affiliate is not a publicly held corporation, prepare financial statements which are in compliance with Federal financial reporting requirements for publicly held corporations, file such statements with the Commission, and make such statements available for public inspection;

"(2) consistent with the provisions of this section, neither a Bell Telephone Company nor any of its nonmanufacturing affiliates shall perform sales, advertising, installation, production, or maintenance operations for a manufacturing affiliate; except that institutional advertising, of a type not related to specific telecommunications equipment, carried out by the Bell Telephone Company or its affiliates shall be permitted if each party pays its pro rata share;

"(3)(A) such manufacturing affiliate shall conduct all of its manufacturing within the United States and, except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, all component parts of customer premises equipment manufactured by such affiliate, and all component parts of telecommunications equipment manufactured by such affiliate, shall have been manufactured within the United States;

"(B) such affiliate may use component parts manufactured outside the United States if—

"(i) such affiliate first makes a good faith effort to obtain equivalent component parts manufactured within the United States at reasonable prices, terms, and conditions; and

"(ii) for the aggregate of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment manufactured and sold in the United States by such affiliate in any calendar year, the cost of the components manufactured outside the United States contained in the equipment does not exceed 40 percent of the sales revenue derived from such equipment;

"(C) any such affiliate that uses component parts manufactured outside the United States in the manufacture of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment within the United States shall—

"(i) certify to the Commission that a good faith effort was made to obtain equivalent parts manufactured within the United States at reasonable prices, terms, and conditions, which certification shall be filed on a quarterly basis with the Commission and list component parts, by type, manufactured outside the United States; and

"(ii) certify to the Commission on an annual basis that for the aggregate of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment manufactured and sold in the United States by such affiliate in the previous calendar year, the cost of the components manufactured outside the United States contained in such equipment did not exceed the percentage specified in subparagraph (B)(ii) or adjusted in accordance with subparagraph (G);

"(D)(i) if the Commission determines, after reviewing the certification required in subparagraph (C)(i), that such affiliate failed to make the good faith effort required in subparagraph (B)(i) or, after reviewing the certification required in subparagraph (C)(ii), that such affiliate has exceeded the percentage specified in subparagraph (B)(ii), the Commission may impose penalties or forfeitures as provided for in title V of this Act;

"(ii) any supplier claiming to be damaged because a manufacturing affiliate failed to make the good faith effort required in subparagraph (B)(i) may make complaint to the Commission as provided for in section 208 of this Act, or may bring suit for the recovery of actual damages for which such supplier claims such affiliate may be liable under the provisions of this Act in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction;

"(E) the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall, on an annual basis, determine the cost of component parts manufactured outside the United States contained in all telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment sold in the United States as a percentage of the revenues from sales of such equipment in the previous calendar year;

"(F) a manufacturing affiliate may use intellectual property created outside the United States in the manufacture of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment in the United States;

"(G) the Commission may not waive or alter the requirements of this subsection, except that the Commission, on an annual

basis, shall adjust the percentage specified in subparagraph (B)(ii) to the percentage determined by the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, as directed in subparagraph (E);

"(4) no more than 90 [per centum] *percent* of the equity of such manufacturing affiliate shall be owned by its affiliated Bell Telephone Company and any affiliates of that Bell Telephone Company;

"(5) any debt incurred by such manufacturing affiliate may not be issued by its affiliates, and such manufacturing affiliate shall be prohibited from incurring debt in a manner that would permit a creditor, on default, to have recourse to the assets of its affiliated Bell Telephone Company's telecommunications services business;

"(6) such manufacturing affiliate shall not be required to operate separately from the other affiliates of its affiliated Bell Telephone Company;

"(7) if an affiliate of a Bell Telephone Company becomes affiliated with a manufacturing entity, such affiliate shall be treated as a manufacturing affiliate of that Bell Telephone Company within the meaning of subsection (b) and shall comply with the requirements of this section; and

"(8) such manufacturing affiliate shall make available, without discrimination or self-preference as to price, delivery, terms, or conditions, to all local telephone exchange carriers, for use with the public telecommunications network, any telecommunications equipment manufactured by such affiliate so long as each such purchasing carrier—

"(A) does not either manufacture telecommunications equipment, or have a manufacturing affiliate which manufactures telecommunications equipment, or

"(B) agrees to make available, to the Bell Telephone Company affiliated with such manufacturing affiliate or any of the other affiliates of such [company,] *Company*, any telecommunications equipment manufactured by such purchasing carrier or by any entity or organization with which such carrier is affiliated.

"(d)(1) The Commission shall prescribe regulations to require that each Bell Telephone Company shall maintain and file with the Commission full and complete information with respect to the protocols and technical requirements for connection with and use of its telephone exchange service facilities. Such regulations shall require each such [company] *Company* to report promptly to the Commission any material changes or planned changes to such protocols and requirements, and the schedule for implementation of such changes or planned changes.

"(2) A Bell Telephone Company shall not disclose to any of its affiliates any information required to be filed under paragraph (1) unless that information is immediately so filed.

"(3) When two or more carriers are providing regulated telephone exchange service in the same area of interest, each such carrier shall provide to other such carriers timely information on the deployment of telecommunications equipment.

"(4) The Commission may prescribe such additional regulations under this subsection as may be necessary to ensure that manufacturers in competition with a Bell Telephone Company's manufacturing affiliate have ready and equal access to the information required for such competition that such [company] *Company* makes available to its manufacturing affiliate.

"(e) The Commission shall prescribe regulations requiring that any Bell Telephone Company which has an affiliate that engages in any manufacturing authorized by subsection (a) shall—

"(1) provide, to other manufacturers of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment, opportunities to sell such equipment to such Bell Telephone Company which are comparable to the opportunities which such Company provides to its affiliates;

"(2) not subsidize its manufacturing affiliate with revenues from its regulated telecommunications services; and

"(3) only purchase equipment from its manufacturing affiliate at the open market price.

"(f) A Bell Telephone Company and its affiliates may engage in close collaboration with any manufacturer of customer premises equipment or telecommunications equipment during the design and development of hardware, software, or combinations thereof relating to such equipment.

"(g) The Commission may prescribe such additional rules and regulations as the Commission determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(h) For the purposes of administering and enforcing the provisions of this section and the regulations prescribed thereunder, the Commission shall have the same authority, power, and functions with respect to any Bell Telephone Company as the Commission has in administering and enforcing the provisions of this title with respect to any common carrier subject to this Act.

"(i) The authority of the Commission to prescribe regulations to carry out this section is effective on the date of enactment of this section. The Commission shall prescribe such regulations within one hundred and eighty days after such date of enactment, and the authority to engage in the manufacturing authorized in subsection (a) shall not take effect until regulations prescribed by the Commission under subsections (c), (d), and (e) are in effect.

"(j) Nothing in this section shall prohibit any Bell Telephone Company from engaging, directly or through any affiliate, in any manufacturing activity in which any Company or affiliate was authorized to engage on the date of enactment of this section.

"(k) As used in this section:

"(1) The term 'affiliate' means any organization or entity that, directly or indirectly, owns or controls, is owned or controlled by, or is under common ownership with a Bell Telephone Company. Such term includes any organization or entity (A) in which a Bell Telephone Company and any of its affiliates have an equity interest of greater than 10 percent, or a management interest of greater than 10 percent, or (B) in which a Bell Telephone Company and any of its affiliates have any other significant financial interest.

"(2) The term 'Bell Telephone Company' means those companies listed in appendix A of the Modification of Final Judgment, and includes any successor or assign of any such company, but does not include any affiliate of any such company.

"(3) The term 'customer premises equipment' means equipment employed on the premises of a person (other than a carrier) to originate, route, or terminate telecommunications.

"(4) The term 'manufacturing' has the same meaning as such term has in the Modification of Final Judgment as interpreted in United States v. Western Electric, Civil Action No. 82-0192 (United States District Court, District of Columbia) (filed December 3, 1987).

"(5) The term 'Modification of Final Judgment' means the decree entered August 24, 1982, in United States v. Western Electric, Civil Action No. 82-0192 (United States District Court, District of Columbia).

"(6) The term 'telecommunications' means the transmission, between or among points specified by the user, of information of the user's choosing, without change in the form or content of the information as sent and received, by means of an electromagnetic transmission medium, including all instrumentalities, facilities, apparatus, and services (including the collection, storage, forwarding, switching, and delivery of such information) essential to such transmission.

"(7) The term 'telecommunications equipment' means equipment, other than customer premises equipment, used by a carrier to provide telecommunications services.

"(8) The term 'telecommunications service' means the offering for hire of telecommunications facilities, or of telecommunications by means of such facilities.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota seek recognition?

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly on this bill, if I could?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The manager of the bill.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I do not mind. It is a little bit out of order to speak on an amendment before the bill has even been brought up, but I will be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, if he wishes to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, I am certainly not going out of order in a way. Since the Chamber is empty, I thought I might use this opportunity to further speak on the amendment I shall be offering, which is of great importance to small, independent telephone companies and to rural cooperative companies.

A number of these small and rural telephone companies have contacted me to express their concerns about being shut out of the process. The purpose of the amendment to be offered by myself and other Senators is to do three things, which we feel would help to correct this problem.

Our goal is universal service, and without universal service as a fundamental premise of our national telecommunications policy, we in rural and small city parts of the country feel we may be left behind in the advancing information age.

It has occurred to me that both our inner cities and our small cities have something in common. They are frequently left out of the telecommunications advances. For example, only recently was Washington, DC, wired for cable TV. The same problem has been true of rural areas and small cities and towns.

The companies that provide these services want to provide them to the very affluent suburbs, the heavily populated suburbs, and everybody forgets

about the more difficult to serve areas. In 1934 we passed the Communication Act which established the concept of universal service. To be consistent with this concept, companies would take some very rich routes, but they would also take some very poor routes. That is how we built our national communications system.

So universal telephone service is something that we are very, very concerned about. This includes not only telephone service but also service that fiber optic cable will bring in the future; also service to small-town hospitals, to small-town libraries, to farms and ranches so that they can participate in the information.

The manufacturing restriction relaxation envisaged in S. 173 should be accompanied by some very clear language protecting these smaller cities and rural telephone providers.

As I have said, our amendment would require the Bell company to make software and telecommunications equipment available to other local exchange carriers without discrimination or self-preference. For example, a small, independent company or a rural telephone co-op might be sold a switch or some other piece of telecommunications equipment but then not be able to buy the software necessary to upgrade that equipment. They would be at the complete mercy of the regional Bell operating companies. That should not be the case.

The bill, S. 173, requires Bell company affiliates to make equipment available only to other local telephone companies and only for use with the public telecommunications network. Other local telephone companies must make available any telecommunications equipment they or any of their affiliates manufacture, to any Bell company that sells them equipment and to any of their affiliates for any use.

Second, our amendment, as I have mentioned, would require the Bell companies that manufacture equipment to continue making telecommunications equipment available, including software, to other local telephone companies so long as reasonable demand for it exists. I emphasize this is a reasonable demand. S. 173 contains no requirement to maintain availability to satisfy the reasonable continuing demand of other local telephone companies.

Small and rural companies are concerned that if the Bell companies are allowed into manufacturing, they would be more likely to buy existing manufacturing operations than start new ones. This is particularly true for switch manufacturing.

The third area, and perhaps the most important one, deals with joint network planning, design, and operations. I might say, before going into that, that the small and rural companies are also worried that a Bell company could acquire an existing manufacturer to change its product line to meet Bell plans and needs and cease to support equipment and software installed by small companies. If that software is not made available, a rural company might have to choose between installing a costly new switch or depriving its subscribers of new services.

Fourth, our amendment would require the Bell companies, to engage, as I mentioned, in joint network planning and design. This may be controversial to some, but the small, independent telephone companies and the telephone cooperatives should be a part of the planning process.

Some might ask, Why do we need this provision? So that we do not have the regional telephone companies just dictating policy. I think our small companies and co-ops, however, should be at the table. Their voices need to be heard. Otherwise, they will be forced to do exactly what they are told, and that is not in the public interest.

Small companies need a voice in the process to assure that the network is designed, implemented, and operated jointly by all. I have emphasized this before. We have been in consultation with many of the smaller telephone companies and co-ops in preparing these amendments.

So at the appropriate time I shall offer these amendments, and I look forward very much to the debate on this bill.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, today the Senate is considering S. 173, the Telecommunications Equipment Research and Manufacturing Competition Act of 1991. This is an important bill which I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting. This bill removes the manufacturing restriction on the regional Bell operating companies imposed by the modification of final judgment. Let me note at the onset that this bill does not address the other restrictions imposed on the Bell companies regarding information services or long distance services.

Senator HOLLINGS, chairman of the Commerce Committee introduced S. 173 on January 14, 1991, and it now has 25 cosponsors. A hearing was held on the bill on February 28 of this year. S. 173 was approved overwhelmingly by the Commerce Committee on March 19, 1991, by a vote of 18 to 1. During last Congress, a similar version of this bill, S. 1981, was also introduced in May 1990 by Senator HOLLINGS and two hearings were held on the bill by the Commerce Committee. S. 1981 was approved by the Commerce Committee on a voice vote.

Before I describe this legislation in more detail, I want to thank Senator HOLLINGS for this important legislation. The Senator from South Carolina has worked very hard on this legislation over the last 2 years. It is only through his initiative and leadership that the bill has reached the floor of the Senate. Ths work also has resulted in the inclusion of language to address the concerns of this country's communications workers—to promote the manufacturing of telecommunications equipment in the United States. I believe that this bill will be good for the U.S. workers while at the same time enhancing this country's international competitive standing in the communications equipment market.

S. 173 permits the regional Bell operating companies to manufacture and provide communications equipment. At the same time, S. 173 recognizes that the Bell companies continue to occupy a dominant position in the local telephone service. The bill thus includes a variety of strong safeguards to protect against cross-subsidization and self-dealing. In conducting their manufacturing activities the Bell companies must comply with several safeguards, including the following:

NO JOINT MANUFACTURING

To prevent collusion, the Bell companies cannot manufacture in conjunction with one another. The bill requires that the Bell companies create seven independent manufacturing entities that will compete with each other as well as with existing manufacturers.

SEPARATE AFFILIATES

The Bell companies must conduct all their manufacturing activities from separate affiliates. The affiliate must keep books of account for its manufacturing activities separate from the telephone company and must file this information publicly.

NO SELF-DEALING

First, the Bell company may not perform sales, advertising, installation, production, or maintenance operations for its affiliate; second, the Bell company must provide other manufacturers an opportunity to sell to the telephone company comparable to that which it provides to its own affiliate; and third, a Bell company may only purchase equipment from its affiliate at the open market price.

NO CROSS-SUBSIDIZATION

The Bell company is prohibited from subsidizing its manufacturing operations with revenues from its telephone services.

DISCLOSURE OF NETWORK INFORMATION

The Bell company must file with the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] full and complete information concerning the telephone network im-

mediately upon revealing any such information to its manufacturing affiliate.

In addition, Mr. President, S. 173 includes a compromise agreement between the Bell companies and the Communications Workers of America [CWA] regarding the domestic manufacturing provision. This compromise provision requires: First, that the Bell companies conduct all their manufacturing in the United States; and second, that a certain percentage of the components they use be manufactured in the United States. Both the Bell companies and CWA support this provision and support S. 173.

Passage of this legislation is critical for a number of reasons: One of the most important is international competitiveness. The U.S. position in high-technology industries is in decline on a number of fronts. U.S. research and development expenditures as a percentage of GNP lag behind Japan and West Germany, for instance. The Bell companies spend far less of their revenues on R&D than the average high technology firm.

The regional Bell operating companies have tremendous assets and experience that could benefit the U.S. international competitive position significantly, if they are allowed to manufacture. The Bell companies earn over $80 billion in annual revenues, control over one-half the Nation's entire communications assets, and provide 80 percent of the Nation's local telephone service. Lifting the manufacturing restrictions would give the Bell companies increased incentives to conduct research and development. If their researchers develop a new or cheaper product, they can profit from that research by bringing it to market. The Bell companies also are likely to provide seed money to many small entrepreneurs who otherwise would seek capital from foreign sources.

In closing, Mr. President, I again thank Senator HOLLINGS and all of the members of the Commerce Committee for their work on this legislation. Today we have before us legislation that will help the United States regain its lead as a manufacturer of advanced telecommunications equipment. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). Without objection, it is ordered.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I rise in open opposition to S. 173. I will be making an extensive statement on this bill tomorrow, but today I want to very briefly outline my position on the bill.

S. 173 eliminates the manufacturing restriction contained in the AT&T consent decree. In itself, that is an extraordinary step. The Congressional Research Service has indicated that the Senate has rarely, if ever, passed a piece of legislation that overrides an ongoing judicial consent decree.

The purpose of this legislation is to allow the Baby Bells to manufacture the switches and transmission equipment which are the backbone of their local telephone monopolies. In my view, the effect of this bill will be to hurt consumers and reduce competition.

Many people think this bill is just a battle between AT&T and the Baby Bells over market share in the equipment market. If that were the case, I would not be standing here on the floor and I would not be standing on the floor tomorrow. AT&T and the Baby Bells are all big companies. They can take care of themselves. But the fact is that this issue is of critical importance to anyone who pays a telephone bill every month.

Make no bones about it, this is a consumer issue. History has demonstrated that consumers get hurt whenever the local phone monopolies can make the equipment which is used in their telephone networks. That is why AT&T was broken up in the first place. The Bell operating companies simply bought equipment from their manufacturing affiliates, paid inflated prices and shifted excess costs on to consumers, and the regulators were powerless to prevent such abuses. If we pass this bill we will be inviting history to repeat itself.

The Bells' incentive and ability to use monoploy power in an anticonsumer and anticompetitive manner has not changed and the regulators' ability to prevent such abuses has not improved. That is why the antitrust courts have continued to uphold the manufacturing restriction, even as they have loosened other parts of the consent degree.

So this bill is all risk for consumers and no benefit. The Bell monopolies are the only parties that are sure to benefit from this bill. There is nothing in S. 173 for the consumers. That is why every major consumer group in the country, all the State utility consumer advocates, and the AARP oppose this legislation.

The reason our Halls around here have been filled with Baby Bell lobbyists is they know they can make more money if they can go into this related activity of manufacturing. Today there is a restriction. When and if this legislation becomes law, there will be no such restriction. There will be some limitations but they will not be sufficient to protect the consumer. And the Baby Bells will again be in the position that AT&T was in some years ago before the matter was in the courts.

There are claimed safeguards in S. 173 which the proponents claim will prevent anticonsumer and anticompetitive abuses. I say to my colleagues in the Senate, they simply will not be effective. Have no question about it, the suggested protections that are in the bill will not protect the consumers and will not keep the Baby Bells from being able to go forward and manufacture and pass on those costs to the consumers.

I am frank to say I have drafted a number of amendments designed to reduce the harm that would be caused by this legislation. If those amendments are not adopted, or to least a substantial portion of them, then this Senate will have passed a piece of legislation that I believe would be very anticonsumer; that would cause telephone rates to increase in the years ahead of us.

I hope when those amendments come before the Senate the managers of the bill will look at them, see whether they are fair, see whether there is equity, see whether it is just; accept some of those amendments. I do not think we can make a bad bill into a good bill, but we certainly can make this bill into a much better bill than it is by accepting some or all of the amendments I will be proposing.

My colleagues should judge this bill according to a simple standard. Based upon our understanding of history, monopoly behavior, and the effectiveness of regulatory oversight in the telephone industry, will this bill be of benefit to both consumers and competition? I believe the answer to that question is no. And I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill and support the amendments I will submit.

I believe otherwise the American consumer will once again bear the burden, and the Bell operating companies will find themselves in the position that AT&T was formerly in, and they will able to raise prices to the American consumer. Certainly, economic times at present are not such that that is warranted.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICI. Mr. President, the United States is witnessing the beginning of a new era in telecommunications. Innovative technologies are breaking into the market in a wide

range of areas from fiber optics to consumer products. Yet, while the U.S. communications industry is spending more on research and development than ever before, we lag behind other leading nations in percentage terms. Large European and Japanese firms increased their research and development spending by 25 percent last year, while the United States' leading communications manufacturer has increased its spending by less than 6 percent.

For the long-term best interest of this Nation, it is critical that we loosen the chains that currently bind regional Bell operating companies [RBOC's] from investing in research and development. Currently there is little market incentive for RBOC's to compete in the research and design of new telecommunications technologies although they control more than half of the industry resources. S. 173 is a significant vehicle for directing valuable telecommunications resources into promoting U.S. competitiveness and trade.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to comment on my opposition to a particular provision of S. 173 that I believe is inconsistent with the intent of the legislation as a whole. The domestic manufacturing and content provision, while admirable in concept, is anticompetitive in practice. As the consent decree that restricts the RBOC's from manufacturing communications equipment illustrates, often-times, unnecessary protections become inefficient barriers.

By requiring the RBOC's to manufacture only in the United States, and to use only component parts manufactured here—subject to certain limited exceptions—this provision of S. 173 seriously undermines our Nation's fundamental goal of achieving free and open trade in telecommunications equipment markets both here and abroad.

Additionally, enactment of the domestic content requirements gives our foreign trading partners a handy excuse for closing the door on U.S. manufactured goods, just when it has finally been opened. These provisions will set a poor precedent for other nations that look to the United States for guidance on trade policy matters.

S. 173 offers a unique opportunity to create new jobs, stimulate technological development, sharpen the U.S. competitive edge, increase the liquidity of financial resources for use by small communications manufacturers, and enhance efficiency. S. 173 accomplishes these feats without Federal funding, but rather by utilizing a tool which is at the heart of the American democracy, the market system.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I support enactment of S. 173, the Telecommunications Equipment Research and Manufacturing Competition Act of 1991.

I believe it is time for Congress to assert its role in setting telecommunications policy for this Nation. In doing so, Congress should acknowledge the impressive advances of the telecommunications industry in the last 10 years and assure that such technological advances continue. The best way I know how to achieve this goal is through competition.

The benefits of the AT&T divestiture have included, for example, the ability of consumers to choose from among several providers of long distance service. The divestiture has, however, resulted in some problems. One of these problems is that a significant portion of the American telecommunications industry is effectively banned from contributing to the advance of technology. This ban is inhibiting the development of new services by telephone companies.

Mr. President, to an important extent, the seven regional Bell operating companies have been forbidden from competing in a number of markets. Whatever case may have existed 10 years ago for these lines of business restrictions, it seems to me the competitive nature of the industry today has convincingly undermined the case for some, if not all, of the restrictions. Still, the restrictions remain. In this, I share the frustration of the Bush administration, which also supports removal of the ban on the regional Bell companies' ability to engage in manufacturing.

As a result of this ban:

American telecommunications research and development has been slowed;

Innovation has been retarded, and American businesses interested in working with the regional Bell companies—businesses now able to work with and receive funding from foreign companies—are severely hamstrung in their ability to do so.

S. 173 will inject more competition into the marketplace by permitting the regional Bell companies to enter the manufacturing field. This bill cleared the Commerce Committee with overwhelming bipartisan support, 18 to 1. I commend Senators HOLLINGS and DANFORTH, chairman and ranking Republican, for their leadership in this matter.

THE NEED FOR S. 173—CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES

AT&T was broken up by the 1982 consent decree entered in the Department of Justice's antitrust case initiated in 1974. The Department of Justice obtained provisions in the consent decree banning the divested regional Bell companies from manufacturing or providing telecommunications equipment and from manufacturing customer premises equipment. The Justice Department apparently feared that if the regional Bell companies were allowed to enter the manufacturing field, they would discriminate against other equipment manufacturers by providing them poorer access to their network and denying them information about network changes. Moreover, there was concern that the regional Bell companies would underprice their manufacturer competitors by overcharging ratepayers buying local telephone services from their regulated monopolies, and by using that revenue to cross subsidize their manufacturing activities.

Whatever the merits of this barrier to market entry may have been in 1982—and the merits were doubtful even then—changed circumstances clearly call for its removal today.

MARKETPLACE CHANGES

In 1982, one company made the vast bulk of decisions on purchasing telecommunications equipment. Now, seven regional Bell companies and private buyers and carriers not delivering local exchange service also buy large amounts of telecommunications equipment.

Moreover, there are many other suppliers of telecommunications equipment to these regional Bell companies and the other buyers of such equipment. No one regional Bell company's purchases are likely to be anticompetitive. We have vigorous competition in equipment markets, including large companies that have the advantage of economies of scale and scope. Why keep these seven regional Bell companies out of the market?

As Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust, James Rill said in a May 21, 1991, written statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee:

> Removal of the manufacturing restriction in all probablity will have significant procompetitive benefits. It is critical that the nation's telephone companies be able to take advantage of and participate in the rapid technological changes that affect this industry. It is well-recognized that the [regional Bell companies] would be formidable competitors in the telecommunications equipment market, and they would be expected to apply their considerable expertise and efficiency in the development of innovative products to the benefit of American consumers. Removal of the manufacturing restriction would permit the [regional Bell companies] to design or work more closely with independent manufacturers to design equipment to best meet their own needs and those of other carriers and customers. This in turn would facilitate the efficient development and implementation of new services—especially exchange services to support the developing information service markets.
>
> Removal of the manufacturing restriction also would permit elimination of the current waiver process under the AT&T decree for such activities. That process currently delays, deters or frustrates outright the provision by the [regional Bell companies] of new products and imposes unnecessary burdens on the industry, the Department, the courts and the American public.
>
> In light of the potential for significant competitive benefits if the [regional Bell companies] are permitted to enter telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment markets and the absence of significant risk of anticompetitive

abuses, the administration believes that the manufacturing restrictions should be eliminated as soon as possible.

CURRENT BAN'S ADVERSE IMPACT ON R&D; AMERICAN COMPANIES

Mr. President, this bill has been described by some opponents as anti-consumer. I believe more competition in the telecommunications manufacturing field is proconsumer. I draw my colleagues' attention to the testimony of the Department of Commerce before the Commerce Committee in support of the removal of the manufacturing restrictions. There, the Department of Commerce stated:

Elimination of the manufacturing restriction will help promote increased telecommunications R&D in this country, and it should also have an impact on related infrastructure development. A 1989 National Telecommunications and Information Administration study found this restriction hampers R&D, not only for the Bell companies themselves, but also for other entities desiring to work with the Bell companies to manufacture telecommunications equipment. The restriction has impaired both the pace at which innovations are being brought to the market and the overall cost of that process.

Mr. President, this impairment of research and development activity hurts consumers by slowing down innovation and increasing the cost of new products and services when they are developed. It also harms America's global competitiveness. As the Commerce Department testified:

U.S. competitiveness could be fostered by permitting the Bell companies to serve as a source of "seed" capital for smaller U.S. manufacturing companies, and also to enter joint manufacturing ventures themselves. In some cases, entrepreneurial U.S. companies have had to turn to foreign firms as a source of funding or expertise.

The testimony of Mark C. Smith, president and CEO of Adtran, Inc., before the Senate Judiciary Committee, is instructive in this regard and gives life to the points made by the administration. Mr. Smith's company has over 200 employees in Huntsville, AL. Adtran designs and manufactures digital loop transmission equipment for telephone companies.

Mr. Smith testified that the manufacturing ban imposed on the regional Bell companies, "as currently interpreted, weakens both my [regional Bell company] customer base as well as their ability to communicate their needs. The ban reduces competition by removing the normal free flow of information between the small entrepreneur looking for the unfulfilled needs of his customers." The regional Bell companies really cannot contribute to Adtran's research and development efforts, a problem other American entrepreneurs also face. Adtran's 50 product design engineers are not able to communicate freely with the regional Bell companies in order to design equipment to meet their needs. Yet, Adtran is able to work with its other customers, including foreign customers, and receive research and development funds from them, in order to meet their equipment needs. Mr. Smith noted that the regional Bell companies, his biggest group of customers, "are having difficulty in ensuring the timely introduction of new technology in digital services for business applications."

S. 173 WILL FOSTER INNOVATION FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

In addition, Mr. President, with respect to fostering innovation, let me note that the Americans With Disabilities Act is a broad mandate for access for persons with disabilities. In the telephone context, however, it only does so in a minimum way. ADA mandates the use of intrastate and interstate dual-party relay systems utilizing operators to translate text from telecommunication devices for the deaf, TDD's, to voice and vice versa to allow a TDD user to converse with a user of a standard telephone. Unleashing the regional Bells would spur innovation generally, including the design and development of services for persons with disabilities. What form might these innovations take? The best way to find out is by letting the regional Bell companies into the manufacturing market. Let me cite, however, the May 21, 1991, statement of Deborah Kaplan, director of the Technology Policy Division of the World Institute on Disability:

There is no technical reason that the networks of the future cannot be designed with "electronic curb cuts," features that permit use by everyone including persons with disabilities. These design features would allow voice output or voice synthesis for people who cannot read enlargeable text, both visual and auditory prompts, multiple modes of input to accommodate people with limited or no dexterity, variable speed command and control systems, and variable sound output to accommodate people with hearing impairments.

Implementation of these features as standard user options will result in many unforseen benefits and applications for the public at large, just as with the original [sidewalk] curb cuts. Just as curb cuts made life easier for far more than the wheelchair riders who pressed for them, this kind of network flexibility will produce all kinds of benefits for the public at large.

It is no surprise that Ms. Kaplan endorsed S. 173 because increasing competition will foster innovation and further the interests of the large market consisting of Americans with disabilties.

FEAR OF CROSS-SUBSIDIZATION AND DISCRIMINATION MISPLACED

Finally, Mr. President, I believe the fears that the regional Bell companies will abuse their entry into the manufacturing field are misplaced. I have already mentioned the competitive nature of that market.

Let me also note that the antitrust laws will still apply to the regional Bells in their manufacturing capacities—with both private scrutiny by competitors and Government scrutiny as well.

Let me respond to the concern that the regional Bell companies will use rates paid by users of their local telephone monopolies in their manufacturing activities. While Federal and State oversight is never 100 percent perfect, I respectfully submit that such concern is much overstated. It is the mission of regulatory agencies to keep telephone rates low. They closely scrutinize rate increase requests and efforts to attribute costs from unregulated activities to the rates paid by local telephone users. Moreover, as Federal Communications Commission Chairman Alfred Sikes and Assistant Attorney General Rill have testified, the FCC has improved rules pertaining to cost accounting and allocation that should check the regional Bell companies if they seek to undertake anticompetitive cross subsidies of their unregulated manufacturing activities with local telephone ratepayer fees.

Similarly, I respectfully submit that the concern that a regional Bell company may buy inferior equipment or pay inflated costs to its manufacturing affiliates is unlikely to be realized. Current FCC regulations, for example, govern such affiliate transactions. Federal and State regulators can deny excessive equipment costs.

The concern that a regional Bell company might impede competition by keeping information about local network exchanges from competitor manufacturers is met by FCC rules requiring timely disclosure of network design information. Further, current manufacturers of telecommunications equipment are already key actors in the design of regional Bell networks. They will likely be aware of planned changes in any event. Of course, a regional Bell company is likely to purchase at least some of its own manufacturing products. Such partial vertical integration occurs in many industries and generally fosters competition.

The bill contains even more safeguards. For example, the bill precludes one regional Bell company from engaging in manufacturing with another regional Bell company. Further, a regional Bell company must perform any manufacturing through a separate affiliate and may not engage in any sales, specific advertising, installation, and similar functions for the manufacturing affiliate. Indeed, the Bush administration feels the bill's safeguards go too far.

CONCLUSION

I urge my colleagues to open the door to further competition by supporting S. 173 and removing the manufacturing ban imposed on the seven regional Bell companies. Let's help American companies innovate and compete in world markets.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

WAIVER OF CERTAIN SECTIONS OF THE TRADE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 53

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the documents referred to in subsection 402(d)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1)) ("the Act"), with respect to a further extension of the authority to waive subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Act. These documents continue in effect this waiver authority for a further 12-month period.

I include as part of these documents my determination that further extension of the waiver authority will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. I also include my determination that continuation of the waivers applicable to the Republic of Bulgaria, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, the Soviet Union, and the Mongolian People's Republic will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. The attached documents also include my reasons for recommending the extension of the waiver authority, and for my determination that continuation of the waivers currently in effect for the Republic of Bulgaria, the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, the Soviet Union, and the Mongolian People's Republic will substantially promote the objectives of section 402. My determination with respect to the waiver applicable to the People's Republic of China and the reasons therefor is transmitted separately.

I note that the extension of the waiver applicable to the Soviet Union will apply to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. This in no way affects the longstanding U.S. policy of not recognizing the forcible incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union or our support for the right of the Baltic States to reclaim their independence.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 3, 1991.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 24, 1991, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2127. An act to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1975 to extend the programs of such act, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the bill was signed on May 24, 1991, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 1991, the Secretary of the Senate, on May 30, 1991, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 232. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to veterans programs for housing and memorial affairs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 831. An act to designate the Owens Finance Station of the United States Postal Service in Cleveland, Ohio, as the "Jesse Owens Building of the United States Postal Service"; and

H.R. 2251. An act making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign government and/or interest for humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed on today, June 3, 1991, by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. FORD].

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 7. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to require a waiting period before the purchase of a handgun; and

S. 1151. A bill to restore an enforceable Federal death penalty, to curb the abuse of habeas corpus, to reform the exclusionary rule, to combat criminal violence involving firearms, to protect witnesses and other participants in the criminal justice system from violence and intimidation, to address the problem of gangs and serious juvenile offenders, to combat terrorism, to combat sexual violence and child abuse, to provide for drug testing of offenders in the criminal justice process, to secure the right of victims and defendents to equal justice without regard to race or color, to enhance the rights of crime victims, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1277. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for two years; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1278. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to provide for the collection of certain fees by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1279. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture (Science and Education), transmitting pursuant to law, the 1989 annual report on the Food and Agricultural Sciences; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1280. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the President's third special impoundment message for fiscal year 1991; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified on April 11, 1986, referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1281. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend titles 10, 14, and 37, United States Code, relating to the promotion, separation, and mandatory retirement of warrant officers of the armed forces, to establish the grade chief warrant officer, W-5, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1282. A communication from the First Vice President and Vice Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to a transaction involving United States exports to the Republic of Indonesia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1283. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Congregate Housing Services Program for calendar year 1989; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1284. A communication from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, certain legislative proposals adopted by the Commis-

sion for submission to the Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1285. A Communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, as amended, and the Hazardous Liquid Pipeline Safety Act of 1979, as amended, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1286. A Communication from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1287. A Communication from the Federal Inspector of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report on the status of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System since October 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1288. A Communication from the Chairman of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Corporation for 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1289. A Communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1290. A Communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1291. A Communication from the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General, National Credit Union Administration, for the period October 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1292. A Communication from the Under Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a delay in the submission of a report; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1293. A Communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report on technical assistance to State radon programs; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1294. A Communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Endangered Species Protection Program as it Relates to Pesticide Regulatory Activities"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1295. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission under the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1296. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-27 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1297. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-28 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1298. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-29 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1299. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-30 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1300. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-31 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1301. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-32 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1302. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-33 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1303. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 9-34 adopted by the Council on May 7, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1304. A communication from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on applications for orders or extensions of orders approving electronic surveillance for calendar year 1990; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1305. A communication from the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Technical Assistance Revolving Fund for the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission in fiscal year 1992; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1306. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, final regulations for Assistance for Local Educational Agencies in Areas Affected by Federal Activities and Arrangements for Education of Children Where Local Educational Agencies Cannot Provide Suitable Free Public Education; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1307. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of final funding priorities for Research in Education of Individuals with Disabilities Program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1308. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on expenditures of amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1990 with respect to acquired immune deficiency syndrome; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1309. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the communication of a waiver of application of certain sections of the Trade Act with respect to the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-74. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

"ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 211

"Whereas Sterling Forest, a privately owned tract of open space approximately 20,000 acres in size located in southern New York and northern New Jersey, is one of the last major undeveloped areas in the New York City metropolitan area; and

"Whereas two important northern New Jersey drinking water sources, the Monksville Reservoir and the Wanaque Reservoir, are fed by streams with headwaters in Sterling Forest, and these reservoirs supply drinking water to almost two million people; and

"Whereas Sterling Forest is imminently threatened with development, and such development is likely to have severe environmental consequences, threaten water supplies such as the Monksville and Wanaque reservoirs, and aggravate flooding in the Passaic River Basin in New Jersey; and

"Whereas open space in the New York City metropolitan area, including southern New York and northern New Jersey, is rapidly diminishing due to the pressures of urban sprawl and development; and

"Whereas recently enacted federal legislation requires the United States Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a study concerning forest resources open space recreation, land use, and alternative conservation strategies for the area known as the New York-New Jersey Highlands, including Sterling Forest, in the States of New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved in the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to take immediate action to prevent development of Sterling Forest in the states of New York and New Jersey.

"2. Duly authenticated copies of this resolution, signed by the Speaker and attested by the Clerk, shall be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, every member of Congress elected from this State and the State of New York, the Governor of the State of New York, the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, the Chief of the United States Forest Service, the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the Commissioner of the New York Department of Environmental Conservation, and the Commissioner of the New York Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation.

"NATURAL RESOURCES

"Memorializes Congress to prevent development of Sterling Forest."

POM-75. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 3

"Whereas many water systems that are required to meet the standards set forth in the federal Safe Drinking Water Act lack the financial ability to make the necessary changes to their systems; and

"Whereas Congress is considering or has considered the following legislation which would assist municipalities and states in financing investments in water systems:

"1. The Environmental Infrastructure Bond Act, which assures tax-exempt status for bonds which finance sewage treatment facilities, drinking water and any other environmental control facilities, regardless of the amount of private participation in the project;

"2. The Rural Water Supply Assistance Act of 1989, which allows federal capitalization grants to states for revolving loan funds to construct rural water systems and improvements for existing systems which serve less than 3,300 persons;

"3. The Rural Partnership Act of 1989, which establishes grants and revolving federal loans for rural areas to secure adequate water supplies and meet federal drinking water standards; and

"4. An amendment to the Tax Reform Act of 1986, which restores the tax-exempt status of bond financing for privately financed facilities if 95 percent of the bond proceeds are dedicated to eligible projects and the facility serves the general public; and

"Whereas there are existing federal programs, such as Community Development Block Grants and section 501 of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1989, which can provide additional support for small water systems; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly*, That the Legislature of Nevada urges the Congress and President of the United States to adopt legislation which provides additional financial support for water systems; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress and the President are urged to provide additional funding through existing programs such as the Community Development Block Grants and section 501 of the Disaster Assistance Act of 1989, and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Chief Clerk of the Assembly to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation."

POM-76. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8006

"Whereas the Nation of Kuwait has been since August of 1990, subject to the military oppression of an invading force, the military machine of the president of Iraq, Saddam Hussein; and

"Whereas economic sanctions, coupled with a deadline resolution of the United Nations, failed to convince Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, resolved to act against Saddam Hussein and through the efforts of the United Nations, a coalition of nearly thirty nations joined together to present a unified front to protest this invasion of one country by another; and

"Whereas the war inevitably involved half a million men and women from across the nation, with eight thousand individuals coming from Washington state; and

"Whereas those men and women are our neighbors, their children play with our children, and they serve our communities through times of peace as well as in this time of war; and

"Whereas the people of the state of Washington are united in their support for the men and women who serve in our armed forces and we wholeheartedly support their efforts on our behalf and on behalf of the world; and

"Whereas we pray for the successful accomplishment of their mission and for their safe return: Now, therefore

"Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff extend our appreciation to all our troops, especially those personnel representing the state of Washington in this serious time of crisis and courage: Be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Richard Cheney, Secretary of Defense, and to General Colin Powell, Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to Honorable Dan Quayle, President of the Senate, and to Honorable Tom Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives."

POM-77. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Whereas due to recent action taken by the United States Congress, beginning this year owners of boats sixteen feet in length and longer will be required to pay an annual recreational boating 'user fee'. The fee depends on the length of the boat; and

"Whereas according to disgruntled boat owners affected by the tax, the government will get approximately one hundred thirty million dollars from the 'user fee' and not one cent is earmarked for boating improvements or boating safety; and

"Whereas there is a substantial penalty if boat owners do not comply with this unjust legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring*, That the members of the General Assembly memorialize the United States Congress to repeal a recreational boating 'user fee' which recently was adopted: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the South Carolina Congressional delegation."

POM-78. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4020

"Whereas changes in federal Forest Service management policies are leading to the loss of twenty thousand jobs in Washington state due to a decline in the federal timber supply; and

"Whereas most of these timber-related jobs are located in rural areas of the state which have few economic alternatives. While the economy of our state's urban areas may be vibrant, our rural communities are suffering from impacts of the decline in timber supply. These rural, timber-dependent communities often do not have the economic diversity of the urban areas. Workers who lose their jobs are frequently far away from jobs in other sectors of the economy and far away from training centers; and

"Whereas if the people of the United States feel that they need to make the decision to cut back on the federal timber supply they should be willing to pay the economic costs of that decision rather than attempt to shift the entire cost to the hardworking timber families in our State's rural communities; and

"Whereas Congress has provided other workers who have been impacted by federal decisions with adequate benefits to make the transition to other jobs. Coal miners impacted by the Clean Air Act and defense workers impacted by defense cuts received special benefits during the last Congressional session. No such benefits were provided for timber workers hurt by federal decisions; and

"Whereas currently available job retraining programs fall short of the mark. They do not provide adequate funds for the long-term training which is needed for a transition to family wage jobs. They do not provide resources to allow workers to maintain their families while they are in training. They are severely lacking in the ability to meet emergency needs. As family emergencies happen, we often see workers drop out of their retraining programs and thus they are considered failures: Now, therefore,

"Your Memorialists respectfully pray that Congress pass a Timber Workers Fairness Act which will provide adequate benefits to timber workers impacted by federal decisions. The benefits should be similar to those provided to workers impacted by federal trade policies under the Trade Adjustment Act, and federal environmental policies under the Clean Air Act. The legislation should have the following components:

"(1) A training program of adequate duration to provide a transition to family wage jobs;

"(2) Training allowances to help families survive through the retraining program. The allowances should be available to self-employed individuals as well as people who have not worked enough hours to be eligible for Unemployment. Families eligible for unemployment insurance should be eligible for an extension of up to fifty-two weeks if they are participating in training;

"(3) Provision of support services to provide for needs such as child care, transportation, and emergency medical services: Be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable George Bush, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington."

POM-79. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8009

"Whereas chemicals and materials that may pose a threat to the environment and public health and safety are an everyday and indispensable part of our lives; and

"Whereas fire fighters, law enforcement officers, and emergency response personnel are potentially exposed to hazardous materials on a daily basis; and

"Whereas new federal requirements under the Occupational Safety and Health Administration require hazardous materials emer-

gency response training for several occupational groups; and

"Whereas these occupational groups include law enforcement agencies, fire departments, emergency medical organizations, emergency management personnel, United States Department of Energy (USDOE) Patrol, USDOE fire departments, USDOE emergency medical personnel, USDOE emergency management; and

"Whereas in addition to the groups for which training is required, the need exists for other emergency response groups to obtain comprehensive training related to hazardous materials response; and

"Whereas currently there is not a facility with the resources to provide adequate training required by federal and state law, especially as training relates to a realistic simulation of credible hazardous material accidents; and

"Whereas the Hanford site would be an ideal site for a Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response (HAMMER) training center; and

"Whereas the Hanford site contains an ample amount of federally owned isolated land with a mild climate; and

"Whereas the Hanford site provides the advantage of a base of extensive technical expertise and training expertise as well as the existence of strong local and political support for enhancing hazardous materials response; and

"Whereas a hammer training facility is consistent with the current site mission and could serve as the perfect program as Hanford becomes the USDOE flagship for site cleanup and environmental restoration activities; and

"Whereas a hammer facility would produce a plethora of benefits to the Hanford site, the local USDOE response agencies, local emergency response entities, and hazardous materials response units throughout the state of Washington; and

"Whereas a hammer facility could serve as a national resource for hazardous materials response training combining realistic field training with thorough and consistent classroom training: Now, therefore

"Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the United States Congress support and fund legislation that would create a Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response training center at the Hanford reservation: Be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable George Bush, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington."

POM-80. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3029

"Whereas oil embargoes instituted by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries cartel during the mid 1970s held the entire industrialized world hostage to outrageous and predatory oil pricing; and

"Whereas the recent invasion of Kuwait by Iraq has resulted in the distruption of world oil supplies, and the political instability of the Middle East has caused extreme volatility in world oil markets; and

"Whereas the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 falls far short of providing cost of production to the nation's agricultural producers; and

"Whereas the market price for most major farm commodities is substantially below the cost of producing those commodities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein*, That the Fifty-second Legislative Assembly urges the President and the Congress of the United States to develop expeditiously a sound and comprehensive national energy policy utilizing renewable agricultural commodities, such as ethanol, in the production of energy and lubrication products; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Fifty-second Legislative Assembly urges that the President request and that the Congress of the United States appropriate funds within the budgets of the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture to establish this sound and comprehensive energy program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate, and each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation."

POM-81. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4060

"Whereas the Glenharold coal mine in west central North Dakota has produced coal from surface mining operations for over 20 years in compliance with applicable state and federal laws, including a progressive program of land reclamation; and

"Whereas the Glenharold mine was originally projected to produce coal until 1995 but, due a decision of the United States Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management, the mine will now have to cease production in 1993; and

"Whereas closure of the mine will leave over five million tons of coal in the ground that could be mined and which will probably never be recovered, resulting in a regrettable waste of a precious resource; and

"Whereas failure to mine five million tons of available coal would result in coal severance tax revenue losses of $2,437,500 to the state of North Dakota, $525,000 to Mercer County, $393,750 to cities in Mercer County, $393,750 to school districts in Mercer County, and $100,000 to the North Dakota Lignite Research Fund; and

"Whereas closure of the Glenharold mine would end the employment of the mine's 105 employees, for whom the annual payroll is $4,600,000, and because each dollar of lignite industry payroll generates an additional three dollars to North Dakota's economy, the state's economy would be negatively impacted in the approximate amount of $18,400,000 per year by early closure of the mine; and

"Whereas an agreement by the Bureau of Land Management to accept an eight percent royalty on the remaining coal at the Glenharold mine, rather than the standard 12.5 percent royalty, would allow the recovery of over five million tons of coal that will otherwise be unused; and

"Whereas when the Bureau of Land Management could obtain an eight percent royalty on over five million tons of coal as compared to receiving no royalty and when our nation's precious resources would be more efficiently used by allowing the mining of the available coal before completion of reclamation of the land, it seems very short-sighted that the Bureau of Land Management has denied the request of the mine operator for a reduced royalty; and

"Whereas if the Bureau of Land Management does not reverse this decision, the North Dakota Congressional Delegation should seek congressional resolution of this issue to allow mining of the available coal to avoid loss of federal, state, and political subdivision revenue and waste of a valuable natural resource: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein*, That the Fifty-second Legislative Assembly of North Dakota urges the United States Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management to reconsider its action denying a royalty rate reduction for operation of the Glenharold mine in North Dakota and urges the North Dakota Congressional Delegation to do whatever is necessary to resolve this matter successfully or to introduce legislation in Congress to allow mining of the available coal at the Glenharold mine before the mine is closed and the land is reclaimed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the United States House of Representatives and Senate, the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, the Washington, D.C. office and the Montana state office of the Bureau of Land Management, and each member of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation."

POM-82. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

"ENGROSSED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4011

"Whereas the current Federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act expires September 20, 1991, and the United States Congress must draft a new law to continue Federal-Aid highway programs and the Highway Trust Fund; and

"Whereas the Washington State Legislature and its members endorse the principles develped by the Highway Users Federation and those of the Washington Transportation Policy Institute: Now, therefore,

"Your Memorialists respectfully pray that Congress act without delay to adopt the new Federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act by October 1, 1991, and include elements of the Federation's plan in Federal Highway legislation: Be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be immediately sent to the Honorable George Bush, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington."

POM-83. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 48

"Whereas during the decade of the 1970s, concern over the world's dwindling energy reserves prompted Congress and the federal administration to develop numerous innovative approaches toward reducing the coun-

try's dependence on imported sources of petroleum; and

"Whereas included in the nation's comprehensive strategy of promoting energy independence was a temporary federal income tax credit on the installation of solar energy conservation systems; and

"Whereas because of the effectiveness of the federal income tax credit in promoting the installation of solar energy devices throughout the nation, many states, including Hawaii, established state tax incentives to further assist in the establishment and development of the solar energy industry in their localities; and

"Whereas although the country's policy toward the exploration, encouragement, and development of alternate energy technologies was weakened considerably during the decade of the 1980s, the present conflict in the Persian Gulf underscores the importance of reestablishing the country's commitment toward the exploration and use of alternatives that rely on nonpetroleum sources to generate energy; and

"Whereas without the added incentive of a federal income tax credit to assist the country in converting its energy infrastructure to a system that is less dependent on foreign oil, consumers may once again adopt the belief that the price of oil will once again fall to the level that it occupied in the days prior to the outbreak of the conflict in the Middle East; and

"Whereas the reinstatement of the federal income tax credit for the installation of a solar energy conservation system by Congress will deliver a clear signal to the country that the government is one again committed to achieving the goal of energy independence; and

"Whereas, heat pump water heaters are now available throughout the United States, they reduce water heating energy requirements by 50 percent to 80 percent and they enable renters as well as homeowners to sharply reduce their water heating energy requirement: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1991*, That the United States Congress is requested to reinstate the federal income tax credit previously allowed for the installation of solar energy conservation measures and also to extend the coverage of these federal tax credits to include heat pump water heaters: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and the President of the United States Senate."

POM-84. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the federal government is currently taking extensive measures to bail out the national savings and loan system because of heavy financial losses accrued through the mismanagement of funds, a scandal which is estimated to cost every man, woman, and child in America $2,000 to $5,000 each; and

"Whereas because of this enormous federal expenditure, President George Bush has finally admitted he will consider raising taxes if Congress agrees to cut back on "entitlement" programs such as Social Security and Medicare; and

"Whereas if this course of action were taken, senior citizens who depend on Social Security for their livelihood may have to pay for this outrageous savings and loan scandal in two different ways: one, with decreases in Social Security and Medicare benefits, and two, with some sort of tax increase; and

"Whereas to penalize senior citizens who have alreasdy suffered as a result of the savings and loan scandal would be adding insult to injury; and

"Whereas a substantial portion of the population in the State of Missouri is comprised of senior citizens who depend on federal entitlement programs for a variety of important needs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the members of the Missouri House of Representatives, Eighty-sixth General Assembly, hereby strongly oppose any plan to obtain funds for the national savings and loan bailout through cutbacks in senior citizen entitlement program, and further call upon the President and the Congress to use any and all means necessary to maintain current funding levels for Social Secuity, Medicare, and other entitlement for senior citizens; and be it further

"*Resolved*, that the Chief Clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives be instructed to prepare properly inscribed copies of this resolution for the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and for each member of the Missouri Congressional delegation."

POM-85. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"ENGROSSED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 4008

"Whereas the continued use of high seas driftnets by Japanese, Taiwanese, and Korean fishing fleets in the North and South Pacific is killing vast numbers of sea mammals and sea birds each year; and

"Whereas these thirty mile-long driftnets are intercepting salmon species that originate in waters of the western United States and Canada further decreasing the important salmon resource of both countries; and

"Whereas Japanese, Taiwanese, and Korean squid fishing fleets of roughly 1200 vessels operate about 30,000 miles of driftnet per fishing day; and

"Whereas squid driftnet fisheries are suspected of incidentally taking large numbers of salmon, seabirds and living mammals as evidenced by over 40,000 metric tons of illegally harvested salmon recovered through various enforcement actions; and

"Whereas these fleets are having a significant impact on the living marine resources of the North Pacific; and

"Whereas in 1987, the United States Congress passed the Driftnet Monitoring and Control Act which required that agreements be reached with nations operating high seas driftnet fleets to allow monitoring of their operation and provide enforcement; and

"Whereas under the 1987 Driftnet Monitoring and Control Act, trade sanctions can be imposed against fish products imported from nations failing to successfully reach an agreement with the United States; and

"Whereas many of these same vessels fish for tuna in the South Pacific where a significant conservation problem exists with albacore tuna; and

"Whereas sixteen South Pacific Island nations have issued the Tarawa Declaration calling for an international ban on driftnet fishing in the South Pacific; and

"Whereas steps taken so far to minimize the impact of these driftnet fisheries on living marine resources have somewhat improved monitoring, enforcement and research; however, they are only early steps and will not halt the imminent threat to the conservation and protection of these resources; and

"Whereas the states of Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Idaho, California, and Hawaii, and the province of British Columbia have signed a proclamation proposing some immediate steps that will work toward the long-term goal of securing an international ban on driftnet fishing on the high seas: Now, therefore,

"Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the United States Congress and President George Bush seek through all legal efforts in all available international forums an international ban on driftnet fishing on the high seas: Be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable George Bush, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington."

POM-86. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Sweetwater, Florida favoring a uniform reduction in foreign aid and the utilization of those funds in domestic programs; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM-87. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

"SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 15

"Whereas 2,285 Americans, including 38 Iowans, remain missing as a result of the conflict in Southeast Asia as of January 17, 1991; and

"Whereas as of January 3, 1991, 1,447 first-hand live sighting reports of Americans have been received since 1975 according to Defense Intelligence Agency statistics; and

"Whereas of the 119 live sightings which have remained unresolved and under investigation, 59 deal with reported Americans seen in prisoner situations and 60 in nonprisoner situations; and

"Whereas official United States government policy has insisted, since April 12, 1973, that it has no evidence of living POWs in all of Indochina; and

"Whereas there is substantial evidence obtained through congressional hearings, interviews with prisoners of war, declarations of a high ranking Defense Intelligence Agency official, foreign government and diplomatic officials, and investigative reporting that there are live American prisoners held in Vietnam and Laos; and

"Whereas there is substantial evidence that, through abuse of official secrecy and bureaucratic inertia, efforts to follow up on reports of live sightings are thwarted by officials who concentrate on discrediting live sighting sources while exaggerating the capabilities of forensic science and making identification of human remains based on dubious presumptions and illogical deductions rather than actual physical identification; and

"Whereas after a one-year investigation, the minority staff of the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee issued an interim report presenting several preliminary conclusions including that the staff review of Defense Intelligence Agency live sight report files shows a disturbing pattern of arbitrary rejection of evidence that connected a sighting to a specific POW/MIA, that the arbitrary rejection resulted in a declaration of presumptive finding of death in each individual case except one, and that the internal United States government policy that all POW/MIAs are presumed dead re-

sults in an emphasis on finding and identifying remains of dead persons rather than searching for living POW/MIAs; and

"Whereas the POW/MIA Accountability Bill, H.R. 3603, introduced by Congressman Denny Smith, directs the heads of federal departments and agencies to disclose information concerning United States armed forces personnel classified as prisoners of war or missing in action from World War II, the Korean Conflict, and the Vietnam Conflict; and

"Whereas the executive branch of the United States government has failed to address adequately the concerns of the family members of the POW/MIAs, and has profoundly mishandled the POW/MIA problem: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate, That the Iowa Senate insists that the President of the United States renew and recommit the full diplomatic and intelligence resources of the United States Department of State and the United States Department of Defense to provide the fullest possible accounting for the Americans who are prisoners, missing, or unaccounted for as a result of the conflict in Southeast Asia and the conflict in the Persian Gulf: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Iowa Senate urges the United States Congress to pass, and the President of the United States to support, H.R. 3603 requiring federal departments and agencies to disclose information concerning United States armed forces personnel classified as prisoners of war or missing in action from World War II, the Korean Conflict, and the Vietnam Conflict to enable them to be brought home: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate place a POW/MIA flag in the Senate chamber, placement to be at the discretion of the President of the Senate, until all of the Americans missing as a result of the conflicts in Southeast Asia and the Persian Gulf (Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm) are returned to the United States or are fully accounted for: be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Iowa congressional delegation."

POM-88. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 120

"Whereas the people of the State of Hawaii come from diverse ethnic and national backgrounds and live in harmony because of mutual respect and the Aloha spirit; and

"Whereas the history of our State shows that the road to harmony requires elimination of practices which foster discrimination in all areas of life; and

"Whereas the 1988 Legislature, in creating the Hawaii Civil Rights Commission, declared that "the practice of discrimination because of race, color, religion, age, sex, marital status, national origin, ancestry, or handicapped status in employment, housing, or public accommodations is against public policy"; and

"Whereas Congress is presently considering H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, which is intended to restore civil rights protections which were dramatically limited by recent Supreme Court decisions and to strengthen existing protections and remedies available under federal civil rights laws in order to provide more effective deterrence and adequate compensation for victims of discrimination; and

"Whereas persons suffering from employment discrimination need the protection of strong laws at both the state and federal levels in order to ensure that factors unrelated to job performance are not considered in employment decisions; and

"Whereas enforcement of strong state laws against discrimination may be impeded by federal cases which changed the burden of proof from that established in earlier precedents and created procedural roadblocks which may allow discriminatory practices to continue; and

"Whereas the promise of equality embodied in our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence needs to be clearly stated in our laws guaranteeing civil rights protection to all persons: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1991*, That the Senate expresses its strongest support for the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; the Chairman of the Senate Committees on Judiciary and Labor and Human Resources; the Chairmen of the House Committees on Judiciary, Education, and Labor; the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus; the Chairman of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus; and each member of Hawaii's Congressional Delegation."

POM-89. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 37

"Whereas the national railroad labor organizations participated in the national effort to resolve a three-year negotiations deadlock; and

"Whereas Illinois rail transportation was disrupted from April 17 to April 18, 1991, as a consequence of a national work stoppage; and

"Whereas it is in the interest of the Illinois economy and in the interest of positive public policy generally that all citizens of the State enjoy uninterrupted commuter services; and

"Whereas the railroad union membership demonstrated concern for the continued safe transportation of commuters by voluntarily continuing to provide service, and the METRA Commuter Rail System also played a leading role in maintaining uninterrupted passenger transportation: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-Seventh General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein*, That the organized rail transportation workers of our State, and the METRA Commuter Rail System, be commended for their unwavering good faith with their fellow citizens by ensuring the continuation of safe and dependable commuter service through the work stoppage; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That suitable copies of this resolution be transmitted to the leadership of the rail labor organizations, the chief executive officers of all rail corporations providing commuter service within the State of Illinois, the Illinois Congressional delegation, the Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation and the Secretary of the Illinois Department of Transportation."

POM-90. A resolution adopted by the American Bar Association calling for rules to require the disclosure of certain information on legislation that affects only one or a few taxpayers, projects, or transactions; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1991, the following reports of committees were submitted on May 30, 1991:

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 596. A bill to provide that Federal facilities meet Federal and State environmental laws and requirements and to clarify that such facilities must comply with such environmental laws and requirements (Rept. No. 102-67).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 5. A bill to grant employees family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 102-68).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIDEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Abby Cooke (Rept. No. 102-69).

By Mr. HOLLINGS, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 591. A bill to require airbags for certain newly manufactured vehicles (Rept. No. 102-70).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERREY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SEYMOUR, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 1197. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act concerning family planning and to provide for the availability of information and counseling regarding pregnancies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. REID:

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning June 9, 1991, as "Animal Rights Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD (for Mr. CRANSTON):

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution disapproving the recommendation of the President to extend nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. Con. Res. 44. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the American public should observe the 100th anniversary of moviemaking and recognize the contributions of the American Film Institute in advocating and preserving the art of film; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PELL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. SIMON, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERREY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KOHL, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SEYMOUR, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. BIDEN):

S. 1197. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act concerning family planning and to provide for the availability of information and counseling regarding pregnancies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

FAMILY PLANNING AMENDMENTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today I am introducing along with Senators CHAFEE, ADAMS, PACKWOOD, and 38 other Senators, the Family Planning Amendments of 1991.

The title X Family Planning Program has an outstanding record of 20 years of service to the American people. It provides high quality reproductive health care services to over 5 million low-income women and men each year. In addition to comprehensive family planning services, title X funded clinics also provide essential primary and preventive care such as screening for breast cancer, cervical cancer, and sexually transmitted diseases.

Family planning programs also serve as the entry point into the health care system for many patients in need of other important services, ranging from prenatal care to AIDS counseling and testing.

Over the past 10 years, our ability to provide these services to families in need has been unconscionably cut back. Funding has been slashed 42 percent in real terms. One thousand clinics have been forced to close. Outreach and followup services have been squeezed out. Today, more than 31 million women are at risk of unintended pregnancy in the United States. Yet title X is serving fewer people than it was serving in 1981. That is unacceptable.

We know that family planning services are cost-effective. Every dollar used to provide family planning services saves an average of $4.40 in funds that otherwise would have to be spent to provide medical care, welfare, and other social services to women who, by law, will be eligible for such services if they become pregnant. In fact, teenage pregnancy costs the United States an estimated $22 billion a year in welfare and associated costs alone.

Family planning and prevention of unintended pregnancy are also the most effective means of reducing the spread of the AIDS virus to newborn infants. It is an essential component of our overall strategy to reduce the incidence of low birth weight, and bring down the shocking rate of infant mortality that is a continuing indictment of our health care system.

Title X is a key part of our effort to prevent adolescent pregnancy. More than 1 million teenagers become pregnant every year, and their pregnancies pose significant health risks for these mothers and their infants. If we are serious about addressing this problem, then it is time for us to get serious about title X.

The legislation that I am introducing today will reauthorize the Family Planning Program, which has been unauthorized since 1985, and provide for modest increases over the next 5 years.

To enable family planning providers to meet the demand for services, the bill will include authorization levels of $180 million for fiscal year 1992, $189 million for fiscal year 1993, $198.5 million for fiscal year 1994, $208.5 million for fiscal year 1995, and $219 million for fiscal year 1996.

The legislation makes several improvements in the current program. First, it establishes a separate authorization for contraceptive research. Many couples are dissatisfied with the contraceptive alternatives available to them, and research has revealed that failures from current methods are higher than had been previously known. A modest increase in research spending represents a wise investment.

The legislation also establishes a new program of community-based information. Stronger methods of outreach and education are essential for those who need but are not using these important services.

We have also included a provision to overturn the recent Supreme Court decision in Rust versus Sullivan, which upheld the gag rule that bars title X grantees from providing abortion counseling or referrals. The language in this bill clarifies that when a pregnant woman seeks family planning information, she will be told, in a nondirective manner, of all the options available to her. The Supreme Court decision struck a blow against the constitutional rights of women and seriously infringes upon the doctor-patient relationship. Many family planning providers have stated that they will refuse the title X money rather than accept these restrictions. The result will be to deny family planning services to low-income women across the country. Separate legislation sponsored by Senator CHAFEE to repeal the gag rule is already pending in the Labor Committee.

I urge my colleagues to support this title X bill. Low-income Americans deserve access to comprehensive and high quality family planning services, and this legislation is an important step toward achieving that goal.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator KENNEDY today in introducing legislation to reauthorize title X of the Public Health Service Act. This critical program provides family planning services for nearly 5 million low-income people each year, including 1½ million adolescents. While the core services of the title X program are family planning and contraception, title X funded clinics are often the patient's point of entry into the overall health care system.

Title X was enacted in 1970. While it has been funded continuously for the past 20 years, it has not been formally reauthorized since 1985. As a result, the program's funding has diminished substantially over the years. In 1981 the appropriation for projects and grants under title X was $162 million. In 1985, appropriations for the program totaled $142.5 million, and last year Congress appropriated only $141 million for title X. So, you can see we have a long way to go before we can even return to the level of funding set 10 years ago. The only way we will be able to adequately fund the program is to reauthorize it formally.

The title X program has been instrumental in reaching out to low-income

women and providing them with critical family planning and health care services. Regretfully, a recent decision by the Supreme Court could compromise seriously the credibility and the quality of this program. The Court's decision in Rust versus Sullivan upholds HHS regulations which bar title X-funded clinics from providing pregnant women with nondirective information on all of their legal and medical options, including abortion. I have long been opposed to these regulations as I believe they are bad health policy and discriminate unfairly against poor women. I have introduced separate legislation to overturn these regulations, and am pleased that my measure is included in this bill as well.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that this year we will be able to reauthorize the title X program. I look forward to working with Senator KENNEDY toward this goal and am hopeful that my colleagues will support us in this effort.

By Mr. FORD (for Mr. CRANSTON):

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution disapproving the recommendation of the President to extend nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Finance.

DISAPPROVAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS FOR THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

• Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on May 29, President Bush officially announced his decision to renew most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status for the People's Republic of China. I now rise to introduce a joint resolution disapproving the extension of the authority to grant this renewal.

With the President's announcement, it is now the responsibility of Congress to decide not to renew MFN. We must send a strong signal to the Chinese Government that their behavior cannot be tolerated in the community of nations.

The denial of MFN for China would send a clear message: the Chinese leadership cannot have a free ride as a member of the world community. It cannot scorn the international standards and agreements that guide the nations of the world and then continue to reap the fruits of international relations.

MFN is a benefit, not a right. There is clear evidence that the Chinese Government is undeserving of preferential tariff treatment. China's rulers continue to violate international standards of human rights, trade, and weapons proliferation.

Human rights have deteriorated in China. Chinese leaders continue to detain members of the pro-democracy movement, without trials, while sentencing more. The peaceful advocacy of democracy can lead to a 13-year prison term these days in Beijing.

The People's Liberation Army continues to occupy and terrorize the Tibetan people. About 1.2 million Tibetans have perished and more than 6,000 monasteries and temples have been destroyed. In Tibet, people are persecuted for advocating democracy and practicing their religious beliefs.

There is no question that goods produced by slave labor in Chinese prisons are now being imported into the United States in contravention of American law. Reports by Asia Watch, the Congressional Research Service, and the General Accounting Office widely document this.

The United States Trade Representative identifies China as a country which is one of the "most onerous and egregious and who are not negotiating in good faith or making progress in negotiations." Last year, American exports to China declined partly because the Chinese decided to restrict imports. Every year at this time, when the Chinese want MFN, they announce special trade missions and announce grain purchases. Every year, after they have gotten what they want, the trade missions end, the purchases stop. Only the trade deficit becomes greater. The trade deficit tripled to $10.4 billion in 1990, and some are projecting a deficit of at least $15 billion this year.

Finally, China's boldest display of defiance of international agreements has been in weapons proliferation, a key area of American concern. This year reports show that China may not only intend to sell long-range M-9 and shorter range M-11 missiles to Syria and Pakistan, but they have secretly been assisting Algeria to build a nuclear powerplant which they now cleverly claim is for "peaceful" purposes. China also continues military assistance to the genocidal Khmer Rouge, thwarting efforts to achieve an international peace settlement in Cambodia.

Mr. President, I realize that many of my colleagues find China's behavior as repugnant as I do. I understand that the decision to renew MFN is difficult. This resolution, however, provides the Congress an opportunity to correct United States foreign policy toward China. I urge my colleagues to seize this crucial moment, and to show the Chinese leadership that they have much to lose by ignoring our concerns.•

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 15, a bill to combat violence and crimes against women on the streets and in homes.

S. 98

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOSKI], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] were added as cosponsors of S. 98, a bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1989.

S. 140

At the request of Mr. WIRTH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to increase Federal payments in lieu of taxes to units of general local government, and for other purposes.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to permit the Bell Telephone Companies to conduct reserch on, design, and manufacture telecommunications equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 239

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to provide for treatment of Federal pay in the same manner as non-Federal pay with respect to garnishment and similar legal process.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], and the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] were added as cosponsors of S. 323, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies, and for other purposes.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish outpatient medical services for any disability of a former prisoner of war.

S. 446

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 446, a bill to amend the Federal Unemployment Tax Act with respect to employment performed by certain employees of educational institutions.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] were added as cosponsors of S. 474, a bill to prohibit sports gambling under State law.

S. 499

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 499, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act to remove the requirement that schools participating in the School Lunch Program offer students specific types of fluid milk, and for other purposes.

S. 588

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 588, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the tax treatment of certain cooperative service organizations of private and community foundations.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN] were added as cosponsors of S. 596, a bill to provide that Federal facilities meet Federal and State environmental laws and requirements and to clarify that such facilities must comply with such environmental laws and requirements.

S. 649

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 649, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the luxury tax on boats.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. GARN, the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to improve the administration of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and to make technical amendments to the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and the National Bank Act.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the requirement that an S corporation have only 1 class of stock.

S. 827

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] were added as cosponsors of S. 827, a bill to credit time spent in the Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II as creditable for Federal civil service retirement purposes for certain annuitants and certain other individuals not covered under Public Law 99-638.

S. 838

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to revise and extend programs under such act, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that the Secretary of Transportation collect a fee or charge for recreational vessels.

S. 844

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to provide for the minting and circulation of one dollar coins.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] were added as cosponsors of S. 866, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that certain activities of a charitable organization in operating an amateur athletic event do not constitute unrelated trade or business activities.

S. 878

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 878, a bill to assist in implementing the plan of action adopted by the World Summit for Children, and for other purposes.

S. 988

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 988, a bill to authorize the promulgation of a model building code to enhance recycling and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to gross vehicle weights on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend section 201(b)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to reauthorize funding for library training, research, and development.

S. 1102

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1102, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of qualified mental health professionals services furnished in community mental health centers.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment, on an interim basis, of compensation, dependency, and indemnity compensation, and pension to veterans and their survivors and dependents if their claims for those benefits are not decided by the Department of Veterans Affairs within specified time limits.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 111, a bill to protect the public from health risks from radiation exposure from low-level radioactive waste, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WALLOP], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] were aded as cosponsors of S. 1125, a bill to provide incentives to health care providers serving rural areas, to provide grants to county health departments providing preventative health services within rural areas, to establish State health service corps demonstration projects, and for other pruposes.

S. 1133

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1133, a bill to establish a demonstration grant program to provide coordinated and comprehensive education, training, health and social services to at-risk children and youth and their families, and for other purposes.

S. 1134

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1134, a bill to provide disadvantaged students with early intervention programs and scholarships to encourage such students to finish high school and to obtain a college education, and to upgrade the course of study undertaken by our Nation's secondary school students.

S. 1135

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as

cosponsors of S. 1135, a bill to provide financial assistance to eligible local educational agencies to improve urban and rural education, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], and the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] were added as cosponsors of S. 1136, a bill to provide to States and local educational agencies to enable such agencies to develop programs that provide opportunities to parents, particularly parents of educationally deprived children, to select the public schools attended by their children, and for other purposes.

S. 1137

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] were added as cosponsors of S. 1137, a bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to simplify the needs analysis.

S. 1156

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. SYMMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1156, a bill to provide for the protection and management of certain areas on public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management and lands withdrawn from the public domain managed by the Forest Service in the States of California, Oregon, and Washington; to ensure proper conservation of the national resources of such lands, including enhancement of habitat; to provide assistance to communities and individuals affected by management decisions on such lands; to facilitate the implementation of land management plans for such public domain lands and federal lands elsewhere; and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 36

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 36, a joint resolution to designate the months on November 1991, and November 1992, as "National Alzheimer's Disease Month."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 115

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 115, a joint resolution to designate the week of June 10, 1991, through June 16, 1991, as "Pediatric AIDS Awareness Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 124

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 124, a joint resolution to designate "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week" for 1992.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 126

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 126, a joint resolution to designate the second Sunday in October 1991 as "National Children's Day."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 132

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 132, a joint resolution to designate the week of October 13, 1991, through October 19, 1991, as "National Radon Action Week."

SENATE RESOLUTION 82

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 82, a resolution to establish a Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 116

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 116, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate in support of Taiwan's membership in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44—RELATIVE TO OBSERVANCE OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOVIE MAKING

Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WELLSTONE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. CON. RES. 44

Whereas in the late 19th century, inventors around the world focused on discovering a means of artificially reproducing movement so that it appeared to the viewer as though he or she were seeing it happen;

Whereas that discovery led to the emergence of the art and science of motion pictures through many creators in the United States and other nations around the world;

Whereas during this period, the technology necessary to create motion pictures was perfected in a series of exciting American inventions, which included the development of the kinetograph and kinetoscope by Thomas Edison and W.K.L. Dickson, and the perfection of strip film by George Eastman;

Whereas the cycle of invention, innovation, and improvement continued without pause during the 1890's with the construction of Thomas Edison's first film studio, dubbed the "Black Maria";

Whereas a series of technological innovations made in 1893 marked a turning point in the development of the motion picture;

Whereas the first commercial presentation of Edison's kinetoscope by the Holland Brothers in New York City demonstrated the public's fascination with motion pictures;

Whereas the demand for kinetoscope films grew and Edison's invention was marketed internationally;

Whereas the motion picture has the power to touch our hearts, souls, and imaginations, and to shape our hopes, dreams, and even our national consciousness;

Whereas the motion picture serves as America's ambassador to the world, conveying American values, beliefs, styles, and attitudes, transforming world culture with its potent images, and making the global village a reality;

Whereas motion picture production is not only an art, but one of America's most successful creative enterprises;

Whereas the motion picture has enriched our cultural heritage with unforgettable characters who have become American icons, from Harold Lloyd, Charlie Chaplin, and the Marx Brothers to the immortal Greta Garbo and the eternal Lillian Gish, from Bogie and Bacall, John Wayne, Sidney Poitier and Cicely Tyson, to Indiana Jones and E.T., and the thousands of other larger-than-life men and women who commanded the silver screen;

Whereas from these motion picture legends came precious film moments that are forever etched in our memories and imaginations;

Whereas in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed legislation leading to the foundation of the American Film Institute, and proclaimed that the institute's mandate would be to recognize the moving image as an art form, to preserve the heritage of film and television, and to identify and train the next creative generation;

Whereas on September 26, 1989, President George Bush reaffirmed the American Film Institute's role as the national organization devoted to the film and video arts, and President and Mrs. Bush honored the American Film Institute at a ceremony which celebrated the art form of the 20th century and the role of the American Film Institute in advocating, nurturing, and preserving the art of film and video;

Whereas the American Film Institute is a national leader in film and video arts and is devoted to advocacy for and preservation of the art of film, television and video; and

Whereas the American Film Institute is poised to spearhead the nationwide celebration of film's centennial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) all Americans should have the opportunity to celebrate the 100th anniversary of film during the year 1993 with exhibitions, festivals, educational programs and other forms of observance; and

(2) the American Film Institute should be recognized as having a leadership role in implementing and coordinating the national centennial celebrations and in joining with

regional entities and other interested parties in organizing other events relating to the 100th anniversary of this great American art form.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding a hearing on June 5, 1991, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on S. 667, Tribal Judicial Enhancement Act.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Select Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding a hearing on June 12, 1991, beginning at 9 a.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on S. 962 and S. 963, legislation to reaffirm the inherent authority of tribal governments to exercise criminal jurisdiction over all Indian people on reservation lands.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Select Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding an oversight hearing on June 19, 1991, beginning at 9 a.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on the National Native American Advisory Commission.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Select Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs will be holding a hearing on June 26, 1991, beginning at 2 p.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building on S. 362, Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians Recognition Act.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Select Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Committee on Governmental Affairs, will hold a hearing on Enforcement and Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act [FARA] on Thursday, June 6, 1991, at 9:30 a.m., in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Small Business Committee will hold a full committee hearing on the General Accounting Office's study of the Small Business Administration's 7(a) guaranteed loan program collateral. The hearing will take place on Tuesday, June 4, 1991, at 9:30 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building. For further information, please call John Ball, staff director of the Small Business Committee, or Patricia Forbes, counsel to the committee at 224-5175.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

EASTERN MARKET CELEBRATES A CENTURY

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise to commemorate the 100th anniversary of Eastern Market in Detroit. The market has a long and colorful history and now, each week, some 70,000 tons of produce and other food, livestock, flowers, and plants are trucked in to be sold to wholesale and retail customers.

This 43-acre market is primarily a supplier to the wholesale trade, but thousands of retail customers also use the market. Each Saturday, some 30,000 shoppers from the Detroit metropolitan area show up to purchase farm produce and shop at the stores. An estimated 100,000 people will visit on each of the two flower days held this year.

What is remarkable about this bustling site is not just its use as a market, but its history. In the years of American slavery, it was used as a stop along the Underground Railroad. In a warehouse beneath what is now the Roma Restaurant, escaped slaves were housed awaiting passage through a tunnel into Canada and freedom.

Mr. President, I offer my best wishes for a successful celebration, which began in April and continues through the Oktoberfest celebration.•

U.S. ARMY ROTC 75TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today, the U.S. Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps [ROTC] celebrates its 75th anniversary. Formally established in 1916, the origins of ROTC trace to the early 1800's and the founding of the American Literacy, Scientific, and Military Academy by Capt. Alden Partridge.

According to an article in the June edition of the Armed Forces Journal International, "of the Army's 10,504 second lieutenants commissioned in fiscal year 1990, 7,878, 75 percent, were ROTC commissionees * * *." Since 1920, over one-half million officers in the Army have earned their commissions through ROTC.

I would like to take a moment to thank all who are involved in this worthwhile program. It is their hardwork and dedication to excellence that seeks out, evaluates, and trains the future officer leadership of the Army.

I think it is only fitting to give special recognition to the only basic training camp for ROTC cadets: Camp Challenge, Fort Knox. For 6 weeks, cadets are exposed to the Army and learn basic soldiering skills. At Camp Challenge, ROTC students receive the necessary training to become effective military leaders of tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues on this important day to keep in mind all our young men and women who seek to be commissioned in the U.S. Army through ROTC.•

FINANCING OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, the Higher Education Act, which provides nearly 95 percent of the Federal assistance for higher education and funds virtually all of our federally supported student financial aid programs, will expire this year. A recent Washington Post editorial suggests—correctly, I believe—that the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act is probably the single most important piece of social legislation the Senate will consider in this session of the 102d Congress.

Of primary concern to me is title IV of the act, which in fiscal year 1991, provided about $18 billion in student aid to help financially needy students attend postsecondary colleges, universities, and trade and technical schools.

Over the past several weeks, Congress has been conducting hearings on various aspects of the student financial aid issue. Two questions receiving significant attention are how to meet the needs of low-income and middle-income families and how to find an appropriate balance between grant and loan assistance.

The administration's fiscal year 1992 education budget would significantly reduce Federal student financial assistance for most middle-class families. In fact, Mr. President, over the past 10 years of Republican administrations, the typical student Federal aid package has shifted from three quarters grants and one quarter loans to a point where it is almost the reverse. Moreover, Federal grant programs have failed to keep up with the soaring costs of college. In 1979, the maximum Pell grant covered 46 percent of average college costs. By 1989, it covered only 21 percent. The difference was made up by loans.

These figures do not tell the whole story, however, since many students from low-income families lowered their educational sights and simply gave up the hope of obtaining a college education. As a result, according to information contained in a recent American Council on Education report, the 41 percent in access gains made by low-income students into colleges between 1966 and 1977 were lost by 1987. Since 1981, the proportion of freshmen from low-income families enrolled in universities dropped by nearly half, from 18.5 percent to 9.7 percent.

To put this in perspective, we must remember that over 95 percent of all Federal higher education dollars go to

student aid. When Congress reauthorizes the Higher Education Act, we should strengthen, rather than diminish, the historical commitment it has made to the young people of our country in providing such assistance. I also believe the heavy reliance on loans to finance postsecondary education has put many students and their families deeply in debt. As a consequence, I fear young people are being driven away from public service occupations such as teaching, nursing, and other social service jobs in order to repay their student loans.

A review of the higher education financing landscape indicates that when it comes to paying for the costs of attending college, the wealthy and a small but select number of low-income students have things pretty well in hand. Wealthier students, by virtue of their family's economic circumstances, generally pay these costs out of existing assets. High ability low-income students, on the other hand, without either assets or resources, have available to them an array of government and private sector grants and scholarships. Regrettably, Mr. President, most low-income and all moderate-income families have pretty much been left to fend for themselves. More often than not, middle-income parents have found no alternative but to assume massive loans to enable their children to attend college. In the case of low-income families, these students simply abandon their college aspirations altogether because grants are not available to meet their college costs.

The administration's fiscal year 1992 education budget proposals, if enacted, would only add to the misery and apprehension of middle-income families who hope to send a son or daughter to college next fall.

For example, under the administration's budget, a student whose income is $20,000, and who attends a 4 year State college, would receive 40 percent less in fiscal year 1992 under the Pell Grant Program. This would be $628 less than he receives this year. Even worse, a community college student with a family income $20,000 would see 73-percent reduction in his or her grant award under the Bush plan.

The administration's retargeting of Pell Grant aid would generally take funds away from families who have a limited amount of income to send a son or daughter to college. Even with the financial aid benefits provided under current law, these families are already struggling to meet college costs.

The President's education budget also calls for altering the eligibility formula for Federal financial student aid. Eligibility requirements would be tightened, and funding would be reduced, for supplemental educational opportunity grants and college work study. Estimates show that about 750,000 middle-income students no longer would be eligible for aid under the Bush proposal.

Needless to say I do not believe the White House budget adequately addresses the pressing needs of these American families who are having a difficult time sending their children to college or other post secondary training programs. What we are finding is that without some type of Federal relief, an increasing number of middle-income families will be without the necessary resources to meet the rising costs of a college education for their children.

In view of these disturbing circumstances, Mr. President, and with an eye toward addressing the student financial aid needs of middle-class American families, I believe Congress should give serious consideration to revamping our Federal student financial aid programs.

Mr. President, there is one proposal in particular that has come to my attention which I believe warrants renewed examination. The concept, an income contingent loan program, is not new. But the proposal to make it universal in its application and availability is new. Although I do not endorse an income contingent loan program proposal at this time, I do believe it may provide an alternative means of financing tuition, room and board costs based on a loan repayment schedule which takes into account a key factor in loan servicing—an individual's ability to repay.

Under an income contingent loan program repayment plan, each borrower would be obligated to pay back at a predetermined and unchanging fixed percentage of current income. The fixed rate would remain constant over the typical 25-year life of a loan. If a borrower becomes unemployed, or takes a maternity leave, or becomes disabled, he or she pays nothing for the period of time that the individual is out of the work force. When employed however, a fixed percentage of an individual's pay would be automatically withheld by his or her employer and forwarded to the Federal Government as a partial loan repayment.

Such a proposal, if enacted, might well provide educational security and student financial aid relief for low- and middle-income families.

In this regard, Mr. President, I would like to bring to my colleagues attention a thoughtful, comprehensive and well documented income contingent loan program proposed by the Economic Policy Institute [EPI].

EPI is a small but respected public policy think tank located in the Nation's Capital. The authors of the paper are Barry Bluestone, Alan Clayton-Matthews, John Havens, and Howard Young.

While I am neither endorsing the adoption of the universal income contingent loan concept in general, nor the specific EPI proposals—particularly as it relates to the use of the Social Security trust fund—I do believe that Dr. Bluestone and his colleagues have written an intriguing document that merits our consideration.

I also believe the EPI paper frames the issue with precision and provides considerable information concerning the nature of the problem we are facing. In addition, it provides us with an initial conceptual model for the further discussion as we cope with the task of finding long-term solutions to problems in financing postsecondary education.

My only regret is that EPI has proposed that Social Security trust fund surpluses be used to provide initial funding for the establishment of the income contingent loan program. My own view is that should we decide to go forward with such a loan program, it would be necessary to fund this program independently of the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. President, I request the accompanying Economic Policy Institute briefing paper, "Financing Opportunity for Post-Secondary Education in the U.S.: The Equity Investment in America Program," be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The material follows:

[From the Economic Policy Institute]

FINANCING OPPORTUNITY FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE U.S.: THE EQUITY INVESTMENT IN AMERICA PROGRAM

(By Barry Bluestone, University of Massachusetts; Alan Clayton-Matthews, Boston College; John Havens, Boston College; Howard Young, University of Michigan)

INTRODUCTION

The key domestic issues facing America in the 1990s will center on questions of "equity"—in both senses of the term. Equity means "fairness," but it also refers to investment such as corporate stock that pays dividends based on the "profitability" of an asset. Equity stands in contrast to debt which requires fixed repayment no matter how profitable the firm.

The Equity Investment in America (EIA) program introduced here applies this dual meaning of equity to provide an entirely new way for students and workers to finance their own postsecondary education, training, or retraining. It is designed to mitigate the financial barriers to college and university schooling and vocational training for *all* students—regardless of income, age, or social background—by providing each U.S. citizen with a lifetime line of credit which can be used to pursue virtually any form of accredited or licensed schooling. Moreover, unlike conventional education "loans," EIA will not subject students to high fixed debt obligations immediately upon leaving school.

In combination with a proposed expansion in the federally-sponsored Pell and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG), as well as College Work-Study subsidies, EIA will benefit those who in the past have been financially hampered from entering or completing a postsecondary education. But the program will equally benefit those in the middle class who are struggling to cope with the spiraling costs of education, but are presently barred from federal loan

programs because they fail so-called "needs-tests."

What is more, EIA uses a unique funding source to provide the funds that students borrow. A portion of the growing surplus in the Social Security system would be lent to the EIA which in turn would make "equity award" loans to students who choose to participate in the program. The beauty of this mechanism lies in the demographics. According to computer simulations of the EIA program, repayments from students will be more than sufficient to fully compensate Social Security in the next century when there will be a larger number of retirees. Indeed, under a modest repayment schedule, EIA would actually be able to make financial contributions to the Social Security Trust Fund before the middle of the next century when the retirement system is expected to need additional funding.

Thus, the Equity Investment in America program can help solve not one, but two of America's most pressing problems: how to provide younger generations with the wherewithal to pursue the full education they and the country need, and how to provide older generations with adequate pension benefits at affordable payroll tax rates.

While differing in some significant respects from the extraordinarily successful "GI bill" that provided postsecondary education for millions of returning servicemen at the end of World War II, the Equity Investment in America plan borrows some critical components from that post-war legislation: EIA is universal, not income or "needs-tested"; it applies to training and retraining as well as to college and university education; and it swaps a single comprehensive and expanded financing system for the current patchwork quilt of federal loans and grants for higher education.[1]

THE ECONOMIC RATIONALE FOR EIA

Few deny the proposition that to ensure its ability to compete effectively, the United States must reinvigorate its primary and secondary schools, increase its training and retraining efforts, and maintain its preeminence in college and university education. In a global economy where capital and technology are becoming infinitely mobile, the one factor that provides a nation with a competitive advantage is the caliber of its labor force. The nation's productivity, the quality and array of its products and services, and our standard of living will continue to suffer if we fail to invest in all levels of schooling.

This is particularly true of professional and technical training. Staying ahead in international competition in a technological age requires having sufficient teachers, engineers, scientists, and health providers. Colleges and universities are well positioned to meet these needs. It is also, however, necessary to develop a commitment to "lifelong" learning so that workers have the skills to move from one occupation or profession to another as economic conditions change. This requires a substantial expansion in vocational training and retraining, and the development of new "apprenticeship" programs in a whole range of fields. Simply put, a high school education in the 1990s is no longer a sufficient condition to successfully compete in the home market or abroad.[2]

One quantitative measure of the value of education beyond the high school diploma is the enhanced earnings that educational investments produce for those who pursue college and university training. We calculate that, in 1990 dollars, the present discounted value of completing some college beyond the high school degree over the lifetime of the average worker is approximately $140,000. The present discounted value of four or more years of college is nearly $500,000.[3]

While education has large payoffs for those who pursue it, those with too little of it are now heavily penalized. Access to postsecondary schooling is increasingly responsible for separating society's "haves" from its "have-nots." The ratio of annual earnings of college graduates to high school graduates has increased from 1.5 to 1 in 1963 to over 1.8 to 1 in 1987—an increase of 20 percent. The widening gap is especially pronounced in the service sector where virtually all of the new jobs are found (Bluestone, 1990).

Whether one pursues school beyond the 12th grade is a function of many factors, but the financial barrier to postsecondary schooling is particularly important given the findings in a recent *USA Today* survey of high school graduates. One-third of those interviewed had delayed or indefinitely put off college because of the expense (Semerad, 1988, p. 154). Family income also plays a role in whether students remain in school. According to the U.S. Department of Education, only three percent of students with family incomes over $38,000 drop out in their first year of college. The dropout rate for students from low income families is closer to 15 percent (Kuttner, 1987, p. 20).

Moreover, for the most disadvantaged students—those from low and moderate income minority families—college enrollment rates have actually declined. The American Council on Education reports that college enrollment rates among blacks began to slide in the mid-1970s. For black men, the enrollment rate fell by 7.2 percentage points between 1976 and 1986. Intense college recruiting during the past four years has arrested the downward trend, but still black male enrollment has increased only slightly—from 436,000 to 443,000 students between 1986 and 1988 (American Council on Education, 1988, p. 8).

The cost of postsecondary schooling is indeed steep and rising. Estimates by the American Council on Education of average student charges for the academic year 1988–89 are in Table 1. But these figures understate the actual cost for most students because they represent the costs for full-time and part-time students combined. Based on figures for the 1986–87 school year, the costs for full-time students are, on average, 17 percent higher than the figures in the table.[4] Moveover, in many of the elite private universities, annual tuition plus room and board fees now exceed $20,000 for undergraduates who attend full-time. Schools such as Yale and Harvard have announced annual tuition and fee increases for 1990–91 that will bring the total to almost $21,000.

TABLE 1.—AVERAGE STUDENT CHARGES, BY TYPE AND CONTROL OF INSTITUTION, 1988–89

[Full-time and part-time combined]

	Total	Tuitions and fees	Room and board	Miscellaneous expenses
4-year public institutions (in-State)	$5,823	$1,566	$2,879	$1,378
4-year public institutions (out-of-State)	8,224	3,967	2,879	1,378
4-year independent institutions (private)	12,256	7,693	3,637	1,196
2-year public institutions (commuter students)	4,111	767	1,313	2,031

Source: The College Board, 1988; and College Entrance Examination Board as reported in American Council of Education, 1989.

Unfortunately, as the cost of schooling has escalated, the federal government has moved to disenfranchise middle class students from federal assistance by restricting eligibility for grants. In 1979, the government set a $32,500 ceiling on family income for a student to be eligible for grant support. Today, despite inflation, a family must have an income no higher than $28,000 to be eligible for aid. Even then, if a student is still eligible for a grant, the amount provided has not kept up with increases in college costs. The largest of the federal loan programs, the Stafford Student Loan, provides a maximum of $2,625 per academic year for the first two years of undergraduate study and $4,000 for each subsequent year, up to a five year maximum of $17,250. Hence, a student who takes out the maximum amount of Stafford loans over four years still must come up with another $9,750 on average to attend a public university and at least $26,750 to go private.

The financial gap between the high cost of postsecondary schooling and the economic position of students and their families is surely not the only barrier that must be overcome to increase the number going on to college, university, or advanced vocational training. But, it is one of the major barriers, and one that can be well addressed with the EIA program as we shall try to demonstrate.

THE BASIC NATURE OF THE EQUITY INVESTMENT IN AMERICA (EIA) PROGRAM

To be sure, financing the EIA program will initially require substantial sums. "Equity awards" under the program are expected to amount to over $40 billion per year. Nonetheless, underwriting the program through current and projected Social Security surpluses is a prudent way to obtain the resources. Administering the program can also be accomplished in an efficient manner. Here is how it would work:

EIA will use a portion of the mushrooming Social Security surplus to capitalize a new U.S. Department of Education agency, the EIA Fiduciary Trust. The Trust is responsible for raising the capital for the program, making EIA awards to students, and overseeing repayment to the program. Unique to the plan is an *income-contingent repayment system* that permits students to take up to 25 years (but not beyond age 65) to repay their EIA loans and allows their annual repayments to vary with the level of their own annual earnings.[5] In this way, EIA is a "pay as you earn" plan with a built-in insurance policy. If one's earnings decline or if one becomes unable to work, the amount of annual repayment automatically adjusts. The actual EIA repayment rate for each participant in the program is based on the amount of EIA funds borrowed, the year in which the funds are borrowed, and the student's age.[6]

The EIA Fiduciary Trust is empowered to set the repayment rates so that *on average* across all EIA participants the total principal awarded plus accrued interest is returned to the EIA Fiduciary Trust and thence to Social Security. In this way, the integrity of the public pension system can be

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

virtually assured. Indeed, well before the middle of the next century, modest repayment rates will allow the EIA program to actually contribute to Social Security after having fully discharged its debts to that system. In addition, the higher incomes associated with larger numbers of postsecondary-trained workers could even permit payroll tax rates to be lower in the future than would otherwise be the case.

EIA would begin by phasing out the two largest federal higher education loan programs—the Stafford and Perkins loans.[7] In their place, the EIA Fiduciary Trust would create an "equity"-based system of student credit with the following provisions:

Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible an applicant must be:

A citizen or permanent resident of the United States.

No older than 55 years of age.[8]

Maximum Investment Award

Maximum award of $10,000 per year; $40,000 lifetime (in 1990 school expense adjusted dollars).

Actual award is not permitted to exceed the cost of tuition and fees plus estimated room and board plus a stipulated amount for miscellaneous education-related expenses.

Use of Investment Award

Awards can be used at any state accredited or licensed postsecondary institution including vocational schools and new "apprenticeship" programs.[9]

Awards are "portable," transferable to other accredited schools.

Repayment Rates and Provisions

Repayment is income-contingent.

Repayment rates are based on amount of award, age of recipient, and year of award.

Repayment applies only to the first $50,000 of earnings, adjusted over time for average earnings growth.[10]

A buyout provision with a prepayment premium permits participants to complete EIA obligations at any time.[11]

Maximum repayment period is 25 years.

No repayments beyond age 65.

Participants repay their obligations through regular payroll withholding to the IRS.

Notification of Employers

Recipients are notified of award by EIA Fiduciary Trust.

Recipients are obligated to notify employers of EIA repayment rate.

Employers are responsible for withholding.

Self-employed recipients must file quarterly with IRS.

The EIA Fiduciary Trust would administer the entire program. Its key responsibilities include:

Processing Applications

Applications are made directly to the EIA Agency. The agency verifies eligibility, grants investment awards, and notifies recipients of their EIA rate and the terms of their payment obligations. Funds are not released directly to the recipient but to the institution or training program in which the recipient is enrolled. These institutions and programs provide local administration of the investment award for a modest fee.

Managing the EIA Fund

The agency obtains funds from the Social Security (OASDI) Trust Fund by issuing non-marketable special issue obligations to Social Security and by issuing marketable bonds to cover extraordinary demand for funds if the need arises. The Trust also makes repayments to the bondholders (i.e., the Social Security Trust Fund).

Establishing EIA Repayment Rates

The agency will determine the EIA rates in accord with prevalent economic conditions and projections. The rate schedules for future awards are periodically reviewed and adjusted in order to maintain the integrity of the fund.

Coordinating Repayments from Participants via IRS

The agency will cross-check its records with Social Security payroll taxes (FICA) to assure repayment obligations are being met.

Covering Agency Expenses and Recapitalization

To cover administrative expenses associated with the program and to recapitalize the program so that it is out of debt to Social Security before the middle of the next century, the repayment schedule has a built-in 1.75 percent premium over the U.S. Treasury bond rate—.25 percent for administrative expenses; 1.50 percent for recapitalization. Under these terms, in 1991 the implicit interest rate in the program is expected to be 9.95 percent.

Congress could begin to implement EIA through a major revision in the Higher Education Reauthorization legislation. As EIA covers more and more students and as previous federal loans are paid off, the Stafford and Perkins programs can be phased out of existence.

THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE EIA PROGRAM

The organizational structure of the EIA program is diagrammed in Figure 1. (Figure 1 not reproducible in the RECORD.) The arrows represent the flow of funds. Funds flow into the EIA Fiduciary Trust Fund from three sources: (1) the Social Security Trust Fund (2) repayments from EIA fund recipients, and as needed (3) federally-guaranteed bonds, as a "safety-valve" source of revenue.[12] The EIA Fiduciary Trust, in turn, awards these funds to qualifying applicants via education and training institutions which provide local administration. As repayments are made to the EIA Fund (via the Internal Revenue Service) from students who participated in the program, the EIA fund repays the Social Security Trust Fund. Essentially, the Trust Fund loans part of its surplus to the EIA Fund in the years when the Social Security Trust Fund balance is growing and in future years is repaid when the balance is scheduled to shrink.[13]

THE PRACTICAL BENEFITS OF THE EIA PROGRAM

Restructuring postsecondary education finance along the lines of the EIA program deals directly with a number of problems inherent in current methods of supporting students in their quest for schooling.

(1) EIA eliminates much of the morass of current federal loan programs in favor of one universal, comprehensive plan available to all postsecondary students.

(2) EIA provides a substantially greater amount of funds under superior terms to most current programs, thus allowing students to better meet the rising cost of postsecondary education.[14]

(3) EIA is available to all students in accredited postsecondary schools regardless of family income. There is no "needs test." It is a middle class program every bit as much as one aimed at the low and moderate income student.[15]

(4) Since repayment is based on actual earnings, there is effective deferral of principal and interest as long as the student is pursuing full-time studies and has little wage and salary income.

(5) As a result of income contingency and IRS collection, defaults are virtually eliminated—something that now costs the U.S. Treasury in excess of $1.5 billion a year.[16] Moreover, stricter licensing of trade schools, with state oversight boards partially funded by a portion of the EIA administrative fees would provide effective sanctions against schools that are supplying inadequate or inappropriate training to students. This would reduce the number of students whose incomes were not enhanced by their schooling.

(6) The EIA program applies equally to all forms of postsecondary schooling from apprenticeships and proprietary trade institutions to graduate and professional schools. It does not discriminate between the student who pursues, for instance, an undergraduate degree in political science and one who seeks retraining as a welder or office machine repairer.

(7) Racial and gender discrimination in the labor market is not automatically ratified as is the current practice under fixed obligation loans. The income contingent feature of the EIA program requires students to repay based on actual earnings and therefore takes full account of differences in earnings which arise for any reason.

(8) Because the EIA program is income contingent, students will be more likely to enroll in programs that conform to their academic strengths and career goals than in programs which simply hold out the promise of spectacularly high earnings that can be used to repay fixed short-term loans. This may mean slightly fewer students opting for law careers and MBAs and slightly more students preparing for careers in elementary and secondary school teaching, nursing, and other fields where the monetary rewards are smaller but the contribution to society is arguably no less and very likely greater.

(9) Under the EIA program, students pay for their own education as the benefits from that education become manifest. In most cases, this will remove a major financial burden from parents and place it on their children who benefit directly from the educational investment.

(10) Finally, the EIA program, by eliminating the need for the Stafford and Perkins loan programs, frees up $5.1 billion of federal education spending per year. These dollars—or at least a portion of them—could be used to expand the Pell and SEOG grant programs for the most financially disadvantaged students.

There are likely to be other benefits as well; simplified and cheaper administration of education loans is surely one of them.

FINANCING THE EIA PROGRAM ON SOCIAL SECURITY DOLLARS

The potential benefits of EIA are clear, but why use Social Security funds to pay for EIA? The reason is that such a unique mechanism provides for a level of intergenerational equity not available through any other device and furnishes the Social Security Trust Fund with an investment opportunity second to none.

The rationale for using the Social Security surplus for EIA is summarized best in a recent lead editorial in *The New York Times*. Responding to the Moynihan proposal to cut the Social Security payroll tax, *The New York Times* reiterated a basic truth concerning virtually any public pension system: future benefits do not flow from retirement account surpluses but are ultimately paid for by future taxpayers (*The New York Times*, 1990).[17] The Social Security system, no matter how many trillions of dollars it might have in surplus on the books, is essentially financed on the nation's future productivity

and earnings. The *Times* goes on to make a crucially important point:

How much pain that causes [future taxpayers] depends on how much the economy grows between now and then. Future taxpayers won't mind the tax burden if they feel well off. *The best way to guarantee that is for the nation to invest in education and capital equipment.* (Emphasis added.)

The editorial's argument is sound. From a purely financial perspective, the question about future Social Security benefits boils down to what possible investments can be made today that will virtually guarantee a stream of income for pension benefits 30 to 40 years from now. One would not think of stock in Merrill Lynch nor even General Motors as a secure enough vessel for this purpose. Public investment in the skills of the nation's workforce is, as the *Times* suggests, clearly another matter. If we can boost future taxpayers' income, then those taxpayers should willingly contribute to the pensions of the generation that comes just before them. Indeed, it is possible to pay some portion of future Social Security benefits out of the extra earnings generated by a better educated, higher skilled, and better paid workforce. It is precisely this reasoning that provides the foundation for the EIA plan.

A SIMULATION OF THE EIA PROGRAM IN ACTION

There is, of course, at least one remaining issue. Is the EIA program as outlined here economically feasible? Put simply, "will it work?" We can analyze this question from two perspectives:

(1) *The individual who may be a recipient of investment awards.* How large will the repayments have to be for given EIA awards?

(2) *The funding agencies involved in capitalizing the program.* What would the unified EIA accounts look like over time? Would there be a time when the EIA fund (or the Social Security fund) is in danger of bankruptcy?

To address these questions the EIA program was simulated using a uniform set of assumptions and a computer simulation model developed for this analysis.[18] Combining estimates from a variety of sources and drawing assumptions from a number of government agencies, the model was first used to simulate conditions for typical program participants. The model demonstrates their repayment schedules under various assumptions about the size of EIA awards, the participant's age, and likely earnings streams. The model was then used to project a set of accounts for the program through the year 2070.

A full detailed set of simulation results can be found in a special appendix, available from the Economic Policy Institute upon request.

CASE STUDIES

To demonstrate what the EIA program would mean to individual participants in terms of their repayment schedules, four hypothetical case studies have been simulated.[19]

Case 1: Traditional College Undergraduates

Bob and Mary both enter college in 1991 and in each of four years of undergraduate study take the equivalent of $5,000 (in 1990 dollars) in EIA awards. Under the assumptions of the model, both will pay a repayment rate equal to 6.53 percent of annual pre-tax earnings (for earnings below the $50,000 cap adjusted for average earnings growth) for the next 25 years in order to repay the EIA Fiduciary Trust.

A portion of Bob's repayment schedule (in 1990 dollars) looks like this:

Age	Expected pre-tax earnings	EIA payment	Percent of earnings
25	$33,840	$2,221	6.53
30	46,364	3,029	6.53
40	[20] 63,911	4,180	6.53

Mary's repayment schedule reflects a lower earnings stream. (This might be due to occupational or wage discrimination.)

Age	Expected pre-tax earnings	EIA payment	Percent of earnings
25	$26,849	$1,754	6.53
30	17,500	1,143	6.53
40	40,350	2,636	6.53

Both Bob and Mary complete their obligations to EIA when they reach age 45 in the year 2018. Note that while Bob and Mary both pay 6.53 percent of their earnings in EIA repayments at age 25, Bob pays 27 percent more than Mary because of his higher income. Moreover, in this example, Mary pays only $1,143 when she is 30 for in that year she worked half time immediately after the birth of her first child.

Case 2: Advanced University Degree

Alex and George make the same EIA investment of $20,000 in their undergraduate careers and then add three years of graduate training for an additional $20,000 in EIA awards. The calculated EIA rate on this sizable total award is 11.60 percent of earnings up to the earnings cap of $50,000.

Alex's dollar repayments rise as his income increases (and as the earnings cap rises with the average wage in the labor market). However, because both Alex and George reach the cap soon after their 30th birthdays and their earnings continue to grow faster than the increase in the cap, their repayment rates as a percent of income declines. At age 40, Alex wins a promotion within his firm along with a large raise. However, since he is already at the earnings cap, his annual payment increases by less than $500 between ages 35 and 40:

Age	Expected pre-tax earnings	EIA payment	Percent of earnings
30	$55,294	$6,413	11.60
35	66,657	7,245	10.87
40	92,000	7,710	8.38

George's repayment rate declines, but more slowly than Alex's. By age 40 he is paying the maximum like Alex, but because of his lower annual wage, he pays a slightly higher proportion of his income:

Age	Expected pre-tax earnings	EIA payment	Percent of earnings
30	$48,216	$5,592	11.60
35	65,323	7,245	11.09
40	78,964	7,710	9.76

The EIA program works just as well for the "non-traditional" student, as Case 3 demonstrates.

Case 3: Non-traditional Part-Time Undergraduate

At age 30, Barbara decides to earn her BA degree on a part-time basis while continuing to work.[21] Beginning in 1991, Barbara takes out an EIA award of $2,500. Over the six years it takes her to graduate, she obtains $15,000 worth of EIA awards. At age 36, Barbara has just graduated and she is earning $25,070 (in 1990 dollars). Her EIA payment is $1.087 or 4.34 percent of earnings. Had Barbara not gone to college, she would have earned at age 36, according to our simulation, $3,187 less. As a result, her EIA repayment that year was equal to about 34 percent of her additional earnings. Later in her career at age 52, Barbara is earning $40,460. Her EIA payment is now $1,755, still 4.34 percent of earnings. If for some reason Barbara did not work at all when she was 52, her EIA payment would be zero.

Case 4: Vocational Training

Michael decides to enroll in a vocational retraining program at age 45 after losing his job at an auto parts manufacturing firm. Michael takes and EIA investment award of $2,500 in 1991 to invest in his training. After completing a training program in computer programming, he gets a full-time job that pays $28,371. That year he repays $324 to the EIA Trust Fund or 1.14 percent of his total earnings. Ten years later at age 56, Michael is still working as a programmer and making $36,898. His payment to EIA is $421. Relative to what he would have made without the training, we calculate that Michael is paying only about 6 percent of his additional earnings in EIA payments.

These are but four of literally thousands of "cases" that could be simulated. The basic point is the same. By using an extended repayment period and by protecting participants against high costs when they are unemployed or their incomes lag, the EIA program provides students with an affordable and equitable method for financing their own educations with built-in insurance against what financial experts call "downside risk."

SIMULATED ACCOUNTS FOR THE EIA FIDUCIARY TRUST AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

Given the size of the potential market for EIA awards, it will take hundreds of billions of dollars over the first decade to fund the program. Will there be sufficient funds to cover its cost? Will the EIA Fiduciary Trust be in a position to repay the money it borrows from the Social Security surplus? By the middle of the next century will the EIA fund or Social Security be in jeopardy of bankruptcy?

To answer these questions, a computer simulation of the overall EIA program was conducted. The simulation was based on the same economic assumptions as in the individual EIA participant cases. Additional assumptions about potential college enrollments were obtained from the U.S Department of Education and Social Security Trust Fund projections were taken from the 1990 Social Security Annual Report.

As it turns out, the demographics are definitely in our favor. Population projections indicate that the traditional college age population will not grow significantly during the rest of this century or, for that matter, into the 21st. Even with a possible ten percent increase in college and university enrollments induced by the incentive of the EIA program, a 50 percent program participation rate, and meeting a goal of three percent of the labor force using EIA assistance for training and retraining each year, the total number of annual EIA awards is expected to increase by no more than 400,000 between 1991 and the year 2010. After that, enrollments are projected to slowly decline. As a result, it is unlikely that there will be an unanticipated explosion in the size of the EIA program.

We project that EIA will assist about 9 million students each year—between 7 and 7.5 million college and university students and about 1.7 million in vocational programs. We assume an average annual award that rises from approximately $4,400 in 1991 to over $8,500 in 1990 education cost adjusted

dollars by the middle of next century. This takes into account prorating of the annual limits on awards for public and private education and two and four-year programs.

Even with participation of this magnitude, the program fits well within the size of projected Social Security surpluses. According to the simulation, the Fiduciary Trust's debt to Social Security will grow over the next 30 years, reaching a peak of about $1.6 trillion in current dollars ($494 billion in 1990 dollars). Thereafter, repayments into the EIA fund will finance new advances to students and reduce the net outstanding balance owed Social Security. By the year 2032, EIA will no longer need to borrow from Social Security and will begin to accumulate assets. By the year 2039, the loans from Social Security could be fully repaid. After that, the EIA fund could provide a substantial return to Social Security. In this way, Social Security could eventually receive a return over and above the interest on the loans it made to EIA (see Table 2).

Basic Assumptions: Dividend payments are made for a maximum of 25 years; College enrollment increases by 10 percent over current U.S. government projections because of EIA incentive; 3 percent of the labor force enrolls in training programs each year; 50 percent of students participate in EIA at an average award of 60 percent of the maximum; EIA repayment rates set to yield 1.75 percent above Treasury rate; Real tuition rises by 2 percent per year through 2000, 1 percent thereafter; and EIA borrowing from Social Security requires periodic interest payments and repayment of principles after fifteen years.

TABLE 2.—EIA FIDUCIARY TRUST ACCOUNT BASIC SCENARIO

[All dollar figures are in 1990 dollars]

Year	Number of participants (millions)	Average EIA awards	EIA New borrowing (billions)	EIA student repayments (billions)	Net EIA fund balance (billions)
1991	8.951	$4,438	$38.638	$1.193	−$38.638
1995	8.975	4,765	46.782	8.344	−199.724
2000	9.112	5,264	49.440	23.242	−390.988
2005	9.280	5,566	43.719	41.706	−536.136
2010	9.272	5,850	54.502	62.905	[1] −602.913
2015	9.128	6,109	33.113	85.940	−564.731
2020	8.984	6,379	23.952	88.501	−474.348
2025	8.954	6,701	22.628	92.641	−367.826
2030	8.923	7,040	2.873	96.510	−244.597
2035	8.896	7,393		100.145	−105.537
2040	8.873	7,764		104.141	+−50.771
2045	8.787	8,130		108.808	+230.319
2050	8.698	8,510		113.735	+439.190

[1] In current dollars, the net EIA negative balance reaches a peak of $1.56 trillion in the year 2019. The earlier date in the real dollar basis reflects the impact of converting current dollars into real dollars.

Source: Alan Clayton-Matthews, EIA Simulation Model.

Moreover in the short run, EIA will not jeopardize the Social Security bank before large scale student repayments begin to materialize. The 1990 Social Security Annual Report forecasts that the Social Security Fund surplus will increase from $297 billion in 1991 to nearly $9.2 trillion by 2025 before declining back toward zero (see Figure 2). (Figure 2 not reproducible in the RECORD.) As a result, total comulated EIA borrowing from Social Security—under the liberal assumptions used in this simulation—never amounts to more than 42 percent of the Social Security surplus and the percentage falls rapidly after the turn of the Social Security surplus and the percentage falls rapidly after the turn of the century (see Figure 3). (Figure 3 not reproducible in the RECORD.) EIA fits well within the current projected levels of Social Security surpluses. The "negative" balances in the two figures indicate a positive surplus that ultimately could be transferred to Social Security.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE EIA PROGRAM

Any new financing program for education as far-reaching as EIA will inevitably raise a number of serious questions. We try to deal with some of the most pressing ones here.

Q. Won't the implementation of such a large scale program as EIA run the risk of adding too much to what we already spend on postsecondary education?

A. No, for three reasons. First, EIA will not dramatically increase the overall amount of money being spent on college and university education by those *already* planning to attend college or university. For them, EIA will simply substitute a better financing mechanism for an inferior array of current funding programs. Second, a reasonable increase in the number attending higher education is now warranted by the superior rates of return that college and university graduates now obtain. We are no longer, if we ever were, "overeducated" as was the belief during the 1970s when returns to higher education temporarily waned. And third, EIA will most expand school resources in vocational training and retraining where the U.S. clearly lags behind the competition.

Q. Won't the EIA program jeopardize *public* higher education by encouraging students to enroll in more expensive private schools?

A. No. While the repayment rates are reasonable, students will still pay a significant amount of their earnings over their lifetimes in EIA repayments. As a result, students will not automatically abandon public higher education for higher priced private schools. Likewise, the $40,000 lifetime limit on awards forces students to be price conscious in making their investment decisions. Moreover, it is not unreasonable to expect that the overwhelming majority of individuals who decide to pursue higher education precisely *because* of EIA will choose lower priced public colleges and universities, boosting the overall numbers going into the public sector.

Q. Won't EIA lead to enormous increases in the level of tuition and fees?

A. No. Continued competition between schools for a relatively stable number of college and university students will ultimately require high priced private schools to limit increases in their tuition and fee schedules. This is likely to occur with or without the EIA program. In any case, if tuition does continue to skyrocket at private schools, the correct remedy is one that is now being implemented, at least tentatively: antitrust action. Ultimately, the EIA Fiduciary Trust could be a powerful ally against college cost inflation by refusing to permit students to use EIA funds at schools that persist in raising tuition and fees to unacceptable levels. And since lifetime EIA borrowing is limited to $40,000, this will limit tuition and fees increases.

Public colleges and universities may be another case. They may use the EIA program to reduce the size of state government subsidies. On some grounds, particularly given the interstate mobility of students after graduation and the subsidy of middle class students on funds raised by regressive state taxes, increases in in-state tuition may be justified. In an era of restrictive state budgets, EIA would relieve states of some of the tuition burden. Yet, in order to maintain a "good business climate," one can expect state legislatures to maintain relatively low college and university tuition and fee rates in order to provide strong incentives for their citizens to pursue what is presumably productivity enhancing higher education.

Q. What keeps unscrupulous operators from setting up "sham" training schools to take advantage of EIA-funded students?

A. EIA requires that all institutions eligible for EIA-funded students must be fully accredited and licensed by the states within which they operate. The EIA could be given oversight authority over state accreditation and licensing. To keep tuition and fees in line, the cost of education could be made one criterion for EIA accreditation.

Q. What about post-secondary school dropouts? How would the EIA program affect them?

A. EIA payments are determined by income levels. A borrower pays the same *percentage* of income (up to the income cap) whether he or she finishes school or drops out. If someone drops out and goes to work, and his or her income rises, then EIA payments also rise. When the borrower re-enters school and income falls, payments also fall. Dropouts who never return to school still have a 25 year obligation to the EIA program. They pay the same percentage of income as if they had completed school. But if income is reduced because the borrower did not finish, the amount of the EIA payments is also reduced.

Q. Won't EIA use of the Social Security surplus reduce the funds available for current deficit reduction?

A. Absolutely. But, like Senator Moynihan, we believe that the Social Security Trust Fund surplus should not be "raided" to cover current government expenses. The federal government could continue to cut defense spending, using part of the "peace dividend" to cover the diversion of Social Security surpluses from deficit reduction. Alternatively, the federal government could raise taxes to cover current spending needs. Strengthening the progressive income tax by boosting the top rate for the highest income families back to 33 or even 38 percent would be a step in the right direction.

Q. Why should the Social Security surplus be used to fund EIA when there are so many

other unmet needs in America that require funds?

A. To be sure, there are other unmet needs—including some that might even be more "urgent" than postsecondary education. Funds for pre-school programs, for primary and secondary schools, for medical research, for environmental protection, or housing for the homeless are all essential. However, postsecondary education with an EIA repayment mechanism involving the direct beneficiaries of the program is perhaps the only one that virtually assures the integrity of the Social Security Trust Fund. For other social programs, the Social Security Trust Fund is simply the wrong instrument.

Q. Isn't the payroll tax that funds Social Security terribly regressive? Why should we finance an education progam on such a regressive tax?

A. Yes, the payroll tax is regressive and probably should be reformed so as to make it less so. This could be done by raising the earnings cap on FICA taxes and lowering the rate or even substituting an expanded income tax for part of the payroll tax. Neither of these changes would negate the positive benefit of using the Social Security surplus to capitalize an ability-to-pay education finance scheme like EIA.

Q. How will the EIA program likely affect low-income students?

A. EIA will make additional resources available to low-income students. First, the program permits students to borrow more funds with reasonable repayment schedules. Second, Pell and SEOG grants, which have been especially helpful to low-income students, will be continued. Third, as mentioned above, Congress should take a portion of the $5.1 billion saved by eliminating the Stafford and Perkins loan programs and transfer it into the Pell and SEOG programs.

Q. Will the EIA program make state college prepayment programs like that in Michigan obsolete?

A. No. States which wish to set up college prepayment programs can do so under EIA. Parents who wish to make substantial contributions to their children's education can do so using this mechanism.

Q. Won't EIA have a negative effect on philanthropic contributions to institutions of higher education?

A. No. Most corporate and individual giving to higher education is for capital expansion, not current expenses. One suspects that corporations and individuals will continue to contribute to college and university endowments for such purposes.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It is the rare government program that simultaneously satisfies a number of disparate public policy goals and at the same time has the potential for garnering broad bipartisan support. The Equity Investment in America progam has the potential for being one of these. By providing an increase in the level of funding available for postsecondary education, by appealing to the needs of the middle class student as well as the student from a low-income family, by providing a prudent investment opportunity for the Social Security Trust Fund, and by expanding postsecondary funding to training and retraining progams as well as colleges and universities, the EIA program meets both the fairness and investment definitions of "equity."

The specifies of the program can be debated and revised, but the basic structure provides a sound basis for promoting the national discussion on how America can renew its commitment to education and to equal opportunity. Going back to the principles of the GI Bill could provide part of the blueprint for the future.

APPENDIX A—CURRENT FUNDING OF POSTSECONDAY EDUCATION IN THE U.S.

Student financing of post-secondary education has become a complex matter involving dozens of grant and loan programs for federal, state, and private sector sources. In 1989, current-fund expenditures of all public and private institutions of higher education within the U.S. reached nearly $121 billion, of which $79 billion was spent by public institutions with the remaining $42 billion spent by the privates (Gerald, Horn, and Hussar, 1989, Table 38, p. 95). This translates into current spending (including room and board) per full-time equivalent student of $14,661 in public four-year universities and colleges; $19,340 in private four-year institutions; and $5,571 in two-year community and junior colleges.

Students, of course, do not shoulder the entire burden of these costs. In public colleges and universities, the state government is responsible for a portion of total higher education finance and in all sectors of higher education, grants, contracts, and contributions from alumni, foundations, and corporations comprise a significant part of institutional finance.

To meet the accelerating costs of postsecondary education, students—particularly from low middle income families—have had an array of loan and grant programs to which they can turn for assistance. According to the American Council on Education 1989–90 Fact Book on Higher Education, total student aid in 1986–87 is estimated to have been $20.5 billion. Of this total, three-fourths came from federal sources, nearly one-fifth came from the institutions themselves, and about one-tenth came from state grant programs. Just over half of the full-time, full-year undergraduates at public colleges and universities received financial aid from some source with 35 percent receiving federal aid. In the private sector, nearly three-fourths of the full-time, full-year undergraduates receive some form of assistance to meet the costs of tuition, room and board, and other school-related expenses.

Among the programs available today are Stafford Student Loans (formerly Guaranteed Students Loans—GSLs), Perkins Loans (formerly National Direct Student Loans—NDSLs), two major grant programs—the Pell and Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants—and the College Work-Study Program.[22]

Stafford Student Loans subsidize and guarantee educational loans that private banks make to students who meet specific family income needs tests. Today, it is the primary federal student loan program. More than 80 percent of all federal student loan dollars are provided under its aegis. In 1986–87, some 3.6 million students (20.5 percent of all undergraduates) received assistance through this program which provided a total of nearly $8.6 billion in loans. The average amount of the loan was just under $2,300. While a student is enrolled in school, the loan need not be repaid. Generally, students are given between five and ten years to repay their loans after completing school but are charged an annual interest rate of ten percent.

Perkins Loans are paid directly through the student's educational institution and are awarded on the basis of need. In 1986–87, about six percent of all undergraduates received Perkins Loans. On average, they borrowed only about $1,000 a year under the program. In theory, the needs test is more strigent under this program, but the interest rate on repayment is much lower—five percent. Repayment schedules are similar to those found in Stafford Loans.

Parent Loan for Undergraduate Students (PLUS) and *Supplemental Loans for Students* (SLS) provide shallow subsidies for education loans that private banks make to parents and to independent undergraduate and graduate students. Unlike Stafford and Perkins Loans, there is no financial needs test. However, interest rates on these loans are significantly higher and repayments of at least interest on these loans must begin within two months of the issuance of the loans.

Pell Grants awards, averaging $1,300, went to 18 percent of all undergraduates in 1986–87. These grants are strictly for low-income students and are awarded directly to the student. The largest of the nation's grant programs, the Pell Grant program awarded $3.5 billion in 1986. As the name implies, these are grants and, unlike loans, are not repaid.

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) provide funds to postsecondary instutitions that in turn make awards to needy students. The average award to the five percent of undergraduates who received one in 1986–87 was $700.

College Work-Study assisted more than 750,000 students in 1986–87 with total awards of $662 million. To receive work-study, students must be financially needy and they must work in jobs approved for payment under this program.

APPENDIX B—INCOME CONTINGENT PROPOSALS FOR FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPARISON OF EIA WITH OTHER INCOME CONTINGENT PLANS

The concept of income contingent loans for education is by no means new or novel.[23] In fact, as early as 1945 Milton Friedman proposed such a plan and it is discussed in his 1962 book, *Capitalism and Freedom*. According to the Friedman plan: "A governmental body could offer to finance or help finance the training of any individual who could meet minimum quality standards. It would make available a limited sum per year for a specified number of years, provided the funds were spent on securing training at a recognized institution. The individual in return would agree to pay to the government in each future year a specified percentage of his earnings in excess of a specified sum for each $1,000 that he received from the government. This payment could easily be combined with payment of income tax and so involve a minimum of additional administrative expense" (Friedman, 1962, pp. 105–106).

More recently, the Reagan Administration proposed legislation to transform the National Direct Student Loan Program into an income contingent scheme.[24] Under this plan, the annual and lifetime loan limits would be signficantly increased, the repayment period would be extended without apparent limit, and repayments would be based on "modified adjusted gross income" of the borrower and his or her spouse (jointly). The interest rate for this program would be sharply increased (from five percent to the 91-day Treasury Bill rate plus three percent). Unlike the Friedman plan, only students demonstrating financial need would be eligible to receive loans.

To our knowledge, the most comprehensive program devised to date is one by Robert D. Reischauer, now Director of the Congressional Budget Office (1989). Under Reischauer's Higher Education Loan Program (HELP), student loans would take the form of an entitlement drawn from a dedicated trust fund. All of those who benefited from this entitlement would be required to

make small, continuing contributions to support the trust fund. The size of the contributions would vary with the participant's earnings and with the size of the benefit that the participant received. The trust fund would be self-supporting and it would not require subsidies from non-participants. Students would repay their loans through the existing FICA payroll tax system. The original funds for the trust fund could come from private capital markets as well as from Social Security trust funds.

The HELP program (and Friedman's early formulation) provides a good place to begin the development of a fully-detailed education finance plan such as the Equity Investment in America Plan. Its major components: universality, income contingent repayment, and the possible use of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus are all important. However, EIA goes beyond the HELP plan in a number of critical areas.

(1) The HELP plan is constructed primarily for the "traditional" student—the high school graduate going directly to college and the undergraduate going directly to graduate or professional school. The EIA program provides funds for non-traditional students as well—those who are beginning their postsecondary schooling later in life or returning to school. This affects the repayment rates for an income contingent program.

(2) The HELP plan is targeted to colleges and universities specifically. The EIA plan extends the same educational funding opportunities to students pursuing training, retraining, and apprenticeship programs outside of the college/university setting. This provides for much greater universality in its application.

(3) Like the HELP plan, but unlike other income contingent plans, EIA explicitly ties its financing to the Social Security Trust Fund and permits the EIA Fiduciary Trust to float additional Treasury bonds if necessary. In this way, the program can guarantee the lowest possible interest rate and assure that there are sufficient funds to permit any and all qualified students to participate fully in the program.

(4) The HELP program suggests that total lending in the first year might be as much as $10 billion. According to various simulations of the EIA program, the first year EIA awards could amount to as much as $39 billion and rise to $55 billion (in 1990 dollars) by the middle of the next decade. Hence, the EIA program is a much more ambitious program, providing America with a source of human capital investment funds for a much broader section of the population.

APPENDIX C—BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE EIA PROGRAM SIMULATION

(1) The future economy and future population: The rate of annual wage growth, the inflation rate, and the average rate of interest for trust fund debt obligations, and the projected annual surplus in the Social Security Trust Fund are taken from the II-B estimates published by the Board of Trustees of the Social Security Trust Fund ("Communication from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds." 1989). The most important of the II-B assumptions are presented in Appendix Table C1.

APPENDIX TABLE C1.—SELECTED ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS FOR EIA PROGRAM SIMULATIONS

Year	Average annual percentage increase in—				
	Real GNP	Average annual wage	CPI	Real wage	Interest rate
1991	2.4	5.5	4.5	1.0	8.2
1992	2.4	5.5	4.5	1.0	7.9
1993	2.1	5.4	4.3	1.1	7.6
1994	2.2	5.5	4.2	1.4	7.3
1995	2.3	5.4	4.0	1.4	6.9
1996	2.3	5.4	4.0	1.4	6.5
1997	2.3	5.5	4.0	1.5	6.4
1998	2.3	5.4	4.0	1.4	6.3
1999	2.3	5.4	4.0	1.4	6.1
2000	1.8	5.4	4.0	1.3	6.0
2010 and later	1.8	5.3	4.0	1.3	6.0

Source: 1990 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, "Selected Economic Assumptions by Alternative, Calendar Years 1960–2065," Table 10. The assumptions used here are from the Alternative II-B scenario.

Population projections are from the Bureau of the Census (Spencer, 1989, Table F (Middle Series)). Mortality rates for the population are also from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Labor force projections are taken from special runs on the March 1988 *Current Population Survey*.[25]

(2) The level of postsecondary school enrollment: College and university enrollment rates by age and attendance status are derived from forecasts made by the U.S. Department of Education (Gerald, Horn, and Hussar, 1989, Table 45 (Middle alternative projection)). These rates were applied to the U.S. Bureau of Census population projections. Annual enrollment in non-college training, retraining, and apprenticeship programs was assumed to be equal to three percent of the labor force.

(3) College enrollments are ten percent higher than U.S. Department of Education projections as a result of the availability of EIA funds.

(4) 50 percent of all students participate in the EIA program.[26]

(5) The average annual EIA award among participants is 60 percent of the maximum allowed and varies according to projected full or part-time enrollment status.[27]

(6) Growth in costs of postsecondary education or training: The expected real rate of growth for postsecondary education costs through the year 2000 was calculated as the average annual rate of growth in real current-fund expenditures per enrollee in public and private institutions of higher education.[28] After the year 2000, the real rate of educational costs was assumed to rise at one percent a year (i.e., one percentage point above the Consumer Price Index).

(7) The effect of postsecondary education and/or training on an individual's future earnings: Age-earnings profiles by level of education were estimated from the March 1988 *Current Population Survey*. The profiles were inflated to future years by the Social Security II-B wage rate projections.

(8) EIA program parameters: The key program parameters for the simulations presented here include:

Repayments are made for a maximum of 25 years or through age 65, whichever occurs first.

The maximum award limit is $10,000 per year and $40,000 lifetime for full-time students. These figures are adjusted each year for expected increases in average educational costs. The limits for part-time students are pro-rated.

The EIA repayment rates are set to yield the U.S. Treasury Bond rate plus a premium of 1.75 percentage points.

Repayment is subject to an annual $50,000 earnings cap (adjusted yearly for increases in the average annual wage).

FOOTNOTES

[1] The Servicemens' Readjustment Act, or as it was popularly known, the GI Bill of Rights, still stands out as perhaps the most successful education investment program ever initiated by the federal government. Following the end of World War II, the federal government provided $14 billion in education and job training benefits for 7.8 million veterans (Congressional Research Service, 1986, pp. 10, 24). The 7.8 million who took advantage of the GI Bill from June 1944 to the end of the program in the early 1960s represents just over half (50.5 percent) of the eligible veteran population. Approximately half of the total budget for the program was spent on the 2.2 million GIs who used the funds to attend college or graduate school. According to the Library of Congress, 2.2 million or 28.5 percent of the 7.8 million attended college under the bill; 3.5 million or 44.6 percent attended other schools including proprietary training schools; 1.4 million or 18 percent received on-the-job training under the bill; and the remaining 690,000 or nine percent were farm trainees. See Appendix A for a review of the current methods used to fund postsecondary education in the United States.

[2] Ultimately, it is the goal of EIA to provide funding so that every year three percent or more of the labor force would be able to avail themselves of vocational training or retraining. This would be part of a new "active labor market policy" for the nation aimed at constantly upgrading and improving the technical skills of the workforce.

[3] These figures were calculated from the March 1988 *Current Population Survey* and reflect the difference in present discounted values between high school graduates and those with less than four years of college and those with an undergraduate degree or more. Expected earnings were calculated through age 65 based on actual March 1988 earnings by age. Earnings were projected to future years and discounted by expected future interest rates using data on wage rate growth and interest rates from the Social Security Administration. For the wage rate growth and projected interest rate assumptions, see "Communication from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds," 1990.

[4] According to the U.S. Department of Education, in the 1986–87 school year, the average full-time, full year undergraduate had total estimated expenses (including tuition and fees, food and housing, and other expenses) of $8,187. This figure ranged from $4,588 in two-year public institutions to $12,757 in four-year doctoral granting private not-for-profit universities and colleges. For part-time or part-year undergraduates, the figures are $4,957, $3,464, and $7,680 respectively (see National Center for Education Statistics, 1988).

[5] Such a plan involving no subsidy to program participants and hence no burden on taxpayers is referred to as a "mutualized plan"—one in which all costs are covered by borrower repayments. Losses due to borrower low income, death, or disability, are covered by repayments above cost by higher income borrowers (see Riddle, 1982, p. 5).

[6] Appendix B provides a brief overview of earlier income contingent college funding programs.

[7] While eliminating these two federal loan programs, EIA would maintain the Pell and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) grant programs as well as College Work-Study. These programs are needed for those students who come from the most financially disadvantaged families. They provide a direct subsidy to these students in order to furnish an incentive to pursue postsecondary education. In 1986–87, 40 percent of black undergraduates, 29 percent of American Indian undergraduates, and 26 percent of Hispanic undergraduates received Pell grants (see National Center for Education Statistics, 1988, p. 55).

[8] Beyond this age, the EIA program would provide no major advantage over short-term bank loans, as the dividend repayment period would be less than ten years and thus the EIA dividend repayment rate would have to be quite high to be actuarially sound.

[9] Some of these new training programs would presumably be in the form of "apprenticeships" in a range of white-collar and blue-collar fields, something akin to apprenticeship training in a number of European nations. These new apprenticeships would have to be licensed by state government education agencies in order to permit students to use EIA funds to pay for them.

[10] The earnings cap is built into EIA in order to avoid what economists call "adverse selection"—the tendency among those who expect to have high salaries to opt out of the program. If large numbers of those who expected high incomes were to avoid the program so as to escape fixed repayment rates on very high incomes, the repayment rates on all participants would have to be much higher. Setting an earnings cap reduces the redistribution effect of the EIA marginally, but enhances the overall financial viability of the program.

[11] Under the buyout provision, an individual can at any time foreclose any further obligation to the EIA program by paying a lump sum equal to 1.9 times the outstanding present discounted value of the average expected stream of repayments for that individual's EIA cohort. The prepayment "premium" of 190 percent is set to be actuarially equivalent to the $50,000 earnings cap. Hence, disregarding the "insurance" benefit of having repayments income-contingent, an individual with earnings above $50,000 would be indifferent between repaying EIA over the full 25 year repayment period and "buying out" his or her EIA obligation once and for all.

[12] This option would be exercised in the event that student demand for awards was so great that the EIA Trust Fund would require more than 50 percent of the outstanding Social Security surplus. Under the simulated conditions discussed later in this proposal, this option would not have to be utilized. This is true despite a significant simulated expansion in the demand for postsecondary schooling and liberal use of EIA awards.

[13] In practice, EIA borrows from the Social Security Trust Fund by issuing non-marketable government guaranteed 15-year bonds. If EIA were implemented in 1991, the first of these bonds would mature in 2006.

[14] Current federal loan programs provide only a fraction of the funds needed by most students. As noted in the text, the largest of these, the Stafford Student Loan program (formerly the Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL) provides a maximum of $2,625 per academic year for the first two years of undergraduate study and $4,000 for each subsequent year up to a total of $17,250. Supplemental Loans for Students (SLS) has a maximum annual loan amount of $4,000 and a total of $20,000. Perkins loans (formerly the National Direct Student Loan program) has the highest maximum: $4,500 per year for the first two years of undergraduate study, $9,000 for the third and fourth years, and $18,000 for graduate study.

[15] The Stafford and Perkins loans are only available to students who have a demonstrated economic need. Students above the standard of need are not eligible and must find alternative means of funding their schooling. These alternative sources are often quite expensive. One example is the Education Resources Institute TERI loan. With a TERI loan, a student can borrow up to $20,000 a year with no income limit or "needs test." However, the present rate on TERI loans is normally the prime rate plus two percent. With a deferment on interest and principal while in school, a typical TERI loan with a five-year term carries an annual percentage rate (APR) of 15.3 percent at regular commercial banks. Professional Education Plan (PEP) loans for graduate study can be even more expensive if the student does not have a co-applicant. The APR on a five-year loan with a two-year deferral of principal and interest is currently in the range of 18 percent.

[16] Presently, the default rate on education loans is 18 percent for those who go to two-year public colleges. 14 percent for those who attend two-year private colleges, seven percent for those who go to either private or public four-year schools, and a whopping 33 percent for those who use their loans to attend trade schools (see Gupta, 1990, p. B2).

[17] The original Moynihan proposal is contained in Moynihan, 1989.

[18] The model was developed by Alan Clayton-Matthews at the Social Welfare Research Institute at Boston College. He also performed the simulations and projections presented in this report. The assumptions used in the simulation are found in Appendix C.

[19] In terms of the financial burden to the individual, the simulation analysis estimates the costs in terms of an EIA percentage factor per thousand dollars of investment. The factors vary with the age of the recipient at the time of the investment award in order to take into account the different earnings streams of individuals of different ages and to account for the foreshortened repayment period for those over age 40. The repayment factor also varies with the year in which the award is made in order to account for the growth in average earnings over time. The schedule of repayment factors is available in a special appendix to this report available from the Economic Policy Institute.

[20] The earnings cap in the year 2013—when Bob is age 40—is $66,500 taking into account the average expected growth in earnings.

[21] Contrary to popular perception, postsecondary school students represent a broad cross-section of the nation's citizens by age as well as by gender and race. Of all students, about 54 percent are female. See Gerald Horn, and Hussar, 1989, p. 17. In 1986 there were 2.2 million minority students, about half of whom were black and 625,000 Hispanic (American Council on Education, 1989, p. 67). The percentage of "non-traditional" students—those over age 25—has been growing. In 1988, over 10 percent were age 30-34 while another 16 percent were 35 years of age or older. Hence, more than one-fourth of current higher education enrollments are comprised of individuals who are "thirtysomething" or better. See Gerald, Horn, and Hussar, 1989, p. 23.

[22] Detail on these educational loan and grant programs is taken from Reischauer, 1989; American Council on Education, 1989; and National Center for Education Statistics, 1988.

[23] For more information on income contingent plans, see Riddle, 1982.

[24] For details on the Reagan Administration program, see Riddle, 1986.

[25] Labor force participation rates by age from the March 1988 CPS were applied to the U.S. Bureau of Census population projections to project future labor force levels. Separate projections were made for men and women, and for whites and people of color.

[26] This rate is significantly higher than current federal loan participation rates and reflects the more favorable terms of the EIA program as well as the elimination of "needs based" eligibility. In 1986, 46 percent of all undergraduates received some form of financial aid—loan, grant, or both. Federal loans went to 24 percent of all undergraduates and 26 percent of all graduate and professional students. See National Center for Education Statistics, 1988, p. ix; and National Center for Education Statistics, 1989. p. ix.

[27] The average award in 1991 is estimated to be $4,638 (in current dollars) taking into account the current ratio of full-time to part-time students and factoring in the number of students electing training and retraining programs. This compares with an average undergraduate federal loan amount of $2,456 in 1986. See National Center for Education Statistics, 1988, p. ix.

[28] Calculated from Gerald, Horn and Hussar, 1989, Tables 3 and 38 (Middle alternative projections).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Council on Education. "Minorities in Higher Education." Washington, D.C., 1988.

American Council on Education. *1989-90 Fact Book on Higher Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1989.

Bluestone, Barry. "The Great U-Turn Revisited: Economic Restructuring, Jobs, and the Redistribution of Earnings." In John D. Kasarda, ed., *Jobs, Earnings, and Employment Growth in the United States*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishing, 1990.

The College Board. *Annual Survey of Colleges*. New York: The College Board, 1988.

"Communication from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds." Transmitting the 1989 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989.

"Communication from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds." Transmitting the 1990 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990.

Congressional Research Service. "Veterans' Education Assistance Programs." Report #86-32 EPW, January 31, 1986. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 1986.

Friedman, Milton. *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Gerald, Debra E., Paul J. Horn, and William J. Hussar. *Projections of Education Statistics to 2000*. National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, NCES 89-648, December 1989.

Gupta, Udayan. "Governments Crack Down on Abuses at Trade Schools." *Wall Street Journal*, April 26, 1990.

Kuttner, Robert. "The Patrimony Society." *The New Republic*, May 11, 1987.

Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. "A Proposal to Cut Social Security Taxes." U.S. Senate, December 29, 1989.

National Center for Education Statistics. *Undergraduate Financing of Postsecondary Education*. Report CS88-239. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, June 1988.

National Center for Education Statistics. *Student Financing of Graduate and Professional Education*. Report No. CS 89-303. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, March 1989.

The New York Times. "How to Pay for Social Security," January 24, 1990, p. A22.

Reischauer, Robert D. "HELP: A Student Loan Program for the Twenty-First Century." In Lawrence E. Gladieux, ed., *Radical Reform or Incremental Change?* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1989.

Riddle, Wayne. "Income Contingent Loans: Background and Analysis." Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, April, 1982.

Riddle, Wayne. "Student Loans—An Income Contingent Approach Proposed by the Reagan Administration for National Direct Student Loans." *Journal of Education Finance*, Vol. 12, Fall 1986.

Semerad, Roger D. "Improving Access to Preschool and Postsecondary Education." Testimony before the Subcommittee on Education and Health of the Joint Economic Committee, December 14 and 15, 1988. Mimeo. Washington, D.C. 1988.

Spencer, Gregory. "Projections of the Population of the United States, by Age, Sex, and Race: 1988 to 2080." In Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Population Estimates and Projections*, Series P-25, No. 1018, January, 1989. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1989.●

IN TRIBUTE TO ORVILLE VOGEL

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is with great honor that I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Orville Alvin Vogel of Lacey, WA, who is considered to be the father of modern agriculture in the Pacific Northwest. Vogel was known internationally for his agricultural research and invention of scientific research equipment.

While stationed at Washington State University, Vogel worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture for 42 years. He led the team that developed the first commercially successful semidwarf variety of wheat. This research was responsible for adding $50 million a year to the State's economy through increased yields.

Vogel's continued successes have provided scientists around the world with the ability to gain higher yielding varieties of wheat and other grains through

his invention of miniature equipment that automates planting and harvesting.

In addition, Vogel's research helped provide the foundation for the Green Revolution, which boosted grain yields in Third World countries, enabling many to become increasingly self-sufficient for the first time.

In 1975, then President Gerald Ford presented Vogel with the National Medal of Science. In 1987, Vogel was inducted into the Agricultural Research Service's Science Hall of Fame. Vogel also was distinguished as the recipient of the 1990 John Scott Award. This honor has been given to such prominent scientists as Thomas Edison, Madame Curie, and the Wright brothers.

Upon retirement, Vogel set forth into several philanthropic ventures. He offered to match donations from the wheat industry in order to develop a special fund at Washington State University for wheat research. His personal contribution totaled $26,000.

Mr. President, I commend Dr. Orville Alvin Vogel's dedication to the improvement of agriculture. His ingenuity and continued efforts have proven immeasurable to the agricultural research industry and all that benefit from it.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, PERMITTING ACCEPTANCE OF A GIFT OF EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL FROM A FOREIGN ORGANIZATION

● Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of Rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 for Ivan A. Schlager, a member of the staff of Senator HOLLINGS, to participate in a program in Korea, sponsored by the USIA and the Korea Economic Institute of America, from May 25–June 1, 1991.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Schlagerin the program in Korea, at the expense of the Government of Korea, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee has received a request for a determination under rule 35 for Bryce Dustman, a member of the staff of Senator BURNS, to participate in a program in Germany, sponsored by Haus Rissen International Institute for Politics and Economics, from August 13–21, 1991.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Dustman in the program in Germany, at the expense of Haus Rissen, a foreign privately funded organization, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.●

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—S. 1139

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1139 be star printed to reflect the changes I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 4; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein; that Senator LEVIN be recognized for up to 20 minutes; with time from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. under the control of the majority leader or his designee; further, that on Tuesday, the Senate stand in recess from 12:30 to 2:15 in order to accommodate the respective party conferences.

Mr. President, I might add for the record the proceedings in closing tonight have been cleared with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, on tomorrow, at 11 a.m., the Senate will resume consideration of S. 173 with the likely possibility that amendments will be offered prior to the Senate recessing at 12:30.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess, as under the previous order, until 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, June 4.

There being no objection, at 4:22 p.m., the Senate recessed until Tuesday, June 4, 1991, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 3, 1991:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LUIS GUINOT, JR., OF PUERTO RICO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA.

LYNN MARVIN HANSEN, OF COLORADO, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ON THE CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE (CFE) JOINT CONSULTATIVE GROUP AND TO THE NEGOTIATIONS ON CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE (CFE).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JAMES H. QUELLO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 1991. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD E. HAWLEY, [redacted] U.S. AIR FORCE.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL WHILE SERVING IN THAT POSITION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 601 AND 3034:

To be vice chief of staff of the Army

To be general

LT. GEN. DENNIS J. REIMER [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER TO BE PLACED ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER THE PROVISONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 1370:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES E. THOMPSON [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 601(A), AND TO BE APPOINTED AS SENIOR ARMY MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 711:

To be lieutenant general

To be senior Army member of the Military Staff Committee to the United Nations

MAJ. GEN. J.H. BINFORD PEAY, III [redacted] U.S. ARMY.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF) IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD P. MORSE [redacted] U.S. NAVY.

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED REAR ADMIRALS (LOWER HALF) IN THE LINE OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP S. ANSELMO [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) JON M. BARR, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE B. BREMNER, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) JAMES R. FITZGERALD [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM J. FLANAGAN, JR [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID E. FROST, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS F. HALL [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN T. HOOD, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM P. HOULEY, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. LAPLANTE, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) CONRAD C. LAUTENBACHER, JR, 202-32-2275, U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILLIP R. OLSON [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL W. PARCELLS, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP M. QUAST [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN S. REDD, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) THOMAS D. RYAN, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) LUTHER F. SCHRIEFER, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) RALPH L. TINDAL, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.
REAR ADM. (LH) TIMOTHY W. WRIGHT, [redacted] U.S. NAVY.

REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD J. ZLATOPER [redacted] U.S. NAVY.

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MILLARD S. FIREBAUGH [redacted] U.S. NAVY.

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ISAIAH C. COLE [redacted] U.S. NAVY.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTIONS 624 AND 628, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS IDENTIFIED WITH A SINGLE ASTERISK ARE NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICER IDENTIFIED WITH TWO ASTERISKS WAS SELECTED FOR PROMOTION BY THE ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL CORPS

To be colonel

LARRY S. MERCK [redacted]

ARMY

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH D. CERONE [redacted]
MARK G. SPITLER [redacted]
**ROBERT W. VENCI [redacted]

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSEPH A. GOETZKE [redacted]

ARMY

To be major

*KENNETH W. HOLDERFIELD [redacted]
*JESSE J. LOTT [redacted]
DONALD K. REEVES [redacted]
JAMES J. MCGROARY [redacted]
*MICHAEL L. WALTERS [redacted]

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICER INDICATED BY AN ASTERISK IS ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE:

ARMY

To be Colonel

ABBENANTE, THOMAS L. [redacted]
ADAMS, KERRY G. [redacted]
ADAMS, LONNIE B. [redacted]
AHEARN, DAVID L. [redacted]
ALRIDGE, GEORGE W. [redacted]
ALLEN, ROBERT C. [redacted]
ALLENBAUGH, RICHARD [redacted]
ALLEY, RICHARD F. [redacted]
ALLRED, KENNETH L. [redacted]
ANDERSON, RICHARD T. [redacted]
ANDERSON, ROBERT J. [redacted]
ANDREWS, JOHN H. [redacted]
ANTHONY, DAVID J. [redacted]
ARGERSINGER, STEVEN [redacted]
ARMSTRONG, RICHARD [redacted]
ATWELL, ROBERT C. [redacted]
AUGER, JOHN D. [redacted]
AYLOR, CORTEZ C. [redacted]
BAILEY, CLAUD, JR. [redacted]
BAILEY, EDWARD L. [redacted]
BAILEY, LINWOOD P. [redacted]
BAILEY, PALMER K. [redacted]
BAINE, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
BAKER, SIDNEY F. [redacted]
BALDWIN, ROBERT L. [redacted]
BANDEL, RAYMOND L. [redacted]
BANKS, JIMMY C. [redacted]
BAREFIELD, ROBERT L. [redacted]
BARFIELD, ANN L. [redacted]
BARR, GEORGE H. [redacted]
BARRETT, GERARD F. [redacted]
BASILOTTO, JOHN P. [redacted]
BEASLEY, CHARLES A. [redacted]
BENNETT, PATRICK J. [redacted]
BERGANTZ, JOSEPH L. [redacted]
BERGMAN, MICHAEL R. [redacted]
BESSENT, ELMO V. [redacted]
BETTS, DONALD W. [redacted]
BISHOP, EUGENE H. [redacted]
BLACKBURN, LINWOOD [redacted]
BLAKE, JAMES T. [redacted]
BOCCOLUCCI, DANIEL [redacted]
BOLGER, JOHN T. [redacted]
BOND, WILLIAM L. [redacted]
BORES, DAVID R. [redacted]
BORRESEN, DAVID F. [redacted]
BOWEN, LESTER R. [redacted]
BOWERS, WILLIAM T. [redacted]
BOWRA, KENNETH R. [redacted]
BRANHAN, TERRY W. [redacted]
BRIDGES, GARY J. [redacted]
BRIDGES, HUBERT, JR. [redacted]
BRIGHT, GEORGE E. [redacted]
BRITTAIN, FRANK W. [redacted]
BROOME, RICHARD E. [redacted]
BROWN, BRYAN D. [redacted]
BROWN, DAVID A. [redacted]
BROWN, JOHN M. [redacted]
BROWN, TERRY E. [redacted]
BROWN, THOMAS C. [redacted]
BROWN, THOMAS E. [redacted]
BROWN, WALTER B. [redacted]
BROWN, WALTER T. [redacted]
BROWNE, ROBERT W. [redacted]
BRUNNER, DONALD J. [redacted]
BRUNS, DONALD J. [redacted]
BRYAN, LARRY E. [redacted]
BUBB, ERNEST E. [redacted]
BULLINGTON, TERRY W. [redacted]
BUSK, ARLAN N. [redacted]
*BUTCHER, DAVID G. [redacted]
CABABA, ROBIN R. [redacted]
CAJIGAL, GEORGE L. [redacted]
CALL, GORDON H. [redacted]
CALLEN, JAN E. [redacted]
CAMPBELL, JAMES L. [redacted]
CAMPBELL, ROBERT D. [redacted]
CAPKA, JOSEPH R. [redacted]
CARDWELL, BARRY E. [redacted]
CARLSON, ADOLF [redacted]
CARR, JOHN J. [redacted]
CARSON, ROBERT G. [redacted]
CARTER, RICHARD A. [redacted]
CARTER, ROLAND W. [redacted]
CASEY, JOHN T. [redacted]
CASSIDY, RICHARD P. [redacted]
CAVIGGIA, JOHN D. [redacted]
CHANDLER, RICHARD M. [redacted]
CHAPPELL, SAMUEL L. [redacted]
CHENEY, SUSAN P. [redacted]
CHRISTOPHER, PAUL E. [redacted]
CICCARELLO, NICHOLA [redacted]
CICCOLELLA, ROBERT [redacted]
CLEARY, DANIEL J. [redacted]
CLOYD, WALTER L. [redacted]
COAN, GEORGE P. [redacted]
COCHRANE, WILLIAM M. [redacted]
COLLIER, JAMES E. [redacted]
COLLINS, OLIVER J. [redacted]
CONWAY, RICHARD G. [redacted]
COOK, CHARLES B. [redacted]
COOK, DONALD C. [redacted]
COON, ROBERT C. [redacted]
COOPER, BILLY R. [redacted]
CORBELL, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
COUGHENOUR, KAVIN L. [redacted]
COUGHLIN, ROBERT J. [redacted]
COWELL, RICHARD A. [redacted]
COWLEY, DAVID E. [redacted]
COX, DANIEL J. [redacted]
CRABBE, JAMES D. [redacted]
CRAIG, RICHARD W. [redacted]
CRAIG, WALTER M. [redacted]
CRAYTON, JUAN V. [redacted]
CREWS, THOMAS M. [redacted]
CROCKERT, JAMES [redacted]
CRONIN, ROBERT M. [redacted]
CULLING, THOMAS E. [redacted]
CUMBIE, DONOVAN R. [redacted]
CUNNINGHAM, JAMES E. [redacted]
CUNNINGHAM, WALTER [redacted]
DALE, RONALD P. [redacted]
DALE, THOMAS D. [redacted]
DANA, THOMAS N. [redacted]
DARNLEY, JAMES H. [redacted]
DAVIDSON, DONALD G. [redacted]
DAVIS, THOMAS H. [redacted]
DAY, LOWELL L. [redacted]
DAYTON, KEITH W. [redacted]
DEAN, DONALD G. [redacted]
DEES, ROBERT F. [redacted]
DEIBLER, SCOTT [redacted]
DEWALD, LEE S. [redacted]
DIALS, THOMAS A. [redacted]
DICKINSON, DON P. [redacted]
DICKSON, DWIGHT B. [redacted]
DIMERCURIO, PETER N. [redacted]
DIVER, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
DODGE, RICHARD L. [redacted]
DOESBURG, JOHN C. [redacted]
DOLTON, HENRY J. [redacted]
DOOLEY, JOSEPH C. [redacted]
DOUGHERTY, JOSEPH M. [redacted]
DRUGLEY, GARY P. [redacted]
DUNN, RICHARD J. [redacted]
DUNN, THOMAS A. [redacted]
EBERTOWSKI, JAMES S. [redacted]
EDNEY, KERMIT JR. [redacted]
EDWARDS, JOHN R. [redacted]
ELDER, DONALD N. [redacted]
ELIAS, THOMAS E. [redacted]
ELLERTSON, JACK W. [redacted]
ELLZEY, THOMAS F. [redacted]
EMERSON, JAMES O. [redacted]
ENGEL, RICHARD A. [redacted]
ENGELBERGER, CHARLE [redacted]
ENGSTROM, CHARLES L. [redacted]
EPKINS, STEVEN A. [redacted]
ETHERIDGE, JAMES H. [redacted]
EVANS, RICHARD E. [redacted]
FARMER, JAMES Z. [redacted]
FARMER, ROBERT [redacted]
FERGUSON, WARNER T. [redacted]
FERNANDEZ, ROBERT M. [redacted]
FESS, KENNETH E. [redacted]
FEYEREISEN, PAUL S. [redacted]
FIELDS, JOSEPH A. [redacted]
FISCHER, ERNEST W. [redacted]
FLANIGAN, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
FLETCHER, JOHN E. [redacted]
FOLEY, DAVID W. [redacted]
FONTANA, DENNIS J. [redacted]
FONTENOT, GREGORY [redacted]
FORD, TERRANCE M. [redacted]
FOSTER, WILLIAM G. [redacted]
FOULK, TOM B. III [redacted]
FOUNTAIN, DAVID C. [redacted]
FOWLER, DAVID J. [redacted]
FOWLER, RUFORD W. [redacted]
FOX, FREDERICK G. [redacted]
FREEMAN, CARL H. [redacted]
FREEMAN, TERENCE M. [redacted]
FREY, KAREN L. [redacted]
FREY, KURT M. [redacted]
GANNON, TERRY C. [redacted]
GATANAS, HARRY D. [redacted]
GATES, JOHN M. [redacted]
GAVITT, JAMES S. [redacted]
GEIER, RICHARD F. [redacted]
GEIS, JOHN P. [redacted]
GELOSO, PETER J. [redacted]
GENTEMANN, MICHOR M. [redacted]
GEORGE, DEWEY P. [redacted]
GERMAIN, ALLEN L. [redacted]
GIBSON, ELIZABETH L. [redacted]
GIBSON, JAMES F. [redacted]
GILMORE, RICHARD B. [redacted]
GLACEL, ROBERT A. [redacted]
GNAGE, JAMES C. [redacted]
GOFF, DONALD G. [redacted]
GONSER, KENT R. [redacted]
GORETH, GARY P. [redacted]
GORING, RICHARD H. [redacted]
GOTTARDI, LARRY D. [redacted]
GRAHAM, WILLIAM G. [redacted]
GREER, CHARLES W. [redacted]
GREER, JASON H. [redacted]
GRIBBLE, G D. [redacted]
GRIFFIN, BENJAMIN S. [redacted]
GRIFFIN, RILEY T. [redacted]
GROENING, WILLIAM H. [redacted]
GROGAN, JACK H. [redacted]
GUSTAFSON, GREGORY [redacted]
HAGEWOOD, EUGENE G. [redacted]
HAISLIP, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
HALL, DENNIS R. [redacted]
HALL, THOMAS M. [redacted]
HALLER, THOMAS L. [redacted]
HAMILTON, JEANNE G. [redacted]
HANING, JOE M. [redacted]
HARBACK, HERBERT F. [redacted]
HARDIE, RICKY E. [redacted]
HARDING, ROBERT A. [redacted]
HASTY, JAMES E. [redacted]
HATLEY, VERNON W. [redacted]
HATTON, SAM E. [redacted]
HAWKINS, DAVID C. [redacted]
HAYDEN, DOUGLAS C. [redacted]
HAYES, THOMAS M. [redacted]
HEALY, DENNIS W. [redacted]
HEATH, FREDERICK W. [redacted]
HENDON, WOODY M. [redacted]
HENNING, CHARLES A. [redacted]
HESS, MONTIE T. [redacted]
HILDEBRANDT, SIEGFR [redacted]
HILTON, CORSON L. [redacted]
HINDS, RANDY C. [redacted]
HITCHCOCK, RAYMOND [redacted]
HODGE, HENRY E. [redacted]
HOLMES, RICHARD F. [redacted]
HOMZA, ELI A. [redacted]
HOPPES, ROBERT J. [redacted]
HORTON, THOMAS A. [redacted]
HUFF, WILLIAM K. [redacted]
HULIN, TERRY M. [redacted]
HUNT, HENRY B. [redacted]
HUNTER, STEPHANIE S. [redacted]
HURD, FRANK K. [redacted]
HURT, CHARLES S. [redacted]
HUSTON, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
HUTCHINSON, DENNIS [redacted]
IRELAND, JAMES W. [redacted]
ISLER, RODERICK J. [redacted]
JACKSON, DENNIS K. [redacted]
JACKSON, JAMES H. [redacted]
JACKSON, JAMES T. [redacted]
JARMAN, KENNETH L. [redacted]
JEFFREY, JEWELL W. [redacted]
JENSEN, JOHN L. [redacted]
JOHNSON, DONALD R. [redacted]
JOHNSON, JAMES M. [redacted]
JOHNSON, JEFFRY M. [redacted]
JOHNSON, OLIVER R. [redacted]
JOHNSON, RICHARD G. [redacted]
JOINER, THOMAS G. [redacted]
JONAS, CLYDE L. [redacted]
JONES, ANTHONY R. [redacted]
JONES, DAVID L. [redacted]
JONES, JEFFREY B. [redacted]
JONES, RUDOLPH M. [redacted]
JONES, ULYSSES S. [redacted]
JONES, WILLIAM L. [redacted]

JUDGE, DAVID J. [redacted]
JUST, EDWARD A. [redacted]
KABAT, WAYNE C. [redacted]
KAY, JAMES S. [redacted]
KEATING, ARTHUR J. [redacted]
KELLY, EDWARD M. [redacted]
KELLY, JAMES C. [redacted]
KENNEDY, AUSTIN J. [redacted]
KENNEDY, DENNIS J. [redacted]
KENNEDY, WILLIAM H. [redacted]
KENSINGER, PHILIP R. [redacted]
KERLEY, CHARLES G. [redacted]
KERR, DONALD L. [redacted]
KIEFER, DAVID S. [redacted]
KING, JAMES R. [redacted]
KLEAGER, JERALD E. [redacted]
KLINCK, EARL F. [redacted]
KLUEVER, EMIL K. [redacted]
KNIGHT, JAMES F. [redacted]
KNOX, RICHARD L. [redacted]
KOLB, RICKEY A. [redacted]
KREGER, THOMAS D. [redacted]
KULBACKI, JAMES W. [redacted]
KYLE, WILLIAM ID [redacted]
LACOSTE, GENE M. [redacted]
LACY, WARREN S. [redacted]
LAMAR, PATRICK [redacted]
LAMB, DONALD W. [redacted]
LAMB, IVAN F. [redacted]
LAMB, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
LANDRUM, JAMES M. [redacted]
LANGFORD, WILLIAM D. [redacted]
LARSON, JAMES A. [redacted]
LARSON, LARS E. [redacted]
LASCHE, GEORGE P. [redacted]
LAWSON, HARLAN A. [redacted]
LAYTON, DANIEL H. [redacted]
LEADBETTER, WYLAND [redacted]
LEE, RONALD N. [redacted]
LEISTER, ALBERT F. [redacted]
LENNOX, WILLIAM J. [redacted]
LENTZ, JON L. [redacted]
LEONARD, HENRY A. [redacted]
LEONARD, HUGH R. [redacted]
LEWIS, MARK R. [redacted]
LITTLEJOHN, EDWARD [redacted]
LOPRESTI, THOMAS T. [redacted]
LORENZ, GRANT G. [redacted]
LOVELACE, DOUGLAS C. [redacted]
LOVELACE, JAMES J. [redacted]
LOVELACE, ROBERT L. [redacted]
LOWMAN, RAYMOND P. [redacted]
LUCAS, RONALD J. [redacted]
LUCAS, THOMAS W. [redacted]
LUMHO, BOBBY T. [redacted]
LUSEY, RODNEY S. [redacted]
LYNCH, FRANK J. [redacted]
LYON, DAVID M. [redacted]
MACDONALD, PETER E. [redacted]
MACEL, JOHN A. [redacted]
MACKEY, RICHARD H. [redacted]
MACKINLAY, WILLIAM [redacted]
MACPHERSON, WILLIAM [redacted]
MADDEN, EVERETT I. [redacted]
MAGROSKY, JOHN J. [redacted]
MANSKY, HENRY P. [redacted]
MAPLE, DONALD P. [redacted]
MARABLE, RENARD H. [redacted]
MARCUM, PHILIP C. [redacted]
MARKS, FLOYD B. II [redacted]
MARTIN, JAMES D. [redacted]
MARTIN, MICHAEL C. [redacted]
MARTIN, ROBERT N. [redacted]
MATTHIES, MICHAEL T. [redacted]
MAYER, EDWARD W. [redacted]
MAYERKIELMANN, MICH [redacted]
MCADOO, RONALD D. [redacted]
MCCORMICK, ARLEY H. [redacted]
MCCULLOUGH, JAMES L. [redacted]
MCDOUGLE, JOHN B. [redacted]
MCELWEE, JERRY W. [redacted]
MCGILL, DENNIS R. [redacted]
MCHENRY, MICHAEL C. [redacted]
MCKEAN, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
MCKENNON, LARRY W. [redacted]
MCKENZIE, EUGENE A. [redacted]
MCLAULIN, THOMAS M. [redacted]
MCLEOD, HUGH S. [redacted]
MCMANUS, WADE H. [redacted]
MCNUTT, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
MEADOWS, WILLIAM T. [redacted]
MEHAFFEY, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
MELCHIOR, ROBERT J. [redacted]
MENSCH, EUGENE M. [redacted]
MERANDA, MARK E. [redacted]
METZ, THOMAS F. [redacted]
MEYERS, JOHN J. [redacted]
MICHALIGA, MICHAEL [redacted]
MILLER, LARRY L. [redacted]
MILLER, RODNEY P. [redacted]
MILLER, WILLIAM J. [redacted]
MILLS, WARREN E. [redacted]
MIMS, SAMUEL E. [redacted]
MINER, BARRY D. [redacted]
MITCHELL, JAMES L. [redacted]
MITCHELL, ROBERT V. [redacted]
MITCHELL, VICTOR G. [redacted]
MOBERG, HARLEY [redacted]
MONEYHON, DARWIN J. [redacted]
MOORE, ISIAH JR. [redacted]
MOORE, JAMES A. [redacted]
MOORE, LYNN D. [redacted]
MORELOCK, JERRY D. [redacted]
MORLEY, THOMAS V. [redacted]
MORREALE, DENNIS L. [redacted]
MORRIS, CHARLES A. [redacted]
MORRIS, JOHN L. [redacted]
MUIRRAGUI, RICHARD [redacted]
MULLEN, JAMES D. [redacted]
NANCE, WILLIE B. JR. [redacted]
NAREL., JAMES L. [redacted]
NATHO, JAMES E. [redacted]
NEDELA, DAVID W. [redacted]
NEITZKE, WALTER C. [redacted]
NELSON, JOHN D. [redacted]
NELSON, PAUL R. [redacted]
NICKISCH, WARD B. [redacted]
NIEDRINGHAUS, LARRY [redacted]
NIENHOUSE, TERRY L. [redacted]
NOEL, RICHARD L. [redacted]
NORTON, STEPHEN R. [redacted]
NYBERG, JAMES E. [redacted]
NYGREN, KIP P. [redacted]
OATES, PHILLIP E. [redacted]
OBRIEN, JAMES D. [redacted]
OBRIEN, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
OCONNOR, PETER R. [redacted]
ODAWE, NICHOLAS F. [redacted]
OGRADY, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
OKABAYASHI, RODNEY [redacted]
OKEEFE, DENNIS M. [redacted]
OLSEN, LOREN M. [redacted]
ORISTIAN, JOHN E. [redacted]
ORR, BILLY J. [redacted]
ORR, ROBERT JR. [redacted]
OSBORNE, ROBERT E. [redacted]
PAOLUCCI, JOHN N. [redacted]
PARKER, PATRICK D. [redacted]
PARR, VINCENT H. [redacted]
PASQUARETT, MICHAEL [redacted]
PATTERSON, ALBERT L. [redacted]
PAVLIK, DONALD C. [redacted]
PEARCE, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
PERKINS, ELLIS C. [redacted]
PERSYN, CHARLES E. [redacted]
PETERSON, BLAIR A. [redacted]
PETERSON, RONALD J. [redacted]
PETRUCCI, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
PHERNAMBUCQ, STANLE [redacted]
PHILLIPS, DAVID K. [redacted]
PHILLIPS, RONALD D. [redacted]
PLUMER, DAVID B. [redacted]
POLIN, RICHARD B. [redacted]
PORTER, DAVID L. [redacted]
PORTER, DONALD L. [redacted]
PORTER, LANNING M. [redacted]
POSTON, DANIEL A. [redacted]
POWERS, DAVID R. [redacted]
PUTNAM, MICHAEL B. [redacted]
QUIGLEY, THOMAS J. [redacted]
QUIRK, RICHARD J. [redacted]
RAINS, ROGER A. [redacted]
RANKIN, RICHARD K. [redacted]
RAUSCH, STEVEN F. [redacted]
RAY, PAUL L. [redacted]
RAYMOND, BRIAN L. [redacted]
REDDY, ROBERT P. [redacted]
REED, ARDEN M. [redacted]
REHM, DONALD A. [redacted]
RESNICK, ALLAN M. [redacted]
RHOADES, GEORGE H. [redacted]
RICE, JAMES H. I. [redacted]
RICE, TERRY L. [redacted]
RICE, WILLIAM J. [redacted]
ROBERTS, HAYWARD H. [redacted]
ROBERTSON, CHARLES. [redacted]
ROBERTSON, JOHN K. [redacted]
ROBINETTE, STEPHEN [redacted]
ROBYN, ERIC W. [redacted]
ROE, CARL G. [redacted]
ROGERS, ERNEST R. [redacted]
ROSNER, THOMAS V. [redacted]
ROSS, DANIEL E. [redacted]
ROSS, ROBERT J. [redacted]
ROSZKOWSKI, JOSEPH [redacted]
ROTH, BRIAN K. [redacted]
ROUQUIE, GABRIEL JR. [redacted]
ROWAN, JAMES H. [redacted]
ROWLETT, RICKY M. [redacted]
RUIZ, DANIEL JR. [redacted]
RUSCIOLELLI, PHILIP [redacted]
RUSS, WILLIAM H. [redacted]
RYAN, SYLVESTER A. [redacted]
SAFFOLD, DONNELL F. [redacted]
SALLABERRY, GEORGE [redacted]
SANDERS, CHARLES W. [redacted]
SAUNDERS, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
SAVAGE, DENNIS M. [redacted]
SVITSKE, GEORGE J. [redacted]
SCALES, ROY T. [redacted]
SCHMITT, JOHN K. [redacted]
SCHNEIDER, KENT E. [redacted]
SCHORNICK, JOHN N. [redacted]
SCHOTTEL, DAVID K. [redacted]
SCHWARTZMAN, CHARLE [redacted]
SCOTT, BRUCE K. [redacted]
SCOTT, JAMES G. [redacted]
SCOTT, TERRY L. [redacted]
SCOTT, THOMAS D. [redacted]
SEIBERLING, WALTER [redacted]
SELAND, CHARLES A. [redacted]
SELDEN, GEORGE H. [redacted]
SEMENEC, MICHAEL JR. [redacted]
SEVERANCE, PAUL M. [redacted]
SHADBURN, ROBERT P. [redacted]
SHANAHAN, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
SHELVERTON, CLAUDE [redacted]
SHERIDAN, JOSEPH, C. [redacted]
SHERWOOD, RICHARD W. [redacted]
SHINE, PATRICK T. [redacted]
SHIRAH, HENRY C. [redacted]
SHORT, AUGDEN W. [redacted]
SILLS, RICHARD E. [redacted]
SILVERMAN, MICHAEL [redacted]
SIMMONS, CLYDE R. [redacted]
SKELTON, JOHN D. [redacted]
SKRODZKI, THOMAS E. [redacted]
SLADE, JIMMIE L. [redacted]
SLOAN, LARRY R. [redacted]
SMITH, DAVID O. [redacted]
SMITH, JOHN R. [redacted]
SMITH, RICHARD W. [redacted]
SMITH, STEPHEN R. [redacted]
SNOW, STEPHEN J. [redacted]
SODERLUND, PAUL R. [redacted]
SOMMERS, LAWRENCE E. [redacted]
SPEARS, JOHN A. [redacted]
SPEER, GRAY D. [redacted]
SPICELAND, EVANS C. [redacted]
SPRING, JAMES L. [redacted]
SPRINGER, CARL D. [redacted]
STANSFIELD, JERRY T. [redacted]
STECK, EARL N. [redacted]
STEIGER, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
STEIN, FREDERICK P. [redacted]
STEVENS, HALBERT F. [redacted]
STOBBS, EMMETT E. [redacted]
STONGE, ROBERT J. [redacted]
STOVALL, AUSTIN A. [redacted]
STRAUSS, THOMAS J. [redacted]
STREET, BERNARD H. [redacted]
STRICKLIN, TONEY [redacted]
STROM, STEPHEN H. [redacted]
STUART, RONALD F. [redacted]
STULL, LYNN B. [redacted]
SUDNIK, MICHAEL P. [redacted]
SUESS, ROBERT K. [redacted]
SULLIVAN, DANIEL J. [redacted]
SULLIVAN, JOHN K. [redacted]
SULLIVAN, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
SUMMERLIN, RONALD G. [redacted]
SWAHN, JOHN F. [redacted]
SWARTZLANDER, DAVID [redacted]
SWEENEY, JOHN J. [redacted]
TANKSLEY, DAVID M. [redacted]
TARTELLA, JOHN [redacted]
TESDAHL, ROBERT M. [redacted]
TETERS, RICHARD L. [redacted]
THEIMER, DAVID B. [redacted]
THIEME, THOMAS N. [redacted]
THOM, BRIAN L. [redacted]
THOMAS, MICHAEL E. [redacted]
THOMAS, RONALD D. [redacted]
THOMAS, WILLIAM G. [redacted]
THOMPSON, JERALD L. [redacted]
THOMPSON, WALTER H. [redacted]
TIGHE, DENNIS W. [redacted]
TIMMERMAN, JESSE H. [redacted]
TOMASIK, DONALD M. [redacted]
TOMMERVIK, DAVID R. [redacted]
TOWNSEND, JAMES W. [redacted]
UYESUGI, DANIEL F. [redacted]
VALENZUELA, ALFRED [redacted]
VALERSKY, JOHN A. [redacted]
VANAIRSDALE, MICHAE [redacted]
VANANTWERP, ROBERT [redacted]
VARIS, PETER H. [redacted]
VARNADO, TALMADGE R. [redacted]
VASSAUR, TOMMY W. [redacted]
VAUGHN, RAYFORD B. [redacted]
WAGSTAFF, LARRY J. [redacted]
WALKER, JOHN S. [redacted]
WALKER, STANLEY L. [redacted]
WALLACE, JOHN R. [redacted]
WALLS, OSBORNE K. [redacted]
WALSH, EDWARD O. [redacted]
WALTERS, RICHARD E. [redacted]
WARD, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
WATSON, FLOYD E. [redacted]
WATSON, JEROME A. [redacted]
WATSON, RODNEY L. [redacted]
WEBB, PATRICK F. [redacted]
WEILDBRENNER, JAMES [redacted]
WELLS, KENNETH B. [redacted]
WEMLINGER, JOHN V. [redacted]
WHARTON, WILLIAM D. [redacted]
WHITE, LANCE M. [redacted]
WILHELM, FREDERICK [redacted]
WILLIAMS, JAMES H. [redacted]
WILLIAMS, OTIS [redacted]
WILLIAMS, ROBERT D. [redacted]
WILLIAMS, STEPHEN D. [redacted]
WILLIAMS, THOMAS D. [redacted]
WILLIS, CLIFFORD G. [redacted]
WILSON, RICHARD A. [redacted]
WINTERS, STEPHEN C. [redacted]
WINTRICH, FREDERICK [redacted]
WISTNER, RICHARD F. [redacted]
WITHYCOMBE, HOWARD [redacted]
WOLOSKI, JOHN C. [redacted]
WOODBURY, GEORGE A. [redacted]
WRENTMORE, ROBERT J. [redacted]
WRIGHT, JEFFREY W. [redacted]
YEISLEY, JOHN C. [redacted]
YORK, THOMAS A. [redacted]
YOUNG, ROBERT F. [redacted]

YOUNG, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
ZAIS, MITCHELL M. xxx-xx-x...
ZAKRZEWSKI, STEPHEN xxx-xx-x...
ZIMMERMAN, RYAN M. xxx-xx-x...
380X
364X

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10 UNITED STATES CODE. THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10 UNITED STATES CODE:

ARMY

To be major

ABAHAZY, DANIEL F. xxx-xx-x...
* ABBOTT, CHRISTIAN A. xxx-xx-x...
* ABEJON, ALVIN A. xxx-xx-x...
ABERNATHY, DALE M. xxx-xx-x...
* ABERNATHY, MARK H. xxx-xx-x...
* ABRON, JAMES A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
ACENBRAK, STEVEN D. xxx-xx-x...
* ACKER, EDWIN S. xxx-xx-x...
* ADAIR, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-x...
ADAMS, CECILIA C. xxx-xx-x...
ADAMS, DOUGLASS S. xxx-xx-x...
* ADAMS, KAREN S. xxx-xx-x...
* ADAMS, ROBERT R. xxx-xx-x...
AGOGLIA, JOHN F. xxx-xx-x...
AGOSTA, KENNETH B. xxx-xx-x...
AKIN, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
AKINS, GEORGE JR. xxx-xx-x...
ALANIZ, DAVID H. xxx-xx-x...
ALBERS, PATRICIA L. xxx-xx-x...
* ALBINO, JOSE R. xxx-xx-x...
ALBRECHT, RICHARD A. xxx-xx-x...
ALEMANY, WALTER A. xxx-xx-x...
ALFORD, ELI T. xxx-xx-x...
ALGERMISSEN, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
ALLEN, KERRY C. xxx-xx-x...
* ALLEN, PHILLIP J. xxx-xx-xx...
* ALLEN, RICARDO V. xxx-xx-x...
* ALLEN, SUSAN M. xxx-xx-x...
ALLYN, DANIEL B. xxx-xx-x...
* ALSTON, DARRELL W. xxx-xx-x...
AMSTEIN, PATRICK W. xxx-xx-x...
ANDERSEN, ERIC C. xxx-xx-x...
ANDERSON, BRADLEY C. xxx-xx-x...
ANDERSON, DAVID S. xxx-xx-x...
* ANDERSON, DEBRA L. xxx-xx-x...
ANDERSON, JOEL D. xxx-xx-x...
ANDERSON, JOSEPH xxx-xx-x...
* ANDERSON, MARK C. xxx-xx-x...
* ANDERSON, STEVEN J. xxx-xx-x...
ANDREWS, JEFFREY R. xxx-xx-xx...
* ANGLE, JAMES L. xxx-xx-x...
* ANSON, HAROLD E. II xxx-xx-x...
ARATA, JOHN L. xxx-xx-x...
* ARDNER, MARGUERITE A. xxx-xx-x...
ARIELLY, THOMAS, M. xxx-xx-x...
ARMSTRONG, KEITH A. xxx-xx-x...
ARNZEN, ROGER A. xxx-xx-x...
ARRIOLA, JAMES T. xxx-xx-x...
ARSENAULT, JAMES E. xxx-xx-x...
* ARTHUR, STEVEN L. xxx-xx-x...
ASH, PETER J. xxx-xx-x...
* ASTILLERO, ALFREDO R. xxx-xx-x...
AUSTIN, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-x...
AVERY, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
AVERY, PAUL H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* AVILES, CELESTE L. xxx-xx-x...
* AYDLETTE, MITCHELL A. xxx-xx-x...
* AYERS, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
* BAARDSON, BRUCE A. xxx-xx-x...
BACHINSKI, STEPHEN W. xxx-xx-x...
* BACK, JOE T. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BAEHRE, MARK D. xxx-xx-x...
BAEHRE, MICHAEL D. xxx-xx-x...
* BAGGOTT, CAREEN P. xxx-xx-x...
BAGWELL, JAMES D. xxx-xx-x...
BAILEY, DON W. xxx-xx-x...
* BAKER, CHARLES L. xxx-xx-x...
BAKER, DAVID B. xxx-xx-x...
* BAKER, HOBERT A. xxx-xx-x...
BAKER, JOHN P. II xxx-xx-x...
* BAKER, JOHNNY L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BAKER, THOMAS M. xxx-xx-x...
BALDERAS, ELIAS, V. xxx-xx-x...
* BANKS, ALLEN V. xxx-xx-x...
BANKSTON, DANIEL L. xxx-xx-x...
BARBER, GARY A. xxx-xx-x...
BARBOSA, CARLOS E. xxx-xx-x...
* BARCLAY, JERRY S. xxx-xx-x...
BARFIELD, WALTER R. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
* BARGE, CHARLES E. xxx-xx-xxxx
BARGERON, ROBERT D. xxx-xx-x...
BARKALOW, CAROL A. xxx-xx-x...
* BARNER, HONNEY L. xxx-xx-x...
BARNES, PETER R. xxx-xx-x...
BARNES, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-x...
BARNETT, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
BAROWSKI, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
BARR, FREDERICK N. xxx-xx-x...
BARRASS, JOHN J. xxx-xx-x...
BARRENTINE, HAROLD R. xxx-xx-x...
* BARRERAS, KEVIN R. xxx-xx-x...
BARRETT, GERALD G. xxx-xx-x...
BARRON, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
BARRY, ROBERT F. II xxx-xx-x...
BARRY, RONALD F., SR. xxx-xx-x...
BARTH, FRANK L. xxx-xx-x...
BARTHOLOMEW, DONALD A. xxx-xx-x...
BARTO, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-x...
* BASILOTTA, JEFFREY L. xxx-xx-xx...
* BASS, CHARLES A., JR. xxx-xx-xx...
BAUMAN, SCOTT T. xxx-xx-x...
* BAUTISTA, JUANA P. xxx-xx-x...
* BAYLOR, ROXANA. xxx-xx-x...
* BAZEMORE, DEBBIE V. xxx-xx-x...
BEACH, GREGORY E. xxx-xx-x...
BEAL, STEVEN F. xxx-xx-x...
BEALS, DAVID W. xxx-xx-x...
BEANS, MICHAEL K. xxx-xx-x...
* BEARDEN, ROBERT W. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BEATTY, YVONNE A. xxx-xx-x...
* BEATY, REGINALD B. xxx-xx-x...
BECK, GREGORY T. xxx-xx-x...
BECKINGER, ROBERT C. xxx-xx-x...
* BEECHER, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
* BEGLEY, IRA J. II xxx-xx-xx...
* BEHRINGER, ROGER A. xxx-xx-x...
BELL, ANTHONY B. xxx-xx-x...
* BELL, DAVID K. xxx-xx-x...
BELL, LAWRENCE J. xxx-xx-x...
BENDER, DAVID J. xxx-xx-x...
BENECKE, GLENN J. xxx-xx-x...
BENNER, WILLIAM E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* BENNETT, KATHLEEN R. xxx-xx-x...
* BEOUGHER, GUY C. xxx-xx-x...
BERG, JAMES L. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
BERLIN, JON K. xxx-xx-x...
* BERNADEL, JOSEPH M. xxx-xx-x...
* BERNARD, DAN C. xxx-xx-x...
BERRY, JANICE M. xxx-xx-x...
BEST, CAROLE N. xxx-xx-x...
* BEST, MICHAEL B. xxx-xx-x...
BESTER, CHERYL A. xxx-xx-x...
* BETHEL, DARNELL J. xxx-xx-xx...
* BEVILLE, JODY L. xxx-xx-x...
* BICE, BRYAN N. xxx-xx-x...
* BICKFORD, LEON A. xxx-xx-x...
* BINGER, ROY C. xxx-xx-x...
BIRD, VICTOR M. xxx-xx-x...
BISHOP, THOMAS E. xxx-xx-x...
BIZER, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
BLACHER, MAURICE P. xxx-xx-x...
* BLACK, GARY L. xxx-xx-x...
* BLACK, JERZELL D. xxx-xx-xx...
* BLACK, JIM H. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
* BLACK, ROBERT J. xxx-xx-x...
* BLAIR, WENDELL W. xxx-xx-x...
BLAKELY, FREDDIE N. xxx-xx-x...
BLAKLEY, JAMES C. xxx-xx-x...
* BLANCHARD, ALAN W. xxx-xx-xxxx
* BLASSER, JOHN D. xxx-xx-x...
* BLAYLOCK, VINCENT R. xxx-xx-x...
BLISS, GARY L. xxx-xx-x...
BLISS, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
BLOWE, KEITH C. xxx-xx-x...
BOARDMAN, JAMES W. xxx-xx-x...
* BOARDMAN, JILL L. xxx-xx-x...
* BOATSWAIN, NOEL T. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* BOCHSLER, HAROLD J. xxx-xx-x...
* BOCHES, MARK C. xxx-xx-x...
* BOCKRATH, ALLAN R. xxx-xx-x...
* BODENHEIMER, JIM D. xxx-xx-x...
* BODLING, EDWARD F. xxx-xx-x...
BOEGLEN, KENNETH L. xxx-xx-x...
* BOGART, MATTHEW A. xxx-xx-x...
BOGGS, EDWARD W. xxx-xx-x...
BOHNWAGNER, ALAN F. xxx-xx-x...
* BOISON, MATTHEW F. xxx-xx-x...
* BOISVERT, ROBERT W. xxx-xx-x...
* BOITNOTT, DANNY P. xxx-xx-x...
* BOKMEYER, SETH P. xxx-xx-x...
BOLAN, CHRISTOPHER J. xxx-xx-x...
BOLING, JAMES L. xxx-xx-x...
BOLTZ, CLIFF F. xxx-xx-x...
BONSELL, JOHN A. xxx-xx-x...
* BOOKER, CORNELIUS M. xxx-xx-x...
* BOOKER, WAYNE P. xxx-xx-x...
* BOONE, LEWIS M. xxx-xx-x...
* BOSS, MICHAEL P. xxx-xx-x...
BOSWELL, SHERWOOD R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* BOUGHTON, FELIX V. xxx-xx-x...
BOUKEDES, STEVE G. xxx-xx-x...
BOUNDS, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
* BOURGEOIS, REGINALD S. xxx-xx-x...
BOWDEN, C D. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BOWEN, GEORGE E. xxx-xx-x...
* BOWEN, SCOTT J. xxx-xx-x...
BOWIE, EDWARD L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* BOWIE, JAMES F. xxx-xx-x...
BOWLING, CHRISTOPHER R. xxx-xx-x...
BOWMAN, MICHAEL M. xxx-xx-x...
* BOYCE, REYNOLD J. xxx-xx-x...
* BOYD, BEVERLY L. xxx-xx-x...
* BOYD, ROBERT J. xxx-xx-x...
* BOYD, WAYNE A. xxx-xx-x...
* BOYLE, JON xxx-xx-x...
BOYLE, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
BOYLE, THOMAS J. xxx-xx-x...
BRADBEER, THOMAS G. xxx-xx-x...
* BRADLEY, VERNON xxx-xx-x...
* BRADLEY, WOODROW JR. xxx-xx-x...
* BRADY, GARRY K. xxx-xx-x...
* BRAGG, LARRY M. xxx-xx-x...
BRANDENBURG, ROBERT L. xxx-xx-x...
* BRANNON, DONALD H. xxx-xx-x...
BRANT, JEFFREY L. xxx-xx-x...
BRATCHER, LINDA K. xxx-xx-x...
* BRATTON, LEAMON C. xxx-xx-x...
BRAUN, WILLIAM G. III xxx-xx-x...
BRAY, JAMES G. xxx-xx-x...
BREWSTER, ROBERT E. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
BRICK, DIANE E. xxx-xx-x...
BRIDGE, DONALD W. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BRIGGS, JOHN H. xxx-xx-x...
* BRIGGS, RANDALL N. xxx-xx-x...
BRIGGS, STEVEN J. xxx-xx-x...
* BRILEY, BERTHA M. xxx-xx-x...
* BRILL, JEFFREY xxx-xx-xx...
BRINKER, JEROME C. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
BROADUS, JAMES C. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BROCKMAN, JONATHAN B. xxx-xx-x...
* BRODEN, LATASHA F. xxx-xx-x...
BROGNA, ANTHONY xxx-xx-x...
BROOKS, GORDON B. SR. xxx-xx-x...
BROOKS, JAMES E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BROOKS, JEANNE M. xxx-xx-x...
BROOKS, RICHARD W. xxx-xx-x...
* BROOKS, STEVIE W. xxx-xx-x...
BROUGH, PAUL A. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, BRADLEY D. xxx-xx-xxxx
* BROWN, CARLTON E. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, DAVID W. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, ELMER G. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, GILBERT Z. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, HEIDI V. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, JEFFREY W. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
* BROWN, REX E. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, ROBERT B. xxx-xx-x...
BROWN, ROBERT P. xxx-xx-x...
* BROWN, RODERICK E. xxx-xx-x...
* BROWN, STANLEY J. II xxx-xx-x...
* BROWN, STANLEY P. xxx-xx-x...
* BROWN, WINFRED O. SR. xxx-xx-x...
BROWNE, NANCY C. xxx-xx-x...
BRUHN, MICHAEL L. xxx-xx-x...
* BRYAN, REBECCA S. xxx-xx-x...
* BRYANT, DANIEL J. xxx-xx-x...
BRYANT, JACKIE J. xxx-xx-x...
BUCHER, FREDERICK W. xxx-xx-x...
BUCKINGHAM, JAMES M. xxx-xx-x...
BUCKLEY, DOUGLAS S. xxx-xx-x...
BUCKMASTER, MELISSA M. xxx-xx-x...
BUEL, LARRY V. xxx-xx-x...
* BULEN, WILLIAM E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* BULEY, DONALD C. xxx-xx-x...
BUMGARNER, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
* BUNCH, CYNTHIA E. xxx-xx-x...
* BUNDY, DENNIS D. xxx-xx-x...
* BURDEN, CHESTER L. xxx-xx-x...
* BURFICT, THEODORE xxx-xx-x...
BURKART, RALPH C. xxx-xx-x...
BURKE, ANNETTE M. xxx-xx-x...
* BURKE, REMICK E. xxx-xx-x...
* BURNETT, DONALD J. xxx-xx-x...
BURNETT, PETER L. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
BURNEY, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
BURNS, JOHN C. xxx-xx-x...
* BURWELL, EUGENE F. xxx-xx-x...
* BUSH, AARON W. xxx-xx-x...
* BUSHMAN, WARREN M. xxx-xx-x...
BUSHNER, ROGER D. JR. xxx-xx-x...
BUSHWAY, PATRICIA J. xxx-xx-x...
* BUSICK, BRIAN P. xxx-xx-x...
BUTCHER, HAROLD H. xxx-xx-x...
BUTTON, STEPHEN H. xxx-xx-x...
BYRD, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
* BYRD, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
* CABRERO, JOSE M. xxx-xx-x...
CAFARO, PETER J. xxx-xx-x...
CAHILL, TIMOTHY J. xxx-xx-x...
* CAIN, WILLIAM R. xxx-xx-x...
CAIN, WILLIAM T. xxx-xx-x...
CALLAHAN, TERRENCE S. xxx-xx-x...
CAMARELLA, DEAN A. xxx-xx-x...
CAMPBELL, BRYAN, E. xxx-xx-x...
* CAMPBELL, DOUGLAS W. xxx-xx-x...
CAMPBELL, JAMES D. JR. xxx-xx-x...
CAMPBELL, JOHN E. xxx-xx-x...
* CAMPBELL, VERNON L. xxx-xx-x...
CAMPERSON, BRIAN T. xxx-xx-x...
CAMPERSON, CYNTHIA J. xxx-xx-x...
CANNADY, MARK L. xxx-xx-x...
CANNON, MICHAEL M. xxx-xx-x...
CANO, AMADOR L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* CANTLON, JOHN R. xxx-xx-x...
CANTOR, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
* CANTU, ARTURO S. xxx-xx-x...
* CAREY, BETTY J. xxx-xx-x...
* CARPENTER, CONSTANCE M. xxx-xx-x...
CARPENTER, LARRY A. xxx-xx-x...
CARPENTER, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
* CARR, KENNETH R. xxx-xx-x...
CARR, ROBERT A. xxx-xx-x...
CARR, THOMAS H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
CARRANO, JOHN C. xxx-xx-x...
CARREL, KEVIN E. xxx-xx-x...
CARRINGTON, ROBERT S. xxx-xx-x...
CARRINGTON, ROBIN, F. xxx-xx-x...
* CARSON, JAYNE A. xxx-xx-x...
* CARSON, KENNETH xxx-xx-x...
CARTAGENA, CARLOS A. xxx-xx-x...
CARTER, CHARLES W. xxx-xx-x...
* CARTER, DANNY M. xxx-xx-x...
* CARTER, DON C. xxx-xx-x...
* CARTER, JOE N. xxx-xx-x...
CARTER, LORENZO xxx-xx-x...
* CARTER, SAMUEL C. xxx-xx-x...

CARTER, STEVEN W. [redacted]
* CARTY, JOHN J. JR. [redacted]
* CARY, TIMOTHY C. [redacted]
* CASABLANCACERASE, ENEDINA M., [redacted]
CASE, BLANE J. [redacted]
* CASSAGNOL, DENISE M. [redacted]
CASSIDY, PATRICK J., [redacted]
* CASTALDO, ALBERT A. [redacted]
* CASTILLO, RAYMOND [redacted]
CAVANAUGH, DANIEL E. [redacted]
CAVANO, JEFFREY P. [redacted]
CEDARS, PATRICK M. [redacted]
CHAIN, BRADLEY D. [redacted]
* CHAMBERLAIN, CHARLES T. [redacted]
* CHANDLER, WALTER W. [redacted]
CHARGUALAF, VICTOR P. [redacted]
CHARLES, CHRISTOPHER M. [redacted]
CHARTIER, VANCE G. [redacted]
CHASE, DEBORAH J. [redacted]
CHEATHAM, JOHN M. [redacted]
* CHENEA, STUART E. [redacted]
CHENEY, OWEN W. II [redacted]
* CHERRY, ANDREW [redacted]
CHESNE, BRUCE D. [redacted]
* CHESNEY, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
CHESTER, LEONARD G. [redacted]
* CHING, HARRY K. [redacted]
* CHRISTIAN, GARY A. [redacted]
CHUNG, ROBERT K. [redacted]
CHURA, MICHAEL F. [redacted]
CLAIR, CAROL D. [redacted]
* CLAPPSADDLE, BEN C. [redacted]
CLARK, CHARLES G. JR. [redacted]
CLARK, DANIEL J. JR. [redacted]
CLARK, JAMES K. [redacted]
CLARK, JAMES M. [redacted]
* CLARK, MARY J. [redacted]
CLARKE, JOHN C. [redacted]
* CLARKE, WAYNE J. [redacted]
* CLARKJONES, LORRAINE A. [redacted]
* CLEAVER, JILL K. [redacted]
* CLEAVER, JOHN N. [redacted]
CLEMENTS, GEORGE F. [redacted]
CLEMENTS, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
CLEPPER, ELIZABETH J. [redacted]
* CLINE, ROSEMARY A. [redacted]
* CLOSEN, FRANK J. [redacted]
CLUNE, ROBERT [redacted]
COALWELL, RICK L. [redacted]
* COATES, JAMES P. [redacted]
* COBB, GARY P. [redacted]
COGER, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
COHEN, RUDOLPH R. JR. [redacted]
COHN, PATRICK T. [redacted]
COKER, DAVID W. [redacted]
* COLBERT, MASON M. [redacted]
* COLE, WADE C. [redacted]
* COLEMAN, RICKEY D. [redacted]
COLLEY, JEFFREY G. [redacted]
COLSTON, RAYMOND M. [redacted]
* COLVARD, DIANE O. [redacted]
* COMBS, RICKY B. [redacted]
COMBS, STEPHEN D. [redacted]
COMISH, JAMES H. [redacted]
COMLEY, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
* CONLEY, PAUL M. [redacted]
CONNELL, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
* CONNER, MICHAEL H. [redacted]
CONNER, RAYMOND M. [redacted]
CONNOLLY, MICHAEL C. [redacted]
CONNOR, ARTHUR W., JR. [redacted]
CONRAD, GEORGE R. [redacted]
CONWAY, RANDALL G. [redacted]
* CONYERS, JAMES L. [redacted]
* CONYERS, MARY W. [redacted]
COOGLE, JAMES O. JR. [redacted]
* COOK, JAMES R. III [redacted]
COOKE, THOMAS M. [redacted]
COOPER, BRUCE J. [redacted]
COOPER, CORTEZ A. III [redacted]
COOPER, KEITH L. [redacted]
COOPER, STEPHEN P. [redacted]
* COPE, DEMETRIUS C. [redacted]
* COPELAND, TYRONE [redacted]
COPPOLA, ALFRED A. JR. [redacted]
* CORBETT, MICHAEL R. [redacted]
* CORBIN, MICHAEL F. [redacted]
* CORCORAN, BRIAN P. [redacted]
COREY, WESLEY A. [redacted]
CORMACK, JOSEPH W. [redacted]
* CORNELIUS, CARL E. JR. [redacted]
CORNELL, JERRY L. [redacted]
CORNETT, TIMOTHY R. [redacted]
CORNWELL, JOHN I. [redacted]
* CORONADO, RICARDO T. [redacted]
* CORSETTE, RICHARD H. [redacted]
CORY, RENNIE M. JR. [redacted]
COSGROVE, GREGORY J. [redacted]
COSTIGAN, JAMES F. [redacted]
* COSTIGAN, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
* COTELLESSE, JOHN S. [redacted]
* COTTON, BENJAMIN C. [redacted]
COX, KENNETH J. [redacted]
* COX, KENNY R. [redacted]
COX, RANDALL G. [redacted]
CRADDOCK, BRIAN M. [redacted]
* CRAFTON, GARY J. [redacted]
* CRANE, PAUL E. JR. [redacted]
CRANFORD, TEDDY C. [redacted]
CRAWFORD, JESSIE H. [redacted]
CRAWFORD, PAUL M. [redacted]
CRAWFORD, WID S. [redacted]

CREAMER, DAVID F. [redacted]
CREAMER, JAMES J. [redacted]
CRICKS, JAMES R. [redacted]
CRIZER, SCOTT H. [redacted]
CROFOOT, HOWARD B. [redacted]
* CROLL, MELVIN C. [redacted]
CROMWELL, JOEL C. [redacted]
CRONIN, JAMES B. [redacted]
* CROSS, LINDA S. [redacted]
* CROSS, RAYMOND A. [redacted]
* CROSS, WILLIAMS B. [redacted]
* CROSSLEY, PAMELA J. [redacted]
CROSSON, REGINALD B. [redacted]
* CROW, JAMES M. [redacted]
* CROWDER, CHARLES L. [redacted]
* CROWDER, JOYCE E. [redacted]
CRUSE, CLARENCE A. III [redacted]
* CRUZ, LUIS A. [redacted]
* CSRNKO, DIANE E. [redacted]
* CUCCIA, ANTHONY S., JR. [redacted]
CUDNEY, PAUL R. [redacted]
* CULL, KENNETH J. [redacted]
CULP, MARTIN J. II [redacted]
CUMMINGS, JAMES F. [redacted]
CUMMINGS, JOHN P. [redacted]
CUNNINGHAM, ROBERT A. [redacted]
* CUOZZI, HOWARD R. JR. [redacted]
CURL, JAMES R. [redacted]
CURRAN, CHRISTOPHER F. [redacted]
CURSIO, ROBERT L. JR. [redacted]
CURTIN, JOSEPH G. [redacted]
* CUSIMANO, ANTHONY J. JR. [redacted]
DAGNES, PETER G. [redacted]
DALESSANDRO, ROBERT J. [redacted]
DALLAS, JOY S. [redacted]
DALY, DAWN M. [redacted]
* DANDO, BRIAN J. [redacted]
DANIEL, SHARAN L. [redacted]
* DANISON, MARK A. [redacted]
DANLEY, GARY N. [redacted]
DARDEN, OTIS M. [redacted]
* DARDEN, STEPHEN A. [redacted]
DAUTREMONT, LYNN A. [redacted]
* DAVENPORT, JOHN [redacted]
DAVIDSON, JAMES E. [redacted]
* DAVIS, ANTHONY R. [redacted]
* DAVIS, BENSON [redacted]
* DAVIS, BROOKS S. [redacted]
DAVIS, DARRELL R. [redacted]
DAVIS, JAMES L. [redacted]
* DAVIS, JEFFREY J. [redacted]
DAVIS, JOHN A. [redacted]
* DAVIS, KEITH E. [redacted]
DAVIS, LEE A. [redacted]
* DAVIS, MARGARET D. [redacted]
DAVIS, ROBERT J. JR. [redacted]
* DAVIS, THOMAS E. JR. [redacted]
*DAWSON, DONNA D. [redacted]
DE, LA P. [redacted]
DEARE, CRAIG A. [redacted]
* DECKER, FRANK L. [redacted]
* DECOULAZ, ROBERT P. JR. [redacted]
DEHAAN, DAVID D. [redacted]
DEHORSE, DAVID S. [redacted]
* DELAURIER, ARNOLD P. JR. [redacted]
* DELEON, MARIO [redacted]
DELLASILVA, JOSEPH J. [redacted]
* DELORIA, WAYNE C. [redacted]
DELRE, JAMES F. [redacted]
* DELTON, CAROLYN A. [redacted]
* DEMPSEY, PAT N. [redacted]
DEPAZ, MARGOT J. [redacted]
* DESKINS, ASHLEY A. [redacted]
DESROSIERS, ROBERT C. [redacted]
* DEUTSCH, JOHN P. [redacted]
DEVERILL, SHANE M. [redacted]
DEVINE, STEWART T. [redacted]
DEVITO, DAVID F. [redacted]
DEVLIN, ROBERT J. [redacted]
DEVRIES, DAVID L. [redacted]
DEWITT, THOMAS I. [redacted]
* DEYERLE, LETA S. [redacted]
* DIAZ, PETER [redacted]
* DICKENS, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
* DICKERSON, PAULA E. [redacted]
* DIEGOALLARD, VICTORIA [redacted]
DIETRICH, MAX J. [redacted]
DIGENNARO, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
DIGESU, GARY F. [redacted]
DIGIULIO, STEVEN R. [redacted]
* DILLARD, STEPHEN J. [redacted]
DILLARD, TERENCE L. [redacted]
DILLON, DEIRDRE L. [redacted]
* DILLON, JAMES M. [redacted]
* DINGLE, JAMES E. [redacted]
DISCAVAGE, GREGORY D. [redacted]
* DISCHE, STEVEN T. [redacted]
* DIXON, FORD N. [redacted]
* DIXON, ROLAND M. [redacted]
DOAN, GILBERT E. III [redacted]
* DOBSON, DAVID M. [redacted]
DOCTOR, MICHAEL E. [redacted]
DOLAC, JOHN J. [redacted]
* DOLBY, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
* DOMINGO, ANITA M. [redacted]
DONAHUE, PATRICK J. II [redacted]
* DONOVAN, JOHN H. [redacted]
* DONOVAN, RICHARD F. [redacted]
DOOLEY, JOHN T. [redacted]
DOOLEY, MICHAEL T. [redacted]
DORNSTAUDER, ALEXIS [redacted]
* DOWNIE, ALASTAIR M. [redacted]

DOYLE, DOROTHY S. [redacted]
* DOYLE, KEVIN J. [redacted]
* DOYLE, SAM D. [redacted]
DOYLE, TIMOTHY D. [redacted]
DRAKE, GORDON C. [redacted]
* DRAZENOVICH, DARLENE A. [redacted]
DRUMM, MICHAEL W. [redacted]
DRYER, DAVID A. [redacted]
DUBOSE, EMMETT H. JR. [redacted]
DUBRAVCAK, EDWARD E. [redacted]
* DUCHARME, JIM M. [redacted]
* DUFFY, JAMES W. [redacted]
DUFFY, KENT B. [redacted]
DUFFY, SHARON R. [redacted]
DUFFY, SUSAN R. [redacted]
DUMAS, MARC G. [redacted]
DUNCAN, RONALD M. [redacted]
* DUNLAP, MICHAEL S. [redacted]
DUNN, LARRY E. [redacted]
* DUPPS, ERIC L. [redacted]
DURHAM, EMERY B. [redacted]
DURHAM, TERRIE J. [redacted]
DURNFORD, JEFFREY L. [redacted]
DURR, KIMBERLY K. [redacted]
DWYER, STEPHEN R. [redacted]
* DYDASCO, VICENTE T. JR. [redacted]
* DZERVENS, PAMELA V. [redacted]
* EADES, WARREN A. [redacted]
* EARLY, ELIZABETH A. [redacted]
EASTER, RUSSELL A. [redacted]
ECONOM, JOHN A. [redacted]
EDMISTER, BRENT D. [redacted]
EDMONDS, JAMES A. [redacted]
EDMUNDS, ANDREW A. [redacted]
EDWARDS, FRANK M. III [redacted]
EDWARDS, KELLY M. [redacted]
* EDWARDS, OWEN T. [redacted]
* EDWARDS, ROBERT E. JR. [redacted]
* EHLER, CARL V. [redacted]
EICHHORN, ADRIAN A. [redacted]
EISELE, KENT W. [redacted]
EISSLER, RICHARD K. [redacted]
ELDRIDGE, STEVEN C. [redacted]
ELEFANTE, ELY E. [redacted]
ELLERBE, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
* ELLERS, CONWAY S. [redacted]
ELLINGTON, JERALD W. [redacted]
* ELLIOTT, ALEXANDER C. [redacted]
ELLIS, BRYAN W. [redacted]
*ELLIS, DAVID R. [redacted]
ELLIS, RONNIE T. [redacted]
ELLIS, TRACY L. [redacted]
*ELLOSO, RAYMOND C. [redacted]
EMBERTON, KEITH D. [redacted]
EMBREY, JAMES H. [redacted]
*EMERSON, MARK W. [redacted]
EMMERSON, JOHN S. [redacted]
EMPRIC, BRUCE E. [redacted]
*ENDERLE, RICHARD A. [redacted]
ENDRES, THOMAS J. [redacted]
ENGEN, DONALD W. [redacted]
ENGLISH, EUGENE C. [redacted]
ENNEKING, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
ENO, TIMOTHY J. [redacted]
ESAREY, CLINTON D. [redacted]
*ESPINOSA, SANTOS B. [redacted]
ESPOSITO, MICHAEL B. [redacted]
ESPOSITO, RICHARD M. [redacted]
*EVANS, BETTIE J. [redacted]
*EVANS, GREGORY S. [redacted]
*EVELAND, GEORGE D. JR. [redacted]
*EWELL, WILLIAM S. [redacted]
*EWING, WALTER E. [redacted]
*FAHEY, NICHOLAS F. [redacted]
*FALEN, KENDRA M. [redacted]
*FALLEN, LARRY D. [redacted]
FALLIN, THOMAS N. [redacted]
FANT, MICHAEL A. [redacted]
FARNER, DAVID C. [redacted]
FARNHAM, EDWARD C. [redacted]
FEHN, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
FEHRENBACH, DENNIS D. [redacted]
*FEIERSTEIN, MARK D. [redacted]
FEIL, MICHAEL W. [redacted]
FELTON, LESTER M. [redacted]
FERDERBER, SCOTT M. [redacted]
FIACCO, ANNE [redacted]
FIEDLER, PRINSLOW B. [redacted]
FIELDS, DAVID L. [redacted]
*FIELDS, VINCENT A. [redacted]
*FIGUERRES, JEFFERSON M. [redacted]
FILIPOWICZ, STEPHEN J. [redacted]
FINCH, RAYMOND C. III [redacted]
*FINGER, ROLAND E. [redacted]
FINKE, JON E. [redacted]
*FINLEY, JOHN G. JR. [redacted]
*FIORA, EDWARD L. [redacted]
*FIORE, ALEXANDER C. [redacted]
FISCHBACH, JEFFREY S. [redacted]
*FISHER, EDWARD J. [redacted]
FITE, MARSHALL P. [redacted]
FITZGERALD, DANIEL P. [redacted]
FITZGERALD, TIMOTHY P. [redacted]
FITZPATRICK, KELLY M. [redacted]
FIX, ROBERT G. [redacted]
*FLAGG, ERIC A. [redacted]
FLANGAS, GUS W. [redacted]
FLEMING, RICKIE G. [redacted]
*FLEMONS, RUFUS C. JR. [redacted]
*FLENIKEN, LARRY W. [redacted]
FLOREK, RICHARD A. [redacted]
*FLOYD, HARVEST A. [redacted]

FLYNN, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
FLYNN, MICHAEL T. [redacted]
*FONTANEZ, VICTOR JR. [redacted]
*FORD, WILLIAM G. [redacted]
FORTE, ALLEN N. [redacted]
FOSTER, DUANE K. [redacted]
*FOSTER, JAMES M. [redacted]
*FOSTER, MARK J. [redacted]
FOSTER, MARK S. [redacted]
*FOSTER, STEVEN D. [redacted]
FOUNTAIN, ALTON N. III [redacted]
FOUQUIER, MARK A. [redacted]
*FRANCIS, EDWARD J. [redacted]
FRANKE, THOMAS A. [redacted]
FRASER, KELLY R. [redacted]
FRAZIER, BENJAMIN C. [redacted]
FRIEDMAN, ROBIN B. [redacted]
FRITZ, GREGORY J. [redacted]
FROMM, PETER D. [redacted]
FRUNZI, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
*FRYER, ANDRE R. [redacted]
FUGATT, EDWARD [redacted]
*FULLER, PETER N. [redacted]
*FUNK, PAUL D. [redacted]
*FURGASON, KIMBERLY A. [redacted]
FURR, PHILIP L. [redacted]
GABEL, DOUGLAS L. [redacted]
GABRIEL, BERNARD F. [redacted]
GAEBELEIN, THAD A. [redacted]
GAFFIN, BRIAN E. [redacted]
*GAINES, BOYD D. [redacted]
GALING, STEVEN E. [redacted]
GALLAGHER, WILLIAM J. [redacted]
GALLOUCIS, MICHAEL S. [redacted]
GALYEAN, PATRICK O. [redacted]
GANNON, JOHN J. [redacted]
*GANTT, SILVEN C. [redacted]
GARCIA, DARY L. [redacted]
*GARCIA, GERMAN D. [redacted]
GARCIA, JACOB A. [redacted]
*GARIT, OCTAVIO M. [redacted]
GARRA, NEIL A. [redacted]
GARRETT, ANTHONY R. [redacted]
GARRETT, WILLIAM B. III [redacted]
*GARVEY, DANIEL L. [redacted]
*GARZA, EMILIO JR. [redacted]
*GASKIN, CHARLES E. [redacted]
GASS, GREGORY P. [redacted]
GATES, FRANCIS K. III [redacted]
*GAVIN, REGINALD E. [redacted]
GAYLE, MICHAEL D. [redacted]
GAYLES, CARLTON E. [redacted]
GEIDER, JOHN E. [redacted]
GEIGER, RANDY E. [redacted]
GEISLER, ARNOLD H. [redacted]
GENTRY, DONALD E. [redacted]
GEOGHEGAN, GLENN J. [redacted]
*GEORGE, CLARENCE W. [redacted]
GERMANN, DOUGLAS H. [redacted]
*GERMANN, LEWIS A. [redacted]
*GIBBS, WILMA A. [redacted]
*GIBSON, CHARLES L. [redacted]
GIFFORD, DENISE I. [redacted]
GIFFORD, MICHAEL W. [redacted]
GILDHOUSE, VERNDELL H. [redacted]
GILLEN, WILLIAM J. JR. [redacted]
GILLESPIE, LINDA G. [redacted]
GILLIS, REGINALD R. [redacted]
GILLISON, AARON P. [redacted]
*GLASS, TERRY J. [redacted]
GLEASON, THOMAS P. [redacted]
GNIADEK, JOHN J. [redacted]
*GOEHRING, GREGORY L. [redacted]
*GOERTZ, CHARLES R. [redacted]
GOERTZ, RANDOLPH J. [redacted]
GOLDEN, WALTER M. JR. [redacted]
*GOMEZ, PATRICK M. [redacted]
GONZALEZ, JUAN A. [redacted]
GOODLAND, KATHARINE [redacted]
GOODMAN, ROBERT A. [redacted]
GOODWIN, MIKE D. [redacted]
*GORCZYCA, STANLEY D. [redacted]
GORDON, MARK A. [redacted]
GORE, GEORGE O. [redacted]
GOREVIN, MATTHEW L. [redacted]
GORSKI, FRANK J. III [redacted]
GOSNELL, STEVEN K. [redacted]
GRABOWSKI, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
*GRAEF, KARL H. [redacted]
GRAF, ROBERT E. JR. [redacted]
GRAHAM, BRUCE L. [redacted]
*GRAHAM, DALTON D. [redacted]
*GRAHAM, JESSE R. [redacted]
GRAHAM, ROY J. [redacted]
GRAHEK, RONALD A. JR. [redacted]
GRANATA, SALVATORE M. [redacted]
GRANER, MARK L. [redacted]
GRANT, MICHAEL W. [redacted]
GRASS, PETER T. [redacted]
GRASSE, MARK C. [redacted]
*GRAUL, CHARLES T. [redacted]
GRAWE, REID E. [redacted]
GRAY, DAVID R. [redacted]
*GRAY, MILTON [redacted]
GRAY, THOMAS A. [redacted]
*GRECO, THOMAS F. [redacted]
GREEN, ALLEN L. III [redacted]
GREEN, DAVID K. [redacted]
GREEN, JEFFREY W. [redacted]
GREEN, LENNOX [redacted]
*GREEN, MATTHEW [redacted]
GREEN, STEVEN M. [redacted]

GREENBERG, ALAN M. [redacted]
*GREENBERG, STEVEN M. [redacted]
*GREENE, GUS E. [redacted]
GREENE, HAROLD J. [redacted]
*GREENE, MARGUERITE E. [redacted]
GREENWALD, BRYON E. [redacted]
GREGSON, JEFFREY G. [redacted]
GREWE, RICHARD A. [redacted]
*GREZLIK, STANLEY A. [redacted]
*GRIER, OTIS JR. [redacted]
GRIFFIN, GEORGE A. III [redacted]
*GRIFFIN, GILBERT A. [redacted]
GRIFFIN, JOHN S. [redacted]
GRIFFITH, HARRY A. [redacted]
GRIM, PAUL E. [redacted]
GRIMSLEY, WILLIAM F. [redacted]
GROEFSEMA, JOHN W. [redacted]
*GROOMS, REGINALD C. [redacted]
GROSS, SHAUNE E. [redacted]
GULOTTA, GASPER [redacted]
GUSTAFSON, KARL D. [redacted]
GUTHRIE, DONALD D. [redacted]
*GUTIERREZ, MARCO A. [redacted]
GUTKNECHT, DONALD A. [redacted]
GUY, JOSEPH L. JR. [redacted]
GWIAZDOWSKI, THOMAS P. [redacted]
GWILLIAM, JEFFREY L. [redacted]
*HAAS, KEITH A. [redacted]
HACKER, NED E. [redacted]
HAFEMAN JOSEPH E. [redacted]
HAFER, MARK D. [redacted]
* HAGGINS, KEVIN C. [redacted]
* HAGGINS, MARSHA F. [redacted]
HALE, KIMBAL W. [redacted]
HALE, MATTHEW T. [redacted]
* HALE, PATRICK D. [redacted]
HALL, HOWARD A. [redacted]
HALSTEAD, REBECCA S. [redacted]
* HALVERSON, BARRY G. [redacted]
HAM, JOHNNIE A. [redacted]
HAMMERSTONE, STEVEN J. [redacted]
* HAMPSTON, LINDA J. [redacted]
* HANDS, CHARLES [redacted]
* HANDY, ERIC S. [redacted]
* HANDY, KEITH M. [redacted]
HANDY, RICHARD C. JR. [redacted]
* HANNA, JOHNNY E. [redacted]
HANSCOM RICHARD G. [redacted]
HANSEN, RONALD J. [redacted]
* HANSON, ERIC J. [redacted]
* HANSON, RICKEY L. [redacted]
* HANSON, WILLIAM R. [redacted]
* HANSROTE, CHARLES J. [redacted]
* HARBISON, JERRY A. [redacted]
* HARDMAN, RALPH V. [redacted]
HARGROVE, DARRELL M. [redacted]
* HARLEY, DIANE M. [redacted]
HARLEY, JEFFREY S. [redacted]
* HARMS, DENNIS M. [redacted]
* HARPER, HAROLD S. [redacted]
HARPER, HERBERT D. [redacted]
HARPER, JAMES H. [redacted]
* HARRIS, BENNIE L. III [redacted]
* HARRIS, CLIFFORD C. [redacted]
HARRIS, COLLEEN M. [redacted]
HARRIS, CYNTHIA [redacted]
HARRIS, MICHAEL E. [redacted]
HARRIS, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
* HARRIS, RONNIE A. [redacted]
* HARRIS, SPENCER D. [redacted]
HARRISON, JAMES W. JR. [redacted]
HARRISON, LARRY J. [redacted]
* HARROP, CALVIN L. [redacted]
HARRY, CHARLES A. [redacted]
* HARSHBARGER, KENNETH A. [redacted]
HART, STEVEN M. [redacted]
* HARTL, EDWARD [redacted]
* HARTOS, RANDY R. [redacted]
HARVEY, THOMAS A. [redacted]
* HASTEDT, DAVID A. [redacted]
* HATCHER, ALDENE [redacted]
HATLEY, CHRISTOPHER N. [redacted]
* HAVERTY, ROBERT B. [redacted]
HAWKINS, KEVIN C. [redacted]
* HAYDEN, CARL D. [redacted]
* HAYES, GLENN D. [redacted]
* HAYES, TOMMIE L. [redacted]
HAYNE, RONALD J. [redacted]
HAYES CHARMAINE Y. [redacted]
HAYWOOD, DAVID W. [redacted]
* HAZELWOOD, CHARLOTTE A. [redacted]
HAZLETT, SCOTT D. [redacted]
HEANEY, THOMAS A. JR. [redacted]
HEDRICK, SHIRLEY D. [redacted]
HEHL BRET [redacted]
HEINEY, PAUL L. [redacted]
* HEINZMANN, ROBERT G. [redacted]
HELD, BRUCE J. JR. [redacted]
HELTON, EMORY R. [redacted]
HENCHEN, MICHAEL L. [redacted]
* HENDERSON, EARL A. [redacted]
HENDERSON, JAMES B. [redacted]
* HENDLEY, JAMES G. [redacted]
HENDRICKS, RICHARD S. [redacted]
HENKEL, LOUIS O. [redacted]
* HENNEN, CHRISTOPHER G. [redacted]
HENRY, GREGORY L. [redacted]
HERGENROEDER, DANIEL J. [redacted]
* HERMAN, JOHN A. [redacted]
HERNDON, JEFFERY E. [redacted]
HEROLD, BRENT D. [redacted]
HEROLD, STEVEN M. [redacted]

HERR, DOUGLAS E. [redacted]
* HERRING, JOHN O. [redacted]
* HESTER, MARK E. [redacted]
HETHERINGTON, DAVID L. [redacted]
* HEWITT, STEPHANIE A. [redacted]
* HEWLETT, JEFFREY M. [redacted]
* HEYMANN, ANDREW D. [redacted]
HICKMAN, SHEILA B. [redacted]
HICKMAN, WAYMON L. JR. [redacted]
HICKS, GEORGE A. [redacted]
HIEBERT, GREGORY D. [redacted]
* HIGGINS, CHRIS L. [redacted]
HIGGINS, PATRICK M. [redacted]
HIGGINS, WILLIAM F. JR. [redacted]
* HILGER, MAURICE K. [redacted]
* HILL, HENRY L. [redacted]
HILL, KENNETH D. [redacted]
* HILL, WILLIAM A. [redacted]
*HILLIAN, LAWRENCE [redacted]
HILLIARD, RICHARD L. JR. [redacted]
HILLS, JEFFREY W. [redacted]
HILTON, CARY A. JR. [redacted]
HINGULA, EDWARD T. [redacted]
HIRATA, ANDREW Y. [redacted]
HOBBS, ELI JR. [redacted]
HOBBS, ROBERT C. [redacted]
HODGE, GEORGE E. [redacted]
HOEY, BRIAN J. [redacted]
*HOGAN, CLAYTON L. JR. [redacted]
HOGAN, THOMAS H. [redacted]
HOGG, DAVID R. [redacted]
*HOLLAND, JERRY D. [redacted]
HOLLAND, JOHN R. [redacted]
*HOLLAND, LOUIS C. [redacted]
*HOLLIS, DEBORAH [redacted]
*HOLLOWAY, LARRY W. SR. [redacted]
*HOLLOWAY, RALPH J. [redacted]
*HOLLOWELL, WILLIAM M. [redacted]
*HOLMES, CLAIBORNE C. [redacted]
HOLT, DAVID M. [redacted]
*HOLT, JAMES D. JR. [redacted]
*HOOD, GREGORY D. [redacted]
*HOPE, LARRY A. [redacted]
HOPKINS, GERALD J. [redacted]
HOPKINSON, WILLIAM C. II [redacted]
HOPPER, GARY B. [redacted]
*HORN, ALAN R. [redacted]
HORNER, DONALD H. JR. [redacted]
*HORNER, TIMOTHY J. [redacted]
*HORTON, ALICE D. [redacted]
HOUGHTON, MARVIN G. [redacted]
*HOWARD, JAMES T. [redacted]
HOWARD, JOHN C. [redacted]
*HOWARD, KEVIN S. [redacted]
*HOWELL, RAVIN L. [redacted]
*HOWERTON, JOHN W. [redacted]
HOWLE, ROY C. JR. [redacted]
HRDY, RUSSELL J. [redacted]
HUDSON, EARLE F. JR. [redacted]
*HUEBER, DALE A. [redacted]
HUGGAR, ANTONIO S. [redacted]
HUGGINS, JAMES L. JR. [redacted]
HUGGINS, LYNDON W. [redacted]
HUGGLER, SUSAN L. [redacted]
*HUGHES, JOHN M. [redacted]
*HUGHES, MICHELLE A. [redacted]
HUGHES, PEGGY D. [redacted]
*HUGHES, VINCENT O. [redacted]
HULL, HAYWARD A. [redacted]
HUNT, ANTHONY J. [redacted]
*HUNT, TIMOTHY P. [redacted]
*HURLEY, BRIAN R. [redacted]
HURLEY, MARK S. [redacted]
*HURST, ELIZABETH A. [redacted]
*HUSTON, JAY P. [redacted]
HUTCHINSON, ELBERT [redacted]
HUTZKY, PAUL E. III [redacted]
HYDE, DONALD B. JR. [redacted]
IRBY, ROBERT J. IV [redacted]
IRONS, TRACHETA L. [redacted]
*IRVIN, JOHNNY W. [redacted]
IRVIN, VICTOR D. [redacted]
ISBELL, DONALD N. [redacted]
ISHAM, HOLLIS D. [redacted]
*ISKRA, CHRISTOPHER E. [redacted]
*ISOM, RONALD G. [redacted]
IVES, JOHN W. [redacted]
*IVEY, BENJAMIN J. [redacted]
IVY, CARL G. [redacted]
*IVY, LENORA A. [redacted]
*JACARUSO, JAMES N. [redacted]
*JACKSON, ELESTER [redacted]
JACKSON, JOCELYN R. [redacted]
*JACKSON, RAYMOND P. [redacted]
*JACKSON, WILLIAM E. [redacted]
JACOBS, CHRISTOPHER A. [redacted]
JACOBS, JOHN F. III [redacted]
JAHN, WILLIAM C. [redacted]
JAMES, MARK S. [redacted]
JAQUES, CHRISTIAN K. [redacted]
JARRETT, JAMES E. [redacted]
*JARVIS, DANIEL M. [redacted]
*JASSEY, ROBERT L. JR. [redacted]
JEFFERSON, TOM M. [redacted]
JELINEK, ALFRED T. [redacted]
*JENKINS, ANTONIO [redacted]
JENKINS, CLARE K. [redacted]
*JENKINS, CYNTHIA G. [redacted]
*JENKINS, ERNEST G. JR. [redacted]
JENNINGS, KAREN L. [redacted]
*JENNINGS, MARTIN [redacted]
JENNINGS, TRAVIS D. JR. [redacted]

*JERNIGAN, MICHAEL V. [redacted]
JESMER, DAVID G. JR [redacted]
JESSIE, FRANK JR [redacted]
JESSUP, REX E. [redacted]
JEWELL, JOSEPH D. [redacted]
JOHNSON, BRADLEY N. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, DARIEL W. [redacted]
JOHNSON, DEBRA A. [redacted]
JOHNSON, FULTON R. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, GERALD C. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, GREGORY W. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, GWENDOLYN B. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, JAY A. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, JONATHAN M. [redacted]
JOHNSON, KAREN E. [redacted]
JOHNSON, KEITHA V. [redacted]
JOHNSON, MARCUS L. [redacted]
JOHNSON, MARK [redacted]
*JOHNSON, NANCY A. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, PATRICK C. [redacted]
JOHNSON, ROBERT C. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, SHIRLEY R. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, THEODORE C. JR. [redacted]
JOHNSON, THOMAS W. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, WAYNE P. [redacted]
*JOHNSON, WILLIAM M. [redacted]
JOHNSONKINDLE, SILVERLENE [redacted]
JOHNSTON, GARY E. [redacted]
JOHNSTON, SUSAN R. [redacted]
JOHNSTON, WILLIAM F. JR. [redacted]
*JOINER, JAMES D. [redacted]
*JOLLY, TIMOTHY C. [redacted]
JONES, ALVEN [redacted]
*JONES, BURRELL L. III [redacted]
JONES, DALTON, R. [redacted]
JONES, ERNEST W. [redacted]
*JONES, FREDRICK L. [redacted]
*JONES, HOPE M. [redacted]
*JONES, KENNETH C. [redacted]
JONES, LETAZ S. [redacted]
*JONES, PAMELLA C. [redacted]
*JONES, RICHARD L. [redacted]
JONES, STEVE L. [redacted]
JONES, STEVEN M. [redacted]
*JONES, VALENCIA A. [redacted]
JORDAN, BENJAMIN W., [redacted]
JORDAN, EDWARD F. JR. [redacted]
*JOST, BRIAN A. [redacted]
JOYNER, JAMES M. [redacted]
JUDD, DOUGLAS E. [redacted]
JUDY, KENT K. [redacted]
JUNTUNEN, KIM M. [redacted]
KACSUR, CHARLES J. JR. [redacted]
KADESCH, BRENT L. [redacted]
*KAGLER, PURNELL [redacted]
*KALIHER, ANTHONY G. [redacted]
KALLAM, BOBBY H. [redacted]
*KAM, VINCENT W. [redacted]
KANE, JOHN S. [redacted]
*KANZENBACH, JAMES, M. [redacted]
KAPPLAN, BARRY S. [redacted]
KARCH, JOHN C. [redacted]
KASPERSEN, KEITH W. [redacted]
KATZ, KEITH T. [redacted]
*KAUMANS, RICHARD W. [redacted]
*KEARNEY, JOHN F. JR. [redacted]
*KEARNEY, RICHARD F. [redacted]
KECK, RICHARD E. [redacted]
KEE, THOMAS J. III [redacted]
KEEGAN, WILLIAM T. [redacted]
*KEELER, BILLIE W. [redacted]
*KEITH, BARRY L. [redacted]
KELLAR, CHARLES S. [redacted]
*KELLER, HARRY H. III [redacted]
KELLETTFORSYTH, SUSAN P. [redacted]
*KELLEY, GEORGE R. JR. [redacted]
*KELLIHER, MICHAEL P. [redacted]
KELLY, KEVIN W. [redacted]
KELLY, PATRICK III [redacted]
*KELLY, PAUL J. [redacted]
KELLY, STEPHEN E. [redacted]
*KELLY, WILLIAM P. [redacted]
*KEMPF, RICHARD J. [redacted]
*KEMPFE, ROBERT E. [redacted]
*KEMPTON, DEBRA, A. [redacted]
*KENDALL, JOHN F. [redacted]
KENDRICK, WILLIAM D. [redacted]
*KENNEALLY, ROBERT W., JR. [redacted]
KENNEY, RICHARD P. [redacted]
KENNY, KEVIN B. [redacted]
KEPF, NICHOLAS C. [redacted]
*KERKHOFF, KEITH C. [redacted]
*KIDD, JOHN, M. [redacted]
*KIDD, WILLIAM G. [redacted]
KIDWELL, THOMAS S. [redacted]
KILGORE, THOMAS E. [redacted]
KILPATRICK, GAIL D. [redacted]
*KIM, WOOCHAN [redacted]
KIMATA, NORMAN W. [redacted]
*KIMURA, RODNEY W. [redacted]
*KINCAID, BEVERLEY R. [redacted]
*KING, DAVID L. [redacted]
KING, KENNETH M. [redacted]
*KING, PATRICIA A. [redacted]
KINNE, GARY S. [redacted]
*KINNEY, ROBERT D. [redacted]
KINNIBURGH, MARK A. [redacted]
*KIRMSE, KEVIN M. [redacted]
KLACZAK, MARK C. [redacted]
KLECKER, DANIEL J. [redacted]
KLEIN, ROBERT E. [redacted]
*KLIMAS, DIANE L. [redacted]

*KLUGE, KURT N. [redacted]
KNAPP, JEFFREY P. [redacted]
KNAPP, MICHAEL S. [redacted]
*KNIGHT, ALFRED K. [redacted]
KNIGHT, ROBERT K. [redacted]
*KNUDSON, DAVID B. [redacted]
KNUTILLA, THOMAS R. [redacted]
KOENIG, GREGORY P. [redacted]
KOEPP, MARIANNE A. [redacted]
KOHLMANN, JAMES P. [redacted]
KOLDITZ, THOMAS A. [redacted]
KONING, THOMAS L. [redacted]
*KOSLOSKY, ROBERT F. [redacted]
*KOSTOPOULOS, ANGELOS [redacted]
KOZLOWSKI, JAN M. [redacted]
KRAL, RITA A. [redacted]
*KRAMER, DON J., JR. [redacted]
*KRAUSE, DAVID M. [redacted]
KRCELIC, ROBERT L. [redacted]
KREIDER, STEPHEN D. [redacted]
KREYER, MARK W. [redacted]
*KUJALA, ORION N. [redacted]
KURKA, MIROSLAV P. [redacted]
KUYK, CHARLES M. [redacted]
*LACEY, JAMES G. [redacted]
LACOMBE, DAVID E. [redacted]
*LACOT, ANTERO, JR. [redacted]
*LAFATE, KINARD J. [redacted]
LAGEMAN, WENDY R. [redacted]
*LAMMERS, MARY A. [redacted]
*LAMPROS, STEVE J., JR. [redacted]
*LANDAU, JEFFREY L. [redacted]
LANDRY, CHARLES V. [redacted]
LANEY, MARK N. [redacted]
LANG, JEFFREY B. [redacted]
*LANGDON, KIM D. [redacted]
LANZA, STEPHEN R. [redacted]
LAPORTE, ROY C. [redacted]
*LARSON, DAVID K. [redacted]
*LASKI, PAUL A. [redacted]
LASSAN, JOSEF R., III [redacted]
*LASTER, BILLY J., JR. [redacted]
*LAUBER, JAY C. [redacted]
LAUDAN, JOHN E. [redacted]
*LAVERTY, KEITH R. [redacted]
LAVIN, STEPHEN R. [redacted]
*LAW, SCOTT W. [redacted]
*LAWRENCE, STEPHEN A. [redacted]
*LAWSON, MICHAEL K. [redacted]
LEACH, ROBERT B. [redacted]
*LEATHERWOOD, JAYNE A. [redacted]
LEAVITT, ROBERT B. [redacted]
LEDGER, RICHARD Y. [redacted]
LEE, ALVIN K. [redacted]
*LEE, CHRISTINE M. [redacted]
LEE, DOUGLAS J. [redacted]
*LEE, EDWIN W. [redacted]
LEE, HOWARD E. [redacted]
*LEE, SAMMY G. [redacted]
LEE, WILLIAM F. [redacted]
*LEFURGE, CHARLES E. [redacted]
LEGARE, JEAN M. [redacted]
LEITZEL, ROBERT D. [redacted]
LEMAUK, DAVID B. [redacted]
LEMIRE, JUDITH K. [redacted]
LEONARDI, JOHN L. [redacted]
LESTER, FRANK C., JR. [redacted]
LESTER, RICHARD K. [redacted]
*LEWIS, ARTHUR L. [redacted]
*LEWIS, DAVID N. [redacted]
LEWIS, DEBRA M. [redacted]
LEWIS, WINSTON E. [redacted]
LEYDA, CHRISTOPHER D. [redacted]
*LICHTENSTEIN, WENDY D. [redacted]
LIEN, JAMES A. [redacted]
*LIESE, DAVID M. [redacted]
LIGHTNER, JOHN W., JR. [redacted]
*LIND, EDWARD J. [redacted]
*LINDQUIST, MARK E. [redacted]
LINEHAN, MICHAEL J. [redacted]
LINNINGTON, MICHAEL S. [redacted]
LISTOE, KENT R. [redacted]
LITAVEC, DOUGLAS J. [redacted]
LITHGOW, AMY L. [redacted]
LITTLE, RICHARD M. [redacted]
LITTLETON, ERIC C. [redacted]
*LIVINGSTON, FRANK D. [redacted]
*LLOYD, BRIDGEMAN R. [redacted]
LOBBAN, JAMES M. [redacted]
LOCKE, PRISCILLA W. [redacted]
LOCLEAR, JODY C. [redacted]
*LOCKWOOD, GEORGE T. [redacted]
LOEFSTEDT, ARTHUR B., III [redacted]
LOGAN, DAVID W. [redacted]
LOISELLE, RONALD M. [redacted]
LONG, FRANCIS K. [redacted]
*LONG, GREGORY T. [redacted]
*LONG, HUGH B., JR. [redacted]
*LONG, KRISTIE A. [redacted]
LONG, LONNIE G. [redacted]
LONGO, RICHARD C. [redacted]
LOONEY, STEPHEN [redacted]
* LOPERGOLO, MICHAEL F. [redacted]
* LOPEZ, ISMAEL [redacted]
LOPEZ, RAYMOND [redacted]
LOPRESTI, CATHERINE E. [redacted]
* LORD, EMORY S. [redacted]
LOSSETT, AUSTIN H. [redacted]
LOVEN, WILLIAM R. [redacted]
LOVERING, CALVIN S. JR. [redacted]
LOWDER, JOSEPH B. [redacted]
* LOWE, DAVID W. [redacted]

* LOWE, JOSEPH A. [redacted]
* LOWMAN, BARRY [redacted]
* LOWMAN, VALLORY E. [redacted]
* LOWMAN, WARREN K. [redacted]
LOZON, ROSS A. [redacted]
LUBBERS, JOHN W. III [redacted]
LUCIER, CHRISTOPHER H. [redacted]
LUCKETT, DOUGLAS L. [redacted]
LUKEFAHR, BENJAMIN D. [redacted]
* LUMPKIN, ALTON R. [redacted]
LUNDQUIST, VICKI M. [redacted]
LUNSFORD, JAMES R. [redacted]
LUSK, CHRISTOPHER B. [redacted]
LUTTMANN, MICHAEL W. [redacted]
* LYDON, JOHN W. III [redacted]
LYME, DONALD L. [redacted]
LYNCH, WILLIAM C. [redacted]
MAAGE, DONALD W. [redacted]
* MACCAMMON, RONALD K. [redacted]
MACDERMOTT, RICHARD S. [redacted]
MACDONALD, ANNE F. [redacted]
MACDOUGALL, ARTHUR C. [redacted]
* MACEJKO, MARK J. [redacted]
MACK, GABRIELE E. [redacted]
* MACK, WINFRED R. JR. [redacted]
MACLEAN, DAVID G. [redacted]
* MACLEOD, DONALD C. [redacted]
MACNEILL, BRUCE F. [redacted]
MADERA, JORGE L. [redacted]
MAGGIONCALDA, EUGENE P. [redacted]
* MAHLEBJIAN, LISA C. [redacted]
MAIBERGER, ROBERT M. [redacted]
MAINS, STEVEN J. [redacted]
* MALDONADO, JOSE R. [redacted]
* MALLORY, PAUL S. [redacted]
MALONE, ANTHONY S. [redacted]
* MALONE, WILLIAM T. [redacted]
MANCINI, GEORGE M. [redacted]
MANDERVILLE, SCOTT [redacted]
MANGAN, THOMAS J. III [redacted]
* MANN, CHERYL D. [redacted]
* MANN, JENNIFER J. [redacted]
* MANN, MELVIN D. [redacted]
MANNING, BRUCE F. [redacted]
MANNING, JOHN R. JR. [redacted]
MANOS, ANGELA M. [redacted]
MANOUS, JOE D. JR. [redacted]
MAPLES, DAVID L. [redacted]
MARCH, STANLEY R. [redacted]
MARCK, DAVID W. [redacted]
MARICH, LOU L. [redacted]
* MARIN, ALBERT G. III [redacted]
* MARSHALL, KAREN G. [redacted]
* MARSZALEK, MARC E. [redacted]
MARTIN, FRANK A. III [redacted]
MARTIN, PAUL K. [redacted]
* MARTIN, RONALD L. [redacted]
MARTINEZ, AXEL [redacted]
MARTUCCI, PETER A. JR. [redacted]
* MASON, MICHAEL R. [redacted]
* MASTERS, ARVEL W. [redacted]
MASTERS, KARL A. [redacted]
* MASTROMICHALIS, GEORGE S. [redacted]
MATEER, SHAWN M. [redacted]
MATTHEWS, JACOB P. III [redacted]
* MATTHEWS, KENNETH D. [redacted]
* MATTHEWS, MARY E. [redacted]
MATTHEWS, RICHARD W. [redacted]
MATTINGLY, JOHN A. [redacted]
* MAUGHN, WILLIAM T. [redacted]
MAUSS, IRENE G. [redacted]
MAY, BRADLEY W. [redacted]
* MAY, MARIE A. [redacted]
MAY, PHILLIP H., [redacted]
* MAYNARD, REUBEN W. [redacted]
,MAYR ROBERT D. [redacted]
MCALLISTER, MARILYN M. [redacted]
MCAULIFFE, DENNIS P. [redacted]
* MCCARTHY, PATRICK A. [redacted]
MCCARTHY, PATRICK G. [redacted]
MCCARTHY, PATRICK W. [redacted]
MCCARVILLE, MATTHEW M. [redacted]
MCCAUGHEY, RICAHRD I. [redacted]
MCCAULEY, NATHAN E. III [redacted]
MCCLANAHAN, JACK R. JR. [redacted]
* MCCLEARY, MARTIN C. [redacted]
* MCCLELLAN, CHERYL A. [redacted]
* MCCOART, ROBERT J. II [redacted]
MCCONVILLE, JAMES C., [redacted]
MCCORKLE, ROBERT D. [redacted]
MCCOY, EDWARD D. [redacted]
*MCCULLOUGH, MARY B. [redacted]
MCCUNE, JAMES D. [redacted]
MCDANIELS, LLOYD E. [redacted]
MCDONALD, GERALD M. [redacted]
*MCDONALD, HAROLD S. [redacted]
*MCDONALD, SUSAN L. [redacted]
*MCDOUGALL, JAMES C. [redacted]
*MCEWEN, HARRY O. [redacted]
*MCGUINESS, MATTHEW H. [redacted]
*MCGUINN, MICHAEL E. IV [redacted]
MCGUIRE, DONALD V., [redacted]
*MCKEE, WALTER L. [redacted]
*MCKENNA, DAVID J. [redacted]
MCKEON, JANE H. [redacted]
MCKINNEY, MARSHALL E. [redacted]
*MCKINNEY, RICHARD T. [redacted]
*MCKINNEY, WILLIAM R. [redacted]
MCKNIGHT, JOHN L. JR. [redacted]
*MCLAMB, NATHAN A. [redacted]
MCMAHON, ANDREW R. [redacted]
MCMAHON, MICHAEL J. [redacted]

*MCMILLAN, MILTON M. xxx-xx-x...
*MCMILLIAN, DONALD G. xxx-xx-x...
MCMILLIN, KENNETH M. xxx-xx-x...
MCMULLIN, ROBERT C. xxx-xx-x...
MCNEELY, JAMES P. xxx-xx-x...
MCNEIL, RONALD D. xxx-xx-x...
*MCNEILL, WILLIAM R. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
MCNULTY, JAMES W. xxx-xx-x...
MCNULTY, TIMOTHY K. xxx-xx-x...
*MCPEEK, ROBERT L. xxx-xx-x...
MCPHEETERS, SCOTT K. xxx-xx-x...
*MCQUAIN, PAUL M. xxx-xx-x...
*MCQUEEN, BOBBY S. xxx-xx-x...
MCQUEEN, DANNY M. xxx-xx-x...
*MCSHANE, LAWRENCE K. xxx-xx-x...
MCVANEY, GARY P. xxx-xx-x...
*MCWATTERS, WILLIAM T. xxx-xx-x...
MCWILLIAMS, DAVID R. xxx-xx-x...
*MEAD, DANIEL N. xxx-xx-x...
MEADERS, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
MEADOR, MARTIN R. xxx-xx-x...
MEADOWS, PLAUDY M. III xxx-xx-x...
MEALER, ROBIN L. xxx-xx-x...
MEDINA, RUSSELL P. xxx-xx-x...
*MEDLEY, WILLIAM J. xxx-xx-x...
MEEKS, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-x...
MEESE, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
MEIDENBAUER, WILLIAM A. xxx-xx-x...
*MELIUS, MARK S. xxx-xx-x...
*MEMMINGER, TONY A. xxx-xx-x...
*MENDONCA, LAWRENCE A. xxx-xx-x...
*MENGERT, CRAIG A. xxx-xx-x...
*MENNE, BARRY T. xxx-xx-x...
*MERCADO, RUBEN JR. xxx-xx-x...
MERENESS, GORDON H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MERRELL, PHILIP R. xxx-xx-x...
MERRILL, RALPH F. xxx-xx-x...
MERRIMAN, RONALD S. xxx-xx-x...
MERVA, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-x...
*MERVIN, LEONARD A. xxx-xx-x...
METCALF, CAROLYN S. xxx-xx-x...
*MEYER, JEFFREY C. xxx-xx-x...
*MEYER, KENNETH H. xxx-xx-x...
MILAK, ARTHUR G. xxx-xx-x...
MILANI, ANDREW N. II xxx-xx-x...
MILES, JEFFREY T. xxx-xx-x...
*MILES, JEROME xxx-xx-x...
MILLAN, GEORGE J. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLARD, DAVID A. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, CECIL F. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, DAVID G. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, EDWARD C. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, EDWARD G. xxx-xx-x...
MILLER, FRANK L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MILLER, GREGORY S. xxx-xx-x...
MILLER, MARC W. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, NORMAN F. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, RICHARD W. xxx-xx-x...
*MILLER, SHANE M. xxx-xx-x...
MILLER, STEVEN N. xxx-xx-x...
MILLER, WILLIAM J. xxx-xx-x...
MILLEY, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
MILLS, RICKY W. xxx-xx-x...
*MILSTER, CHARLES E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MILTNER, KRISTOPHER F. xxx-xx-x...
MILTON, DAVID S. xxx-xx-x...
*MILTON, THOMAS J. xxx-xx-x...
MINADEO, GARY A. xxx-xx-x...
MINAHAN, JOHN R. xxx-xx-x...
MINER, ANNA T. xxx-xx-x...
*MINTZ, TERRY L. xxx-xx-x...
MIRAVALLE, ROBERT J. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MISHKEL, KENNETH M. xxx-xx-x...
MISNER, ERIN M. xxx-xx-x...
MITCHELL, MAX H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*MOBLEY, RUFUS F. III xxx-xx-x...
MOELLER, DAVID E. xxx-xx-x...
MOELLER, JOHN M. xxx-xx-x...
MOENTMANN, JAMES E. xxx-xx-x...
*MOHAMMED, H A. xxx-xx-x...
*MONGO, RENEE M. xxx-xx-x...
*MONNIER, JANELLE L. xxx-xx-x...
MONTGOMERY, ALEXANDER J. xxx-xx-x...
*MONTGOMERY, BEVERLY I. xxx-xx-x...
*MOODY, ANTHONY T. xxx-xx-x...
MOODY, JAMES E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MOODY, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
MOORE, IRA D. xxx-xx-x...
*MOORE, JAMES M. xxx-xx-x...
*MOORE, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
*MOORE, ROSS P. xxx-xx-x...
MOORE, STEVEN D. xxx-xx-x...
MOOSE, PAUL K. xxx-xx-x...
MOOSMANN, CHRISTOPHER P. xxx-xx-x...
*MORAN, JAMES P. xxx-xx-x...
MORAN, SYLVIA T. xxx-xx-x...
MORAN, TIMOTHY M. xxx-xx-x...
*MOREIRA, CESAR A. xxx-xx-x...
MORETTI, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-x...
MORGAN, LOUIS P. xxx-xx-x...
MORGAN, WILLIAM F. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MORGESE, FRANK xxx-xx-x...
MORGIDA, MARK F. xxx-xx-x...
*MORRIS, BILLY W. xxx-xx-x...
MORRIS, BRETT E. xxx-xx-x...
MORRIS, DEAN C. xxx-xx-x...
MORRIS, ROBERT P. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*MORRISON, MARK L. xxx-xx-x...
*MORTONLINEK, NANCY M. xxx-xx-x...
*MORUZA, PAUL D. xxx-xx-x...
*MOSELY, ERIC E. xxx-xx-x...
MOSHER, RANDY D. xxx-xx-x...
MOSINSKI, DAVID A. xxx-xx-x...
MOSS, WALTER R. xxx-xx-x...
MOUNTAIN, ANDREW M. xxx-xx-x...
*MOYLAN, KEVIN J. xxx-xx-x...
MROZEK, ALBERT A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MUDD, MICHAEL G. xxx-xx-x...
MUEHLBERG, STEPHEN E. xxx-xx-x...
MUELLER, MARY J. xxx-xx-x...
*MUNIZ, JOSE L. xxx-xx-x...
MUNN, CHRISTOPHER J. xxx-xx-x...
MUNN, JEFFREY W. xxx-xx-x...
MUNYON, DAVID W. xxx-xx-x...
MURDAUGH, GEORGE B. xxx-xx-x...
MURPHY, DONALD E. xxx-xx-x...
MURPHY, JAMES M. xxx-xx-x...
MURPHY, NATALIE E. xxx-xx-x...
*MURPHY, RUFUS R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
MUSTION, RICHARD P. xxx-xx-x...
MYERS, DAVID B. xxx-xx-x...
MYERS, EARL C. II xxx-xx-x...
MYERS, LEANDER W. xxx-xx-x...
*MYERS, SHIRLEY A. xxx-xx-x...
MYERS, SUSAN R. xxx-xx-x...
NAESSENS, EDWARD P. xxx-xx-x...
NAGY, PAUL E. xxx-xx-x...
NAPIER, JOYCE P. xxx-xx-x...
*NAPIER, KELLY xxx-xx-x...
*NAPIER, THOMAS Z. xxx-xx-x...
NAPOLI, JOSEPH F. I xxx-xx-x...
NASH, DOUGLAS E. xxx-xx-x...
*NEELY, GEORGE J. xxx-xx-x...
NEGRON, EDGARDO L. xxx-xx-x...
NEKULA, KEVIN E. xxx-xx-x...
NELSON, CLAIRE M. xxx-xx-x...
NELSON, DOUGLAS H. xxx-xx-x...
*NELSON, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
*NELSON, JAMES P. xxx-xx-x...
*NELSON, KENWYN G. JR. xxx-xx-x...
NELSON, RANDY C. xxx-xx-x...
NELSON, ROBERT S. xxx-xx-x...
NELSON, RODNEY C. xxx-xx-x...
NESS, MARLIN A. xxx-xx-x...
NESTOR, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
*NEUMANN, MARKUS R. xxx-xx-x...
*NEUMANN, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
*NEUMANN, ROBERT C. xxx-xx-x...
NEWELL, DONNA S. xxx-xx-x...
NEWELL, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
NEWFROCK, JOSEPH R. xxx-xx-x...
*NEWSOME, JARVIS xxx-xx-x...
*NEWSOME, TRICIA xxx-xx-x...
NEWTON, JEFFERY I. xxx-xx-x...
*NEWTON, JOHN C. III xxx-xx-x...
*NEWTON, MARK F. xxx-xx-x...
*NEWTON, WENDELL A. xxx-xx-x...
*NICHOLSON, JOHN R. III xxx-xx-x...
NICHOLSON, ROBERT K. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*NICHOLSON, ROBERT W. xxx-xx-x...
*NICKELS, DAVID L. xxx-xx-x...
NOLAN, STEPHEN J. xxx-xx-x...
*NORELL, DUANE C. xxx-xx-x...
*NORGAARD, KEVIN R. xxx-xx-x...
NORRIS, KEITH S. xxx-xx-x...
NORTON, DOUGLAS J. xxx-xx-x...
*NORWOOD, DEBORAH E. xxx-xx-x...
NORWOOD, JOHN D. xxx-xx-x...
*NOVELL, CHARLES xxx-xx-x...
NOWAK, GEORGE A. xxx-xx-x...
*NUGENT, PATRICK J. xxx-xx-x...
NYKYFORCHYN, DEBORAH L. xxx-xx-x...
* OAKLEY, JACKIE R. xxx-xx-x...
OBRIEN, BEATRIZ A. xxx-xx-x...
* OBRIEN, KEVIN R. xxx-xx-x...
OBRIEN, MARY E. xxx-xx-x...
OCKRASSA, BRIGID xxx-xx-x...
ODONNELL, JAMES G. xxx-xx-x...
* OHLIN, ROBERT A. xxx-xx-x...
OKEEFE, GERALD B. xxx-xx-x...
OLIVER, KAREN J. xxx-xx-x...
* OLSON, GREG D. xxx-xx-x...
OLWELL, DAVID H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
ORGAN, CHARLES L. xxx-xx-x...
ORMSON, MITCHELL D. xxx-xx-x...
ORRIS, ANDREW J. xxx-xx-x...
* ORSINI, ROBERT H. xxx-xx-x...
ORTIZABREU, ROBERT JR. xxx-xx-x...
* OSTROM, PETER R. xxx-xx-x...
OUTLAND, GREGORY W. xxx-xx-x...
OUTLAND, MARTINEZ xxx-xx-x...
* OVERBY, TODD A. xxx-xx-x...
OWEN, PETER T. xxx-xx-x...
* OWENS, BARNEY C. xxx-xx-x...
OWENS, CHRISTOPHER H. xxx-xx-x...
* PADDEN, ALFRED J. xxx-xx-x...
PAGAN, HECTOR E. xxx-xx-x...
* PAIGE, CURTIS J. xxx-xx-x...
PAINTER, ROBERT F. xxx-xx-x...
* PALECZNY, WILBUR P. xxx-xx-x...
PALMER, RUFUS D. III xxx-xx-x...
* PALMER, SAMUEL L. xxx-xx-x...
* PALSHA, JAMES xxx-xx-x...
PALUMBO, RAYMOND P. xxx-xx-x...
PANTON, STEVEN W. xxx-xx-x...
* PARIS, DAVID E. xxx-xx-x...
PARIS, JAMES M. xxx-xx-x...
PARKER, DONNA M. xxx-xx-x...
PARKER, JAMES P. xxx-xx-x...
PARKER, JOEL R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PARKER, RICHARD H. xxx-xx-x...
PARKER, WILBUR A. xxx-xx-x...
PARKINSON, RANDAL L. xxx-xx-x...
* PARRA, MORRIS B. xxx-xx-x...
PARRIS, SAMUEL J. xxx-xx-x...
PARSHLEY, STEPHEN P. xxx-xx-x...
* PARSLEY, MICHAEL L. xxx-xx-x...
PATRICK, LEAH M. xxx-xx-x...
* PATTERSON, WILLIAM N. xxx-xx-x...
PAULEY, ROSS D. xxx-xx-x...
PAVLIK, GEORGE F. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PAYNE, CHARLES T. xxx-xx-x...
PAYNE, EDWARD W. xxx-xx-x...
PAYNE, JEROME F. xxx-xx-x...
* PAYNE, JOHN B. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PEAK, WILLIAM B. xxx-xx-x...
PEARSALL, GILBERT H. xxx-xx-x...
* PEDERSEN, KATHLEEN M. xxx-xx-x...
* PEEBLES, KENNETH L. xxx-xx-x...
* PEED, DUNCAN V. xxx-xx-x...
* PELCHER, JOHN C. xxx-xx-x...
PELIZZON, DAVID R. xxx-xx-x...
* PELLEGRINO, KEVIN R. xxx-xx-x...
* PELTON, JOHN D. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PEREZ, RODRIGUEZ A. xxx-xx-x...
PEREZ, STEPHEN J. xxx-xx-x...
* PERGANDE, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
* PERKINS, RODNEY W. xxx-xx-x...
PERKINS, STEPHEN P. xxx-xx-x...
PERKINS, WILLIAM E. xxx-xx-x...
PERRIN, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
* PERRIS, BRIAN C. xxx-xx-x...
PERRITT, CHRISTSINE B. xxx-xx-x...
* PERRONE, THOMAS B. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PESKO, MICHAEL JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PESNELL, ANTHONY S. xxx-xx-x...
PETERS, DAVID L. xxx-xx-x...
PETERS, RALPH H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
PETERS, STEVEN E. xxx-xx-x...
PETREE, MARK B. xxx-xx-x...
PETRO, ROBERT O. xxx-xx-x...
* PETTUS, REGINALD E. xxx-xx-x...
PFENNING, MICHAEL P. xxx-xx-x...
PFLUKE, LILLIAN A. xxx-xx-x...
PHELPS, WILLIAM G. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PHILIPS, RONALD K. xxx-xx-x...
* PHILLIPS, CHRIS A. xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIPS, DAVID D. xxx-xx-x...
PHILLIPS, DON A. xxx-xx-x...
PICK, MICHAEL W. xxx-xx-x...
* PIDGEON, ROBERT F. xxx-xx-x...
PIERCE, DONALD R. xxx-xx-x...
* PILLION, STEVEN E. xxx-xx-x...
PINER, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
PIRO, SCOTT D. xxx-xx-x...
* PLEASANT, DAVID xxx-xx-x...
* PLUMMER, RICHARD L. xxx-xx-x...
PLUNKETT, ALLEN E. xxx-xx-x...
POLASKE, TIMOTHY J. xxx-xx-x...
POLCZYNSKI, KENNITH D. xxx-xx-x...
POLLARD, JAMES E. xxx-xx-x...
POLLARD, WAYNE A. xxx-xx-x...
POLO, RICHARD J. JR. xxx-xx-x...
POMERLEAU, JAMES E. xxx-xx-x...
PONDER, RANDALL D. xxx-xx-x...
PONTIUS, WILLIAM M. xxx-xx-x...
* POPE, WILLIAM R. xxx-xx-x...
PORCH, MICHAEL W. xxx-xx-x...
PORTELLI, ALEX R. xxx-xx-x...
PORTOUW, LAWRENCE J. xxx-xx-x...
POST, GREGORY A. xxx-xx-x...
* POTTER, TERRY W. xxx-xx-x...
POTTS, CURTIS D. xxx-xx-x...
POWELL, DAVID D. JR. xxx-xx-x...
POWELL, DEAN A. xxx-xx-x...
* POWELL, JULIENNE xxx-xx-x...
* POWELL, MICHAEL C. xxx-xx-x...
* POWELL, STEPHEN J. xxx-xx-x...
* POWERS, HENRY S. III xxx-xx-x...
PRANKE, SUSAN A. xxx-xx-x...
PRANTL, CARL JR. xxx-xx-x...
PRESSLEY, CLARE M. xxx-xx-x...
PRESSWOOD, DONALD xxx-xx-x...
* PRESTRIDGE, GEORGE N. JR. xxx-xx-x...
PRICE, JAMES A. III xxx-xx-x...
PROHODA, GEORGE xxx-xx-x...
PRUETT, THOMAS K. JR. xxx-xx-x...
PRUITT, JERRY G. xxx-xx-x...
PRUSINSKI, STANLEY J. xxx-xx-x...
PRYOR, LARRY R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* PRYOR, LAWRENCE R. xxx-xx-x...
PUCCI, MARTIN E. xxx-xx-x...
PUCKETT, ANTHONY J. xxx-xx-x...
PUENTES, CARLOS A. xxx-xx-x...
* PUSTER, DAVID W. xxx-xx-x...
PUSTY, DANIEL xxx-xx-x...
QUALLS, JOHN M. xxx-xx-x...
QUANTOCK, DAVID E. xxx-xx-x...
QUIGLEY, BRIAN F. xxx-xx-x...
* QUINCY, MICHAEL L. xxx-xx-x...
QUINTANA, FLOYD A. xxx-xx-x...
* QUISTORF, WILLIAM C. xxx-xx-x...
* RADCLIFFE, VICTORIA A. xxx-xx-x...
* RAINEY, DIANA M. xxx-xx-x...
RAINEY, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
RAINEY, TIMOTHY A. xxx-xx-x...
RAMEDEN, DAVID A. xxx-xx-x...
RAMIREZ, JOE E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* RAMIREZ, TORSTEN E. xxx-xx-x...
* RAMOS, JOHN xxx-xx-x...
* RANKIN, MARTHA E. xxx-xx-x...
RANSOM, DARRELL S. xxx-xx-x...
RANT, WALTER F. II xxx-xx-x...
RAPER, ANTHONY M. xxx-xx-x...
RAPONE, JOSEPH A. II xxx-xx-x...
RATCLIFFE, EDWARD M. xxx-xx-x...

RAUSCH, THEODORE K. xxx-xx-x...
RAY, GEORGE D. xxx-xx-x...
RAY, WAYMOND L. xxx-xx-x...
REAVES, STEPHEN T. xxx-xx-xx...
* REDDIN, STEVEN J. xxx-xx-x...
REDDINGTON, ROBERT S. xxx-xx-x...
REDMOND, STEPHEN A. xxx-xx-x...
* REESE, ANDREW A. xxx-xx-x...
REESE, TIMOTHY R. xxx-xx-x...
* REEVES, I. V. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
REGAN, JOHN S. xxx-xx-x...
REGO, STEPHEN L. xxx-xx-x...
REICHERT, FREDERICK W. xxx-xx-x...
REICHERT, JACK L. xxx-xx-x...
* REINER, WILLIAM P. xxx-xx-x...
REININGER, DONALD G. xxx-xx-x...
REITINGER, KURT C. xxx-xx-x...
REMMEY, BRIAN O. xxx-xx-x...
REMMIE, PAUL A. xxx-xx-x...
RENBARGER, JAMES D. xxx-xx-x...
REORDAN, CHRISTOPHER K. xxx-xx-x...
* REORDAN, REBECCA S. xxx-xx-x...
REOYO, PAUL J. xxx-xx-x...
REPASS, MICHAEL S. xxx-xx-x...
RESTY, MICHAEL JR. xxx-xx-xx...
REVES, DANE K. xxx-xx-x...
RHOADS, JAMES B. JR. xxx-xx-x...
RHODEN, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
RHYNEDANCE, GEORGE H. IV xxx-xx-x...
* RICE, OSCAR L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD, DIANA M. xxx-xx-x...
* RICHARDS, DAVID H. xxx-xx-x...
* RICHARDS, GEWON xxx-xx-x...
* RICHARDSON, FREDRICK G. xxx-xx-x...
* RICHARDSON, IRA R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
RICHARDSON, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
RICHARDSON, THOMAS J. xxx-xx-x...
RIDGE, ROSS E. xxx-xx-x...
RIDILLA, JOHN P. xxx-xx-x...
* RIEGER, WILLIAM R. xxx-xx-x...
RIGBY, WILLIAM A. xxx-xx-x...
RIKER, WILLIAM E. JR. xxx-xx-x...
RINDONE, FRANK L. xxx-xx-x...
RISHER, RHETT A. xxx-xx-x...
* RITCHEY, JOHN P. II xxx-xx-x...
RITZ, STEPHEN G. xxx-xx-x...
RIVAS, ROBERT J. III xxx-xx-xx...
* RIVERA, MIGUEL A. xxx-xx-x...
* RIVERA, PEDRO R. xxx-xx-x...
* RIZZO, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
*ROBERSON, HOYT E. xxx-xx-x...
*ROBERTS, PETER J. xxx-xx-xx...
ROBERTS, STEVEN R. xxx-xx-x...
ROBERTSON, THOMAS W. xxx-xx-x...
*ROBEY, PATRICK M. xxx-xx-x...
ROBINSON, HUGH G. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*ROBINSON, LEON A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*ROBINSON, ROOSEVELT JR. xxx-xx-x...
ROBINSON, WILLIAM G. III xxx-xx-x...
ROBSON, EVAN E. xxx-xx-x...
ROBSON, RICHARD J. xxx-xx-x...
ROCHA, SUSAN M. xxx-xx-x...
ROCHTE, RUSSELL C. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*ROCQUE, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
*RODIS, STEVE C. xxx-xx-x...
*RODRIGUEZ, GILBERTO xxx-xx-x...
*ROESNER, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
*ROGERS, WILLIE C. xxx-xx-x...
ROHRER, DAVID J. xxx-xx-x...
ROMAN, CARLOS R. xxx-xx-x...
*ROMIG, CHRISTOPHER C. xxx-xx-x...
*ROSARIO, PEDRO J. xxx-xx-x...
ROSE, JAMES G. xxx-xx-x...
ROSE, JOSEPH M. xxx-xx-x...
ROSENTHAL, HAROLD S. xxx-xx-x...
*ROSSI, MARIE T. xxx-xx-x...
*ROSSI, ROBERT N. xxx-xx-x...
ROSTEN, GREGORY A. xxx-xx-x...
ROTH, JERRY H. xxx-xx-x...
*ROTH, KATHLEEN K. xxx-xx-x...
ROUNDS, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
ROVEGNO, JOHN S. xxx-xx-x...
ROVERO, JOHN L. xxx-xx-x...
*RUBET, ORTIZ R. xxx-xx-x...
RUDD, ANTHONY R. xxx-xx-x...
RUDESHEIM, FREDERICK S. xxx-xx-x...
RUFF, GEORGE R. xxx-xx-x...
*RUFFIN, RICHARD J. xxx-xx-xx...
RUFFO, VAL L. xxx-xx-x...
RUGGERO, EDWARD J. xxx-xx-x...
RUHL, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-x...
RUIZ, BENIGNO B. xxx-xx-x...
RUNYAN, JAMES C. xxx-xx-x...
RUSSELL, REX A. xxx-xx-x...
*RUSSO, JOHN T. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
RUSSO, MARTIN G. xxx-xx-x...
RUST, STEPHEN L. xxx-xx-xx...
*RUTLEDGE, KENNETH L. xxx-xx-x...
RUTTEN, DAVID J. xxx-xx-x...
RYAN, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
*RYAN, MICHAEL C. xxx-xx-x...
RYAN, MICHAEL D. xxx-xx-x...
SACKS, DANIEL xxx-xx-x...
SADLER, DAVID G. xxx-xx-x...
*SAJEVIC, JOHN K. xxx-xx-x...
SAJO, JAMES R. xxx-xx-x...
SALAZAR, VICTOR M. xxx-xx-x...
SALES, MILLARD V. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
SALO, DONALD G. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*SANCHEZCARRASQUILLO, R. xxx-xx-x...
SANDERS, J.W. xxx-xx-x...
*SANFORD, BETH A. xxx-xx-x...
SANGER, ALAN C. xxx-xx-x...
*SANTALA, RUSSEL D. xxx-xx-x...
*SANTIAGOTORRES, FELIX L. xxx-xx-x...
SANTOS, BENJAMIN B. xxx-xx-x...
SARGEANT, MARK T. xxx-xx-x...
SARNECKY, JOHN xxx-xx-x...
*SARVAY, WILLIAM R. xxx-xx-x...
SATTERWHITE, JOHN H. xxx-xx-x...
SAWYER, SHEPARD A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SAYLES, CALVIN R. xxx-xx-x...
SCARBALIS, DAVID A. xxx-xx-x...
*SCERCY, STEVEN H. xxx-xx-x...
SCHENCK, RICHARD G. xxx-xx-x...
SCHIEFER, CHRISTOPHER M. xxx-xx-x...
SCHILLER, MARK E. xxx-xx-x...
SCHLEYER, GREGORY J. xxx-xx-x...
SCHMALZEL, JOSEPH R. xxx-xx-x...
*SCHMIDT, EDWARD J. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SCHMIDT, TERRY A. xxx-xx-x...
SCHNEIDER, MICHAEL W. xxx-xx-x...
SCHOFFSTALL, JOHN B. xxx-xx-x...
*SCHOLLE, SIEGLINDE xxx-xx-x...
SCHOWALTER, STEVEN J. xxx-xx-x...
SCHULTHEIS, JAMES L. xxx-xx-xx...
SCHULTZ, WARREN R. xxx-xx-x...
SCHUSTER, CHRISTOPHER E. xxx-xx-x...
*SCHWANENBERG, PAUL L. xxx-xx-x...
*SCHWENDEMAN, KENNETH D. xxx-xx-x...
*SCOTT, BRYAN D. xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT, JERRY D. xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
SCOTT, REGINALD D. xxx-xx-x...
*SCOURSI, JANET M. xxx-xx-x...
SCRUGGS, ROBERT F. xxx-xx-x...
SCRUGGS, SAMUEL xxx-xx-x...
SCRUGGS, VICKI L. xxx-xx-x...
SEASTROM, MARK R. xxx-xx-x...
SEIFARTH, ERIC D. xxx-xx-x...
*SEITHFAGAN, KATHLEEN L. xxx-xx-x...
SEKERAK, EDWARD M. xxx-xx-x...
SENNEWALD, JULIA K. xxx-xx-x...
SERINO, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
* SERRANO, JAY D. xxx-xx-x...
* SETTLES, JAMES E. xxx-xx-xx...
SEWARD, JOHN E. xxx-xx-x...
* SHACHNOWGILLETTE, SHEREEN xxx-xx-x...
SHADRACH, DARDEN D. xxx-xx-x...
SHAFER, MELVIN E. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
SHANAHAN, EDWARD P. IV xxx-xx-x...
* SHAUGHNESSY, ROBERT E. xxx-xx-x...
SHAW, KENT R. xxx-xx-x...
* SHAW, ROBERT T. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SHAW, VAN J. xxx-xx-x...
SHEA, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
SHEA, TIMOTHY C. xxx-xx-x...
* SHEARER, LEONARD B. xxx-xx-x...
SHELTON, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-x...
* SHERLOCK, RICHARD J. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SHERMAN, RODNEY D. xxx-xx-x...
* SHIELDS, MIRIAM D. xxx-xx-x...
SHIFFLETT, GUY A. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
* SHIMABUKURO, RONALD S. xxx-xx-x...
* SHIPLEY, EMMETT L. xxx-xx-x...
SHOOP, BARRY L. xxx-xx-x...
* SHRANK, RICHARD C. xxx-xx-x...
* SHRIEVES, GEORGE E. xxx-xx-x...
SHUFELT, JAMES W. JR. xxx-xx-xxxx
* SHUMARD, RICHARD C. xxx-xx-x...
* SHURTZ, WILLIAM F. xxx-xx-x...
SIEGEL, P. J. xxx-xx-xx...
SIENKIEWICZ, FRANCIS xxx-xx-x...
* SILVA, ROBERT A. xxx-xx-x...
* SILVARODRIGUEZ, JOSE I. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMCHICK, JACQUELINE A. xxx-xx-x...
SIMIS, RICHARD L. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMKIN, HOWARD R. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMMONS, BRENDA J. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMMONS, WARREN O. xxx-xx-x...
SIMMS, MARK P. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMON, PATRICK V. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMON, PETER O. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMONDS, LAWRENCE G. xxx-xx-x...
* SIMPSON, MARK D. xxx-xx-x...
SINGLETON, DAVID R. xxx-xx-x...
* SIRNEY, RICHARD P. JR. xxx-xx-x...
* SISSON, WILLIAM L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SITO, CINDY L. xxx-xx-x...
SKELTON, JAMES R. xxx-xx-x...
* SKINNER, STEPHEN C. xxx-xx-x...
SLEDGE, WILLIAM T. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
* SLICKER, JAMES S. xxx-xx-x...
SMART, ANTOINETTE C. xxx-xx-x...
SMART, JON P. xxx-xx-x...
* SMART, RICHARD A. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, ANDRE L. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, BILLY R. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, CARL xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, DAVID xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, ELLIS J. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
* SMITH, GEORGE K. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, GREGORY M. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, HARRY L. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, JEFFREY C. xxx-xx-xx...
* SMITH, JEFFREY L. xxx-xx-xx...
SMITH, JOSEPH M. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, KEITH A. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, KEITH C. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, MARK D. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, MICHAEL F. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, MICHAEL N. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, NATHANIEL xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, OLIVER W. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, PAUL D. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, REGINALD E. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, ROBERT H. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, THOMAS J. xxx-xx-x...
* SMITH, VERNASSA B. xxx-xx-x...
SMITH, WILLIAM H. xxx-xx-x...
* SNEAD, EDWARD W. xxx-xx-x...
SNEAD, WILLIAM A. xxx-xx-x...
SNODGRASS, AUDY R. xxx-xx-x...
SNYDER, CHARLES R. xxx-xx-x...
* SOBERS, ARTHUR A. xxx-xx-x...
* SOKOL, JOSEPH A. xxx-xx-x...
SOLE, THOMAS R. xxx-xx-x...
SOLOMON, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-x...
SOSLAND, STEVEN R. xxx-xx-x...
SOUDER, MICHAEL E. xxx-xx-x...
SOVINE, JOHN W. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SPEARMAN, RICHARD D. xxx-xx-x...
* SPENCER, PATRICIA M. xxx-xx-x...
SPENCER, WILLIAM J. xxx-xx-x...
SPENCER, WILLIE E. xxx-xx-x...
SPIGHT, MICHAEL G. xxx-xx-x...
* SPOLETI, CHRISTOPHER E. xxx-xx-xx...
* SQUIRES, CHARLES D. xxx-xx-x...
STALEY, CYNTHIA E. xxx-xx-x...
* STANTON, THOMAS H. xxx-xx-x...
STAPLETON, BRIAN P. xxx-xx-x...
STARCK, DONALD S. xxx-xx-x...
*STARK, DANNY K. xxx-xx-x...
*STARK, TIMOTHY L. xxx-xx-x...
STARSHAK, JAMES J. xxx-xx-x...
*STAUFFER, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
STEED, TERENCE L. xxx-xx-x...
*STEEL, ALEXANDER P. xxx-xx-x...
STEELE, MARY D. xxx-xx-x...
STEENBERG, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
STEGALL, JAMES W. xxx-xx-x...
STENKAMP, BARNEY J. xxx-xx-x...
STEPHENS, EDDIE A. xxx-xx-x...
STEPHENSON, BRIAN P. xxx-xx-x...
STEPHENSON, EDWARD R. xxx-xx-x...
STEPHENSON, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
STEPHENSON, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
STEVENS, MARY R. xxx-xx-x...
*STEVENS, RANDALL R. xxx-xx-x...
*STEVENSON, CARLTON D. xxx-xx-x...
STEWART, CAROLYN A. xxx-xx-x...
STEWART, TAMARA S. xxx-xx-x...
*STIEHM, CLARENCE A., II xxx-xx-x...
STINSON, MICHELLE K. xxx-xx-x...
STIPE, BEVERLY M. xxx-xx-x...
STIVASON, KENNETH E. xxx-xx-x...
*STOCKMAN, STEPHEN C. xxx-xx-x...
STOINOFF, CHRIS F. xxx-xx-x...
*STONE, CHARLES L. xxx-xx-x...
STONE, GEORGE F. III xxx-xx-x...
STONE, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
STONE, JESSE M. xxx-xx-x...
STORY, KURT S. xxx-xx-x...
STOVALL, JANN E. xxx-xx-x...
STRAMARA, KEVIN P. xxx-xx-x...
*STRANG, STEVEN P. xxx-xx-x...
STRANGE, ARTHUR A. III xxx-xx-x...
STRATIS, JOHN C. xxx-xx-x...
STRATMAN, CORTNEY J. xxx-xx-x...
*STRICKER, MARK R. xxx-xx-x...
*STRINGFIELD, JEFFERY W. xxx-xx-xx...
STROSNIDER, WILLIAM R. xxx-xx-x...
*STRYFFELER, HARRY B. xxx-xx-xx...
STUBAN, STEVEN M. xxx-xx-x...
*SUBLETT, CARL L. xxx-xx-x...
SWAN, WAYNE L. xxx-xx-x...
SWAREN, THOMAS L. xxx-xx-x...
SWEENEY, JOHN P. III xxx-xx-x...
SWEETSER, WILMER A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SWISHER, JOEL V. xxx-xx-x...
SYDENHAM, STANLEY R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
SZARENSKI, CAROL J. xxx-xx-x...
*TAIMANGLO, REYNALDO N. xxx-xx-x...
TAIT, WILLIAM J. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
TALBOTT, MICHAEL C. xxx-xx-x...
*TANNER, DEAN P. xxx-xx-x...
TATA, ANTHONY J. xxx-xx-x...
TAYLOR, BARRY P. xxx-xx-x...
TAYLOR, DEBRA O. xxx-xx-x...
TAYLOR, JEFFREY A. xxx-xx-xx...
TAYLOR, LEE F. xxx-xx-x...
*TAYLOR, SAMMIE L. xxx-xx-x...
*TAYLOR, WENDELL L. xxx-xx-x...
*TEAGUE, BRYAN E. xxx-xx-x...
*TEAGUE, JAMES G. xxx-xx-x...
TEDFORD, PETER J. xxx-xx-xx...
TEEPLES, DAVID A. xxx-xx-x...
TELANDER, PHILLIP D. xxx-xx-x...
*TEMPLIN, JAMES R. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*TERRENOIRE, REBECCA S. xxx-xx-x...
*TERRY, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
*THOMAS, BOBBY D. xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS, DWAYNE L. xxx-xx-x...
*THOMAS, ELIJAH JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*THOMAS, HERMAN xxx-xx-x...
*THOMAS, JERRY K. xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS, KELLY J. xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS, PAUL C. xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS, RAYMOND A. xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS, SCOTT G. xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS, WALTER W. xxx-xx-x...
*THOMASON, JERRY D. xxx-xx-x...
*THOMPSON, CECIL D. JR. xxx-xx-x...
THOMPSON, DENNIS H. xxx-xx-x...

THOMPSON, THOMAS A. xxx-xx-x...
THORNAL, MASON W. xxx-xx-x...
*THORSON, STEVEN J. xxx-xx-xx...
*THURLOW, DAVID S. xxx-xx-x...
TIERNEY, JEFFREY J. xxx-xx-xxxx
*TILSON, MICHAEL D. xxx-xx-x...
*TIMMONS, TIMOTHY S. xxx-xx-x...
TINDALL, JOHN W. xxx-xx-x...
*TISSON, JOHN M. xxx-xx-x...
TODD, FRANK P. xxx-xx-x...
TODD, MAURICE L. xxx-xx-x...
TODD, WILLIAM E. xxx-xx-x...
*TODOROWSKI, DANIEL xxx-xx-x...
TOGUCHI, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
*TOLLISON, HUBERT E. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
TOOMEY, CHARLES J. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
TOOMEY, CHRISTOPHER J. xxx-xx-x...
TOOMEY, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
*TOPPING, ROBERT E. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*TORO, ANDRES A. xxx-xx-x...
TORRANCE, STEVEN M. xxx-xx-x...
*TORRES, NELSON xxx-xx-x...
TORRES, RENE P. xxx-xx-x...
*TORRESCHAMORRO, PEDRO J. xxx-xx-x...
TORREZ, KARLA C. xxx-xx-x...
TOUSLEY, SCOTT W. xxx-xx-x...
*TOUZINSKY, TIMOTHY C. xxx-xx-x...
*TOWERS, JOHN W. xxx-xx-x...
*TOWNS, WINFRED D. xxx-xx-x...
*TOWNSEL, LINDELL B. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
TRAUTMAN, KONRAD J. xxx-xx-x...
TRAYLOR, JIMMIE L. xxx-xx-x...
*TREAT, HOWARD D. xxx-xx-x...
TREHARNE, BARBARA L. xxx-xx-x...
TRIPLETT, CLIFTON N. xxx-xx-xx...
*TROUTMAN, ERBIN L. xxx-xx-x...
*TRUITT, GERY B. xxx-xx-x...
*TUNSTALL, STANLEY Q. xxx-xx-x...
*TURGEON, ALBERT J. xxx-xx-xx...
TURNER, HENRY C. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
TURNER, JOHN H. xxx-xx-x...
*TURNER, RODERICK G. III xxx-xx-x...
*TWITTY, ROBERT A. xxx-xx-x...
*TYSON, CLARENCE L. JR. xxx-xx-x...
UPTON, ROBERT C. III xxx-xx-x...
URBAN, MICHAEL G. xxx-xx-x...
UZELAC, PETER J. xxx-xx-x...
VALENT, OSCAR B. xxx-xx-x...
*VALLANCEWHITACRE, JOAN R. xxx-xx-x...
*VANDERGURG, NEVILLE S. xxx-xx-x...
VANFOSSON, MARION H. xxx-xx-x...
*VANPELT, ELMAN D. xxx-xx-x...
*VANUS, MARK D. xxx-xx-x...
VASSE, ROBERT H. xxx-xx-x...
*VAZQUEZ, RICARDO C. xxx-xx-x...
VELASQUEZ, DAVID S. xxx-xx-x...
*VERDEJO, JESUS JR. xxx-xx-xx...
VERNON, RICHARD A. xxx-xx-x...
*VILLIVA, MARY D. xxx-xx-x...
*VININK, KENNETH A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*VISBECK, MARK W. xxx-xx-x...
*VISSOTZKY, DAVID A. xxx-xx-x...
*VOLKMAN, STEVEN D. xxx-xx-x...
VONBOKERN, KARL H. xxx-xx-x...
*VONJACOBI, CHRISTIAN J. xxx-xx-x...
VONROSENBERG, RANDALL A. xxx-xx-x...
WACKERMAN, DAMIAN C. xxx-xx-x...
*WADDELL, JEFFREY D. xxx-xx-xx...
WAGNER, CHRISTOPHER G. xxx-xx-x...
WAGNER, KENNETH S. xxx-xx-x...
WAGNER, ROBERT J. xxx-xx-x...
*WALCZAK, PAUL S. xxx-xx-x...
*WALDEN, GREGORY A. xxx-xx-x...
WALDIER, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
WALDRON, JOSEPH A. xxx-xx-x...
WALKER, CAREY W. xxx-xx-x...
*WALKER, MICHAEL R. xxx-xx-x...
*WALKER, MICHAEL T. xxx-xx-x...
*WALLACE, JOHN xxx-xx-x...
WALLER, HENRY H. III xxx-xx-x...
*WALSH, GUY J. xxx-xx-x...
*WALSH, KEVIN B. xxx-xx-x...
*WALSH, LESLIE B. xxx-xx-x...
*WALTER, KEITH R. xxx-xx-x...
WALTERS, RICHARD K. xxx-xx-x...
WALTERS, WALLY Z. JR. xxx-xx-x...
WALTON, DONALD B. xxx-xx-x...
*WARD, BRAD M. xxx-xx-x...
WARD, JOHN R. xxx-xx-x...
WARD, MARION M. xxx-xx-x...
WARD, RICHARD W. xxx-xx-x...
WARD, RONALD E. xxx-xx-x...
WARD, WILLIAM F. xxx-xx-x...
WARDLAW, DAVID E. xxx-xx-x...
WARDYNSKI, EUGENE L. xxx-xx-x...
*WARK, THOMAS K. xxx-xx-x...
WARNKE, JOHN C. xxx-xx-x...
WARRICK, VINCENT E. xxx-xx-x...
*WARTHON, KEVIN W. xxx-xx-x...
*WASHINGTON, BETTE R. xxx-xx-x...
WASHINGTON, GEORGE K. xxx-xx-x...
*WASHINGTON, RACHEL M. xxx-xx-x...
*WASHINGTON, VON C. xxx-xx-x...
*WATERS, BRIAN F. xxx-xx-x...
*WATKINS, GAIL M. xxx-xx-x...
*WATRAS, KENNETH A. xxx-xx-x...
*WATSON, ALAN G. xxx-xx-x...
*WATSON, CHARLOTTE L. xxx-xx-x...
WAWRZYNIAK, MICHAEL J. xxx-xx-x...
WEART, JEFFREY M. xxx-xx-x...
WEATHERFORD, JOHN W. xxx-xx-x...
*WEATHERWAX, JODY H. xxx-xx-x...
*WEBB, CHARLES M. xxx-xx-x...
WEBB, LESLIE E. xxx-xx-x...
*WEILER, DALE S. xxx-xx-x...
WEINBERG, EDWARD L. xxx-xx-x...
WEINER, IDA O. xxx-xx-x...
WELCH, DIANNE E. xxx-xx-x...
*WELCH, IVAN B. III xxx-xx-x...
WELKS, STEVEN N. xxx-xx-x...
WENTZ, PAUL L. xxx-xx-x...
*WEST, BERLYN G. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*WEST, RONALD C. xxx-xx-x...
WEST, TERRY A. xxx-xx-x...
WESTBERG, DENNIS A. xxx-xx-x...
WESTBROOK, JOHN P. III xxx-xx-x...
WESTGATE, MOLLY J. xxx-xx-x...
WESTPHAL, STEVEN D. xxx-xx-x...
WHARTON, JOHN F. xxx-xx-x...
*WHATLEY, WILLIAM A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
WHEELER, FRANK E. xxx-xx-x...
*WHITE, BRENDA Y. xxx-xx-x...
WHITECOTTON, DON M. xxx-xx-x...
WHITEHEAD, KATHLEEN L. xxx-xx-x...
WHITEHEAD, RAY A. xxx-xx-x...
WHITEHEAD, STUART A. xxx-xx-x...
WHITEHILL, CRAIG M. xxx-xx-x...
WHITFIELD, STUART A. xxx-xx-x...
WHITLEY, MARY G. xxx-xx-x...
*WHITLOCK, ALVIE D. xxx-xx-x...
WHITMAN, BRYAN G. xxx-xx-x...
*WHITTEMORE, BRUCE G. xxx-xx-x...
WIANT, TERRY L. xxx-xx-x...
WICK, GREGORY J. xxx-xx-x...
WIDMAN, SUSAN M. xxx-xx-x...
*WIGGINS, CHARLES E. xxx-xx-x...
WILCOX, MARK R. xxx-xx-x...
*WILCOX, ROBERT M. xxx-xx-x...
WILES, RICHARD I. JR. xxx-xx-x...
WILHELM, THOMAS P. xxx-xx-x...
*WILKERSON, JIMMY L. xxx-xx-x...
WILKERSON, KEVIN V. xxx-xx-x...
*WILKERSON, SCOTT F. xxx-xx-x...
*WILKINS, MARK S. xxx-xx-x...
*WILKINS, RAYMOND C. xxx-xx-x...
WILKINS, STEPHEN M. xxx-xx-x...
WILLARD, DOUGLAS W. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLEY, JEFFREY D. xxx-xx-xx...
WILLIAMS, AARON J. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLIAMS, CHRISTOPHER E. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLIAMS, EDDIE B. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAMS, GARLAND H. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAMS, JAMES A. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAMS, JEFFREY N. xxx-xx-xx...
WILLIAMS, MICHAEL S. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLIAMS, TERRELL K. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLIAMSON, CHAUNCER L. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLIAMSON, JENNIE M. xxx-xx-x...
WILLINGHAM, FRANK P. xxx-xx-x...
*WILLIS, CARLTON P. xxx-xx-x...
WILLIS, PAUL A. xxx-xx-x...
WILSON, CHARLES A. xxx-xx-x...
WILSON, GREGORY E. xxx-xx-x...
WILSON, RAYMOND C. xxx-xx-x...
*WILSON, ROBERT B. xxx-xx-x...
WILSON, WILLIAM D. xxx-xx-x...
*WINSTON, CLAYTON R. xxx-xx-x...
WINTELS, JUAN J. xxx-xx-x...
*WINTER, STEPHEN R. xxx-xx-xx...
WINTERS, JAYME. xxx-xx-x...
WISNIOSKI, DOUGLAS R. xxx-xx-x...
WITHERS, WILLIAM G. xxx-xx-x...
WOLF, JOHN L. xxx-xx-x...
WOLFE, ROBERT H. xxx-xx-x...
WOLFF, ROBERT A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
WONG, LEONARD xxx-xx-x...
WOODARD, BENNY E. xxx-xx-x...
WOODLIFF, LEE R. xxx-xx-x...
WOODS, ANDRE G. xxx-xx-x...
WOODS, EDWIN P. xxx-xx-x...
WOODS, GEORGE J. III xxx-xx-x...
WOODS, WILLIS A. xxx-xx-x...
*WOOLFREY, ARTHUR W. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*WORKMAN, JAMES C. xxx-xx-x...
WORKMAN, ROBERT B. III xxx-xx-x...
*WORTHY, THERESA D. xxx-xx-x...
WRIGHT, BRIAN A. xxx-xx-x...
*WRIGHT, JOHN V. xxx-xx-x...
*WRIGHT, MICHAEL A. xxx-xx-x...
WRIGHT, PAUL E. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*WRISLEY, KENNETH L. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*WYATT, LISBETH V. xxx-xx-x...
*WYRICK, JIMMY R. xxx-xx-x...
YANNELLO, RAYMOND A. xxx-xx-x...
YARBROUGH, LOWELL S. xxx-xx-x...
YATES, LEON N. xxx-xx-x...
YESHNIK, MARK A. xxx-xx-x...
YOCHIM, FREDERICK A. xxx-xx-x...
*YONG, PETER H. xxx-xx-x...
YOUNG, CHET C. xxx-xx-x...
YOUNG, JIMMY D. xxx-xx-x...
YOUNG, LAVERM JR. xxx-xx-x...
*YOUNG, RICHARD A. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*YOUNG, RICHARD C. xxx-xx-x...
YOUNG, SAMUEL R. JR. xxx-xx-x...
*YOUNG, TIMOTHY R. xxx-xx-x...
*YOUNGMAN, WAYNE M. xxx-xx-x...
YUENGERT, LOUIS G. xxx-xx-x...
*ZAAT, STEPHEN V. xxx-xx-x...
ZAJAC, DANIEL L. xxx-xx-x...
ZAMPELLA, WALTER C. xxx-xx-x...
ZANDY, THOMAS S. xxx-xx-x...
ZAPPALLA, STEPHEN JR. xxx-xx-x...
ZAYAS, JERRY D. xxx-xx-x...
*ZEIGLER, JACK C. JR. xxx-xx-xx...
*ZEIGLER, ROBERT E. xxx-xx-xx...
*ZIEGLER, CHARLES G. xxx-xx-x...
ZIMMERMAN, CHRISTOPHER P. xxx-xx-x...
ZIMMERMAN, RALF W. xxx-xx-x...
ZIOBRO, MARTIN T. JR. xxx-xx-x...
ZOCCOLA, JOHN T. xxx-xx-x...
ZOLP, WILLIAM C. xxx-xx-x...
x...
x...
x...
x...

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 307, TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE, AND SECTIONS 8363 AND 593, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

RICHARD M. ANDERS xxx-xx-x...
BRIAN E. BARENTS xxx-xx-x...
JOHN H. BOH, JR. xxx-xx-x...
JAMES T. BRIDGES xxx-xx-x...
JOHN M. BRYAN xxx-xx-x...
PHILIP R. BUNCH xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL D. BURKHALTER xxx-xx-x...
JOSEPH L. I. CANADY, II xxx-xx-xx...
SAMUEL P. CARTER, JR. xxx-xx-xx...
EUGENE F. CONSIGLIO xxx-xx-x...
JOHN D. DEATON xxx-xx-x...
THOMAS R. EBNER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES A. EVANS xxx-xx-x...
MICHAEL J. FISHER xxx-xx-xx...
BRIAN J. FREEMAN xxx-xx-x...
RONNIE H. GILL xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM P. GRALOW xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE D. GRAVES xxx-xx-x...
KEITH E. HALLMARK xxx-xx-x...
DENNIS P. HARRINGTON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM A. HENDERSON xxx-xx-x...
CLARENCE E. HESTER xxx-xx-x...
JAMES W. HIGGINS xxx-xx-x...
CULLEN A. HOLLISTER xxx-xx-x...
MARVIN E. HORNER xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM L. HOWLAND xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT C. JOHNSON xxx-xx-x...
KENNETH U. JORDAN xxx-xx-x...
DAVID W. JURENKA xxx-xx-x...
RAYMOND A. LEDBETTER xxx-xx-x...
CHRISTOPHER J. LUNA xxx-xx-x...
GEORGE M. MANN, JR. xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT S. MCNAMARA xxx-xx-x...
RONALD W. MIELKE xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT L. MYER xxx-xx-x...
HENRY S. PARKER xxx-xx-x...
JOHN E. PEREZ xxx-xx-x...
LARRY E. PETERS xxx-xx-x...
KENNNETH S. PETERSON xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM H. PHILLIPS xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD A. POLK xxx-xx-x...
WILLIAM T. RAISON xxx-xx-x...
LAWRENCE A. SITTIG xxx-xx-x...
GERALD R. SKOLL xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD L. TESTA xxx-xx-x...
JAMES E. THOMEY xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD D. TREBESCH xxx-xx-x...
BENJAMIN R. WHITLAW xxx-xx-x...

DENTAL CORPS

THOMAS L. WINANS xxx-xx-x...

JUDGE ADVOCATE

JOHN T. KRALL xxx-xx-x...
HAROLD R. SMETHILLS xxx-xx-x...

MEDICAL CORPS

RAUL L. DIOKNO xxx-xx-x...
PAUL V. EDELEN xxx-xx-x...
EDWARD C. KRECKER xxx-xx-x...
ROBERT R. MORRISON xxx-xx-x...
RICHARD A. STEMM xxx-xx-x...
RONALD J. STEPHENS xxx-xx-xx...

NURSE CORPS

SHIRLEY C. CLARK xxx-xx-x...

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS OF THE RESERVE OF THE U. S. NAVY FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION TO THE GRADE OF COMMANDER IN THE LINE, IN THE COMPETITIVE CATEGORY AS INDICATED, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

To be commander

EDWARD L. ABNER
NICHOLAS JOSEPH ABRAHAM
JOHN ARTHUR ACHENBACH
THOMAS RANDALL ADRIAN
SCOTT EDWARD ALBRECHT
THOMAS DEANE ALDERN
ALPHONSE ALVIN ALLEN
JOHN WILLIAM ALLING
BRIAN S. ANDERSON
MARK EVAN ANDERSON
DEAN CAMERON ANDES
EDWARD D. ARMBRUSTER
MICHAEL WELLS ARNOLD
MARK CONRAD ASBURY
CALVIN L. BAGBY
DAVID W. BAIR
STEPHEN HOWARD BAKER

JEROME ANTHONY BALIUKAS
CHARLES MELVIN BARNES
DANIEL ANDREW BEARY
MICHAEL K. BEEBE
MELVIN NMN BELL
DENNIS DEAN BENSON
GUSTAVE LOUIS BERG, III
JEFFREY FELIX BERG
FRANKLIN HUGH BERNARD
CHRISTOPHER JOHN WHIT BERRY
RICHARD DAVID BINNS
DAVID WESLEY BINTZ
JOHN EDWARD BISHOP
DAVID N. BIZE, III
ROBERT LESLIE BLACK
GLEN MARTIN BLINDE, JR
WOLFHUBERTUS NMN BOCK
WILLIAM GREGORY BODDY
CHARLES S. BOWERS, III
JAMES P. BRACY
CARL PHILLIP BRAUN
OSCAR JAMES BRAYNON
VERNON L. BROMLEY
ROBERT CORLISS BROWN
TERENCE HENRY BROWN
BRIAN LEE BRUNNER
JEFFREY DAVID BUEHRLE
JEFFREY ALLAN BUKER
MARK KENNETH BUNKER
CHRISTOPHER SCOTT BURNS
CHRISTOPHER THANE BUTLER
MARK CHARLES BUZEK
WILLIAM R. CADY
JOHN HENRY CAHILL, III
LAWRENCE EDWARD CAHILL
GEORGE K. CARNES, JR
CONSTANCE J. CARTE
JOHN MICHAEL CARTER
JOHN ROGER CASEY
PETER M. CAULK
EDWARD VINCENT CHIMAHUSKY
FRANK PETER CHRZANOWSKI
VINCENT CIARLANTE
RANDALL CHARLES CIESLAK
DANIEL EDWIN CLARKE
MARK S. CLAY
DONALD VAUGHN CLEMONS, JR
LAWRENCE E. CLIFFORD, JR
KARL EDWARD CLOUGH, JR
THOMAS LEE COCHENOUR
DENNIS LOUIS COE
JOE MILTON COLLINS
ROBERT OWEN COLLYER
TERRY LYNN CONNER
JAMES EDWARD CONNORS, JR
WADE THOMAS COOPER, JR
DANIEL M. CORPMAN
HARRY T. COWELL
JOHN BRACKLIN CRIBBS, II
STEVEN K. CROWE
DAVID MACLEOD CUNEO
JOHN MICHAEL CUNNINGHAM
JAMES MAYALL DAIGNEAU
CAROLE LEIGH DANIS
DOUGLAS STEPHAN DAUGHTRY
JOHN KING DAURORA
ROBERT M. DAWSON
JOSEPH A. DAY
DIRK J. DEBBINK
MICHAEL ANTHONY DEGIGLIO
JAMES WILLIAM DEGOEY
RICHARD SANCHEZ DELACRUZ
BRIAN S. DEVITT
CHRISTOPHER WAYNE DILLER
THOMAS P. DONNELLY
PATRICK EDWARD DOWNER
BRIAN WYNNE DOWSLEY
PATRICK G. DRISCOLL
JOHN DUFF, III
MICHAEL DUGAN
JON ANTHONY DUNCAN
HENRY DUNNENBERGER, III
JAYMIE ALAN DURNAN
RICHARD MICHAEL DWYER
DAVID S. ELLIOTT
THOMAS LOUIS ELMORE
WILLIAM ARTHUR EMSLIE
PETER W. ENGEL
BYRON RANDOLPH ENGH
CRAIG R. ENOS
HEIDI MUELLER ERNST
STEVEN CRAIG ESTES
MICHAEL STEPHEN ETHERIDGE
JOHN DAVID FAULDERS
ROBERT JOSEPH FAY
DONALD STEVEN FELDMAN
DAN EDWARD FENN
WILLIAM HENRY FENNECKEN
DOUGLAS H. FERGUSON
ROGER GLENN FLEISCHER
DAVID STEPHEN FLOYD
SCOTT A. FONTAINE
GREGORY A. FOSTER
STEPHEN CRUZ FOX
DAVID ROBERT FRANCHELLA
DENNIS MARK FRANICH
GREGORY DOUGLAS FRISK
ROGER L. FRITZLER
DAN RICHARD FUNK
DAVID WAYNE GALATIOTO
CARON JEAN GALVIN
JOHN S. GARDNER
STANLEY A. GARMER
JAMES C. GASSAWAY
JOHN E. GAULT
PATRICK HOWARD GAVIN
DANIEL GEARING
OLIVER FORD GIBSON, III
ROBERT EDWIN GLEASON
SAMUEL PEARSON GODDARD, III
DOUGLAS GOOLSBY
JEFFREY A. GORMAN
THOMAS M. GORMAN
PAUL A. GOTTSCHALK
ELEANOR LEE GOWARD
JOHN C. GRACE
WALTER FORD GRADY
ERIC GREGORY GRAFF
CHRISTINE GRANT
MARK DOUGLAS GRAY
PETER D. GREEN
RUSTY M. GREER
MICHAEL DAVID GRIFFES
MICHAEL F. GROMEK
JOHN CHARLES HALL
WILLIAM ALLAN HALL
RICKY THOMAS HAMMONDS
DOUGLAS E. HANNUM
RAYMOND NEIL HANSEN
JUNE T. HARDY
KATHLEEN LYN HARGER
GILBERT RAY HARLAN
JOSEPH H. HARRINGTON, JR
JACK F. HARRIS
RODNEY ALAN HARRIS
MARC ALAN HARRISON
WILLIAM CHARLES HARTMAN
LARRY WAYNE HAUTH
JOHN EDWARD HAWKINS, JR
RICHARD D. HAYES, III
STUART A. HAYES
DOUGLAS J. HESS
JOHN ERIC C. HIGGS, III
DONALD C. HILL, JR
KENNETH RAYMON HINDERSINN
FRANCIS C. HINDS, III
BRUCE E. HINKLEY
JOHN DOUGLAS HOBDAY
LAWRENCE EUGENE HODEL
JAMES D. HOFFMAN, JR
PAUL E. HONEYCUTT
DONNA LEIGH HOPKINS
STEPHEN HORBIAK
ARTHUR WILLIAM HORN, JR
STEPHEN S. HORTON
CHRISTOPHER MARK HOZA
DAVID J. HUDACEK
RICHARD HUGO HUEBNER
FREDERICK PAUL HUGHES
ROBERT EDWARD HUMMEL, JR
ROBERT GRAY HUNTER, JR
THOMAS HARVEY HUTCHINSON
JAMES CHEAIRS IKARD
LAWRENCE JAMES INDIVIGLIA
SCOTT DAVID INGLIS
WILLIAM HERBERT ITTNER
WILLIAM MARSHALL IVORY
ALICE G. JACKSONWRIGHT
JOHN ROBERT JACOBSON
THEODORE JAMES JACOBSON
THOMAS ERIC JACOBSON
ANDRE A. JALBERT
BRUCE CLYDE JAMES
GREGORY SCOTT JARRELL
GREGORY JENKINS
ROBERT P. JENKS
JAY ROBERT JENNINGS, II
DANIEL JAMES JERABEK
JOHN MICHAEL JOERGER
SIGURD ARTHUR JOHANSEN, JR
ARVIN W. JOHNSEN
DIANNE HENSLEE JOHNSON
GEORGE ROBERT JOHNSON
STEVE ALLEN JOHNSON
RICHARD MERWIN JOHNSTON
HENRY B. JONES, III
CARL W. JORDAN
CARROLL MICHAEL JUDICE
RANDAL MILTON JUSTUS
RONALD LEE KAHLENBECK
RICHARD P. KELLY
STEVEN JOSEPH KEOUGH
KEITH W. KINANE
FREDERIC KINKIN
KEVIN J. KINPORTS
STEVEN ROBERT KIRCHMANN
RICHARD KIRSTEN
KENAN JAMES KNIERIEM
PETER M. KNOETGEN
FRED DAVY KNOX, JR
DEAN WILLIAM KOEHLER
CLIFFORD W. KRCHA
THOMAS DUANE KUHLMANN
T. J. LAGERSTROM
EDDY WILLIAM LAI
CLARENCE L. LAMAR
CHARLES RICHARD LASKO
ROBERT FRANCIS LAVARNWAY
JAMES HARLAN LAWRENCE
CHARLES HAROLD LEACH, III
PATRICK LEBLANC
ROBERT L. LENCE
PETER ARTHUR LENZEN
HELEN VANESSA LEONG
WILLIAM J. LESTER
JEFFERY WILLARD LEVI
BENNY F. LEWIS
MICHAEL RAWLS LILEK
STEPHEN ODELL LILLIE
JAMES K. LIMING
BRADLEY JAY LITTLE
FREDERICK LITTY
JEFFREY HULFORD LONG
WILLIAM LEVI LONGSHORE, III
CHAM WAH LOUIE
MARVIN LEE MACKIN
JAMES HOWARD MADDEN
MICHAEL PAUL MAGNOTTI
EUGENE JOSEPH MALONE, JR
JOHN MICHAEL MASON
EDWARD NMN MASSO
MICHAEL JUDE MAYNARD
JOHN RILEY MCCARRAHER
EDWARD LEON MCCUTCHEN, JR
JAMES CAREY MCDONALD
ROBERT S. MCEWEN
JOHN P. MCGINN, JR
MICHAEL EUGENE MCKENNY
PATRICK PETER MCKERNAN
WILLIAM E. MCMINN
MORGAN MCQUISTON
JAMES M. MCTERNAN
MICHAEL K. MCVAY
R. D. MCWHORTER
RICHARD W. MEANOR
DENNIS PAUL MESSENGER
MICHAEL ARTHUR METSKAS
DAVID ROBIN MICKLE
WILLIAM EDWARD MILES
ROBERT LEE MITCHELL
ROGER ALLEN MITISKA
JOHN DUNCAN MONACO
PRISCILLA ANNETTE MONDIEK
RONALD MELVIN MONROE
MICHAEL JEROME MOON
RANDALL KEITH MOON, JR
PETER ALLEN MOORE
WILLIAM RICHARD MOORE
SARAH JEAN MOYE
ROBERT W. MULLOY
BRIAN EDWARD MULVANEY
GERARD ANTHONY MUMFREY, II
STEPHEN RICHARD MUNROE
KEVIN P. MURPHY
JOSEPH KAROL NAWROCKI
COLLEEN NMN NEVIUS
WILLIAM RAND NEWHOUSE
STUART THEODORE NEWMAN
CYNTHIA LOUISE NOWELL
DONALD J. NOWICKI
DONALD WILLIAM OAKES
KARLA S. OGDEN
JOHN JOSEPH OKEEFE, III
DENNIS LEE OLIVER
WILLIAM MICHAEL ORR
JAMES T. OSTRICH
STEPHEN KEITH PAGE
STEVEN LEONARD PALS
MICHAEL ROBERT PAPENTHIEN
CHARLES PARAMORE
WILLIAM NICHOLAS PARHAM, JR
ROY O. PARKER, JR
REMY JOHN PATTYN
STEVEN KENNETH PETROSKI
GEORGE G. PLATZ
LOREN R. PLISCO
OSCAR JULIO PORRAS
GEORGE WALLACE POSTELL, III
KEVIN LEON POWELL
JAMES PROPHETER
RAYMOND PETER RAGUSKY
BARRY EVANS RAINEY
THOMAS S. RAU
DAVID L. RAUNIG
JOHN FRANCIS RAVOLD
SCOTT DENTON REAGAN
FRED EVAN REHRIG
THOMAS MICHAEL REIDY
ROBERT PAUL REILLY, JR
WILLIAM BENJAMIN RHUE
ANDREA ELLEN RICE
WILLIS LEE RIEF
DANIEL CHARLES RIGTERINK
EDDIE ROY RILEY
STEPHEN HENRY ROACH
WILLIAM M. ROBBERSON
STEVEN WAYNE ROBERTS
ROBERT CLYDE ROBERTSON, III
DAVID ROBINSON, IV
JOHN ELTON ROCKEY, JR
TOMI ELLIOTT ROESKE
OTTO ERNEST ROSSNER, III
STEVEN L. RUSSELL
MARK STEVEN SADEL
ALAN D. SARGEANT
MARTIN BLAINE SATTISON
GREGORY D. SAUL
DOUGLAS ERIC SCHAEFER
MICHAEL HENRY SCHMALTZ
ERIC ERNEST SCHONEBERGER
RONALD H. SCHWARTZ
SUSAN KAROL SCHWARTZ
DONALD B. SCOTT
ROBBIE DALE SCRUGGS
RANDALL LESTER SEGERT
JORGE PIZARRO SEIDEL
JAMES DANIEL SENCINDIVER
MICHAEL P. SEPELYAK
ROBERT SHEPPARD
PAUL S. SHERBO
WILLIAM RONALD SHERROD
WOODROW RALPH SHIELDS
DANIEL MAURICE SHIPLEY
DAVID JOHN SHORT
ERIC RUD SHUTLER
DANIEL LEWIS SIMPSON
WILLIAM MALCOLM SIMS, JR
KEVIN RUSSELL SKJEI
LEE T. SLAUGHTER
RONALD JOSEPH SMELTZER
ROBERT EDWARD SMITH
WAYNE CAMERON SMITH
DAVID PATRICK SMOUSE
JOHN W. SPENCER
DANIEL JOHN SPOONER
FELIX JOHN STANKIEWICZ, JR
DANIEL JENSON STEELE
ALAN RICHARD STEICHEN
CHARLES JAMES STEINBAUGH
MICHAEL NEWTON STOLLINGS
JOHN LEWIS STRIDE, JR
WILLIAM K. STULB
THOMAS SULLIVAN
THOMAS HILLMAN SULLIVAN, JR
PAUL MARTIN SUMMERVILLE
WILLIAM JAY SUMNER
KARIN DARLENE SUTTON
STEPHEN PAUL SWIERCZEK
CHARLES WATERSON SWINTON
RUSSELL WARREN TALBOT
JOHN J. TARTAGLIONE
PAUL JOHN TELTHORST
MARGARET ELIZABETH THOMAS
DOUGLAS ALAN THOMPSON
DAVID JOHN THORN
OWEN G. THORP
THOMAS JAMES TINSLEY
GARY FREDERICK TRITT
ROBERT ARTHUR TYLICKI
JAMES ROBERT UNDERWOOD
LAWRENCE DEL URBAN
DAVID J. VANPETTEN
RICHARD ROBERT VANTHOF
JOHN FRED VARNEY
ROBERT E. VASSAR
GARY WAYNE VERNON
MICHAEL J. VIETEN
ROBERT RALPH VOGEL
DAVID C. WAGNER
KENNETH ALAN WAGNER
DALE WILLIAM WAINWRIGHT
RICHARD JAMES WALLACE
JAMES LAWRENCE WALSH
DANIEL A. WARDROP
WILLIAM HENLEY WATSON, JR
STEVEN DOUGLAS WATT
ROBIN M. WATTERS
FREDRICK WILLIAM WEBER
EDWARD MICHAEL WEIKAL
JEFFREY W. WELCH
LEE O. WELCH
PATRICIA ANN WELLING
JEFFREY W. WENDEL
DANIEL EDWARD WERNLI
GERALD ALAN WHITE
JOSEPH WILLIAM WHITE
KENT D. WHITE
DANIEL WHITSETT
DENNIS KEITH WILCOX
HARVEY E. WILKINSON, JR
BETH GERMAINE WILLIAMS
ALBERT LEE WILSON, JR
ROBERT HOWELL WILSON
TERRY GYEN WINGO
STUART ORIAN WITT
ROBERT NATHANIEL WOFFORD
GREGORY J. WOLFE
MILTON LEGRAND WOOD, IV
DAVID ALLEN WOODCOCK
DAVID BRUCE WRIGHT
GARLAND P. WRIGHT
WILLIAM EDWARD YEAGER
EDWARD P. YETSKO
GREGORY JOSEPH YODER
NEIL M. YOUNG
STEPHEN A. YOUNG
DAVID M. ZATH
CAROL JEAN ZINK
EDWARD HOWARD ZUMSTEIN
VICTOR ARTHUR ZWIERLEIN

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS (TAR)

To be commander

ANTHONY JOSEPH ABBRUZZI
BENEDICT JAMES ARCARIO
DAVID E. BANKS
PAUL HENRY BASZNER
DANIEL BEECHER BELL
ALAN JEFFREY BLACKBURN
RICHARD ARTHUR BLOW
ROBERT MAURICE BRESNAHAN, JR
DAVID W. BULLARD
WILLIAM GRADY CARNAHAN
DON GORDON COOPER
MARK OWEN COULTHARD
LEO DENNIS CULLEN
WILLIAM AIME DEMERS
DAVID LAWRENCE DOWNING
WILLIAM JOSEPH FERENCZY
JOHN HOMER FISHER
MARK ALAN FRIESZ
DAVID G. GEOFFRION
ANTHONY WAYNE GILES
PAUL E. GONZALES
GILES GIRARD GOULDSMITH
ROBERT EARL HAYES, JR
PAUL J. HERON
ROBERT FRANCIS HOLMAN
MARK A. JOHNSON
MARTIN P. KAUCHAK
WILLIAM STEPHEN KELLY
ROBERT E. LOWE
JAMES VINCENT MARTONE
PAUL JAMES MAZICH
JOHN JEFFERY MCGARRY
REED ERIC MCGUIRE
WILLIAM EARL MCKINNON
STEPHEN PATRICK MCMULLIN
KENNETH LYNN MCWILLIAMS
CHARLES LOUIS MORIN
JONATHAN PATRICK MUIR
GUS N. OROLOGAS
THOMAS A. OSSECK
JAMES W. PANDZIK
JAMES FRANK PEREIRA
JEFFREY S. RAMPONE
MARY ANN F. ROWE
ALBERT JESSE SCHUETTE
FREDERICK WILLIAM SIEGERT
ROBERT ANGELO SINIBALDI, JR
HAROLD EDWARD SPEARS, JR
ROBERT ALLEN SPENCER, JR
TIMOTHY LEE STOCKWELL
PAUL JOSEPH SWAGLER
FORREST L. TOUCHBERRY
DANA LYNN UPTON
BARRY N. WILBUR
IRVIN GONZALES WILLIAMS, III
ERIC ALAN WISEMAN
MARK D. WORRILOW

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS

To be commander

BENJAMIN PATAYAN ALBA
STEPHEN LEE BERRY
DALE ROBERT CURTISS
WILLIAM MATTHEW DEAN
MARK PAUL DOEHNERT
STEVEN ZACHARY ELBINGER
EUGENE M. GOLDA
DARRELL CHARLES HAGEN
GARY LYNN HICKS
NELSON ROLF KING
THOMAS LAWRENCE LAGUARDIA
ALLEN LYNN MATHENY
DAVID TERRY MCDANIEL
STEPHEN CHARLES NELSON
ISABELLA JENNIFER OLEARY
GARY ADAM ORSKI
MICHAEL L. SCOTT
WILLIAM DAVID SCOTT
JOHN ERVIN THORP
ROBINSON D. WONG
ERIC R. ZUMWALT

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (ENGINEERING)

To be commander

DENNIS ARTHUR BEHM
ERIC DONALD BRIES
REGINALD ARTHUR DAVIS
WILLIAM ROCK DAZE
MARC LEWIS GOLDSCHMITT
ROBERT NOROBERT JUAREZ, JR
RONALD WALTER MORRISON
RALPH AVERILL PALMER, III
HARRY FLOYD SHAFFER
CHARLES RAYMOND SHARRATT
RODNEY DAVID VAUGHT

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE)

To be commander

JOSEPH ROBERT BADICK
MATTHEW CLEMENT BOENKER
MICHAEL RAY CLEMENTS
DANIEL FRANK PARRILLO

AEROSPACE ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICERS (MAINTENANCE) (TAR)

To be commander

MORGAN BLAINE PEARSALL

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (MERCHANT MARINE)

To be commander

JOHN WALSH BRENNAN, JR
JAMES WRIGHT BYERS
MICHAEL HENRY DILLON
JOHN MILTON GANDY, III
RICHARD BRUCE GRAHAM
LOUIS FRANCIS HANNIGAN
RODNEY GRAFTON MCFADDEN

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (CRYPTOLOGY)

To be commander

DANIEL A. ACTON
DAVID L. BURRILL
LARRY DERYL BYRD
ROBIN NMN FELIX
EDWARD JOHN GENNINGER
RAY ALLEN GOODSON
CARL JOHN GUS, JR
MICHAEL ROBERT KNAPKE
PAUL RAYMOND LANG
MELINDA ANN LAWTON
JOSEPH FRANCIS LEES
GARY EDWARD MITCHELL
GERALD WAYNE PEETERS
MICHAEL JOSEPH PITTARD
DANIEL ARTHUR POHTO
JOHN SHERROD ROBERTSON
ROGER PERNO SNEDEN, II
KENT BRUCE ZIMMERMAN

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE)

To be commander

RICHARD JOHN ALEXANDER
WILLIAM POLK ALEXANDER, III
ROBERT FULTON BAARSON
MOLLY RAHE BAUMGARDNER
DAVID PAUL BIEGA
JEROME DANIEL BISH
JOHN W. BURNS
THOMAS DWIGHT CHEEK
CHARLES EDWIN CHENEY
PETER EUGENE COVELL
DOUGLAS E. CUPO
GEORGE WILLIAM DEBOER
MICHAEL DONAHUE
JOHN CHARLES DOSTA
RICHARD WILLIAM DUTSON
CRAIG R. FAJNOR
WILSON NORFLEET FELDER, II
LEO LAWRENCE FLYNN, JR
STEPHEN CRAIG FOREE
BRADLEY CHARLES FUSSELL
MICHAEL PETER GOLDEN
JNEANNE MARY GREGOIRETHEUS
JUAN GARCIA GUEVARA, JR
JOSEPH GREGORY HAYS, III
JOHN HENRY HODGKINSON
JEFFREY CRAIG HOY
ROBERT EARL HUMPHRIES
BRADLEY M. INMAN
PAUL DAVID JESS
HOWARD T. KAUDERER
KENYON HYATT KENNEDY
NORMAN ALAN KENT
BRUCE JOSEPH LAPOINTE
MARK ALAN LUETKEMEYER
MARJORIE MARIKO HIGA MANUIA
LYNN E. MARSHALL
LARRY K. MARSKE
BENJAMIN BARGER MORGAN
KENYON LYNN MOSS
MELVIN CLAY MURPH
DENISE ELLEN MURPHY
LANE EDWARD NAPOLI
RICHARD STEPHEN OLSON
DONALD JEFFREY PAINTER
KENNETH FRANCIS PATTERSON
ALAN E. PEASE
MARK M. PETZINGER
JAMES WALTER PICKERING
PHILLIP LINCOLN POIRIER, JR
JAMES BOST ROBERTS, III
LARRY W. ROGERS
MARYBETH KIMBERLY RUPERT
RUSSELL CHARLES SCHLOTE, JR
DON CHARLES SCHOMER
ALFRED JOHN SEUFERT, JR
GLENN RAY SIVILLS
FREDERICK DEAN STEIN
ALAN ROBERT THEILE
EDGAR DALE THOMPSON
LARRY JAMES TODD
DEBORAH TERESSA PAINTE WARD
MARGARET MARY WATRY

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (INTELLIGENCE) (TAR)

To be commander

WILLIAM ANDREW CIRA
STEPHEN MICHAEL SAIA

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

To be commander

WILLIAM GEORGE ARMSTRONG, JR
GLENN EDDIE T. FLOOD
WILLIAM HOWARD HICKMAN
STEPHEN HOWARD HORWITZ
MARK STANLEY JOHNSON
NATHAN EDWIN JONES
JAMES ANTHONY KENDRICK
ANNE CYNTHIA LEON
GARY HUGH MACDONALD
STEVIE PRESSLEY
PETER JAMES REYNIERSE
JEAN ELLEN ROBERTS
MICHAEL PATRICK SMITH

SPECIAL DUTY OFFICERS (OCEANOGRAPHY)

To be commander

ROBERT MARK AUNE
SCOTT FARLEY BUCK
WILSON CHUN SIM FONG
GREGORY FRANK NEUSCHAFER
LEE SMITH, III

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS IN THE STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY FOR PROMOTION TO THE PERMANENT GRADE OF COMMANDER, PURSUANT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTION 624, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW:

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

RICHARD JOHN ACKERMANN
JOHN FRANCIS ALBURGER
BRYAN STANLEY APPLE
RICHARD WAYNE ASHBURN
CHARLES ROBERT AUKER
MARK WAYNE AUSTIN
GLENN SHERWOOD BACON
RICHARD SHELDO BAKALAR
BRUCE PAUL BARGER
DUNCAN STEWART BARLOW
DAVID JOHN BARNETTE, JR
LYNN SLOANE BEMILLER
TIMOTHY ALLEN BEMILLER
KEVIN GELZER BERRY
PHILIP BLISS BESHANY
CRAIG ERNEST BISCHOFF
LAURIE BETH BLAKLEY
BILL NELSON BOSWELL
WILLIAM A. BOWLER
CHARLES ELDON BRADY, JR
JOHN THOMAS BRAUN
TERESA M. BRENNAN
JOE PAUL BRYAN
CHARLES L. BRYNER, JR
STEVEN LANCE BUCKLEY
PATRICIA L. BUSS
MARK WILLIAM COBB
WILLIAM L. CODY
MARGARET LYNN COHEN
LAURENCE DAVID CONLEY
WILLIAM R. CORSE
MICHAEL DOYLE COURTNEY
LANCE EVAN CROPP
CHRISTOPHER CUNNINGHAM
CRAIG LEE CUPP
TERESA ANN DARCY
JAMES ROY DEVOLL
ROBERT JOHN DHAEM
ERNESTO ALBE DIAZORDAZ
JAMES PAUL DORMAN
ROBERT P. DRISCOLL
MARK EDWARDS
RICARDO BROWNL EUSEBIO
WILLIAM BRUCE FERRARA
WILLIAM JARVIS FORTE
EDWARD GASTALDO
H. JOHN GERHARD
THOMAS F. GIESECKE
IGOR M. GLADSTONE, JR
DANIEL LEONARD GRIFFEN
JAMES ALLAN GRIGGS
LARRY K. GRUBB
KELLY D. GUBLER
DANIEL W. HANSEN
DAVID MARSHALL HARLAN
JOHN RANDALL HEIL
MICHAEL ROSS HENRY
JAMES M. JOHNSTON
EDGAR THOMAS JONES
ELAINE MELISSA KAIME
DAVID ALAN KALLMAN
GERARD D. KENNEDY
EDWARD M. KILBANE
EUGENE S. KILLEAVY
PATRICK J. LANIGAN
RAYMOND BRUCE LEIDICH
DAVID LEIVERS
RICKY LOCKHART
SEAN RAYMOND LOGAN
JOSEPH O. LOPREIATO
HUGH P. MADDEN
EVERETT FRANCIS MAGANN
MICHAEL PETE MALANOSKI
STEPHEN V. MAWN
BRIAN ROBERT MCDONALD
WILLIAM ANTHO MCDONALD
CAMERON C. MCKEE
KEVIN W. MCNEELY
JOHN KURT MEHL
PAULA JOYCE MELONE
HARRY F. MEYERS
JACKIE ROBINSON MILLER
KEITH D. MUNSON
JOHN E. MURNANE
MATHEW NATHAN
JONATHAN C. NESBITT
DALE C. NEWTON
MICHAEL RICHAR NOWACKI
JEFFREY MICH OGORZALEK
FRED G. PANICO
IVAN YOPP PEACOCK
MARSHA GAIL PIERDINOCK
CHRISTOPHER RAMOS
RALPH WILLIAM RENKEN
MICHAEL T. RICCIARDI
KIRBY G. RIDGWAY
DOUGLAS CHARLES RIEHLE
KENNETH JEROME RILEY
GEORGE ED RODELSPERGER
GABRIEL ANGE RODRIGUEZ
ELLESTON CRAIG RUCKER
ANGUS HARRISON RUPERT
JEANNE MARIE RUSHIN
ELISABETH JANE RUSHING
DAVID MICHAEL SACK
LOUIS J. SAPORITO
BARBARA ANN SCHIBLY
FRANK VERNON SCHRAML
SAUL SAMUEL SCHWARZ
DAVID GRAYSON SCOTT
RANDALL VAN SELLERS
DAVID J. SMITH
DAVID GRAH SOUTHERLAND
MICHAEL RAYMON SPIEKER
MARK S. SPITZER
TIMOTHY LAMO STERNBERG
THOMAS J. STILLWELL
RICHARD ALAN SUMMA
JEFFREY M. SWALCHICK
WILLIAM TAYLOR
MICHAEL A. TURNER
JOHN H. VARGA
WILLIAM A. WALKER
PETER JOH WEIMERSKIRCH
WALTER RALPH WEISS
BRUCE MAC WENIG
THOMAS G. WESTBROOK
LAURA WILLIAMS
ROGERS LEE WORTHAM

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

KEITH THOMAS ADAMS
REBECCA JEAN ADAMS
ROBERT B. ALDERMAN
DOUGLAS J. ALLEN
CLIFFORD JAMES ALLIGOOD
MICHAEL ALAN ANDERSON
MICHAEL AUGUSTINE
JAMES M. BAKER
MARK HAROLD BARBER
JOSEPH CLIFFORD BASTIAN
GEORGE E. BENNETT
JERAN BINNING
KARL WILLIAM BOGOTT
JOSEPH RALPH BONOMO
BARRY BLANE BOYD
MARTIN JOSEPH BROWN
SARAH ELLIOTT BROWN
RICHARD ALEXANDER BRYANT
WINSTON HAMLETT BUCKLEY
ROBERT J. BUMP
LADEAN WILLIAM BUNKERS
ROBERT JOE BUTHERUS
HOWARD CARTWRIGHT, JR
JOE D. CLEMENTS
HAROLD CLARK COLE, JR
RICHARD STANLEY COLTON
RAYMOND H. COOK
GARY W. CORDERMAN
JAMES STEVEN COWART
GREGORY A. CRISMON
MATTHEW D. CULBERTSON
EDWARD ARTHUR DAHL
MICHAEL MEADOWS DARBY
JAMES JOHN DARGAN, JR
DELBERT ERNEST DAVIS
JAMES WALTON DAY, JR
DOUGLAS MICHAEL DEETS
JAMES LAWRENCE DIETZ
JOHN S. DITTMEIER
WILLIAM DOUGLAS DOLAN
DAVID S. DOUGLAS
RICHARD D. DOWLING
CHRISTOPHER BARSTOW DRAKE
JAMES FRANCIS DUFFY
RONALD DAVID ELKINS
WILLIAM F. FEAY
RICHARD HARVEY FEIERABEND
SCOTT WARD FISHER
DONALD EUGENE FRANKLIN
MICHAEL WAYNE FREE
ANTHONY PETER FRONTIERO
STUART DOUGLAS FUNK
MICHAEL FUZY, III
WILLIAM JOSEPH GAULT
HOWARD E. GLASSMAN
JAMES NICHOLAS HAGARTY
ROGER ELLIOT HAMMER, JR
MARK DAVID HARNITCHEK
MICHAEL WELDON HEDGES
EDWARD N. HERING
LARRY RAY HEYEN
MICHAEL W. HICKINBOTHAM
JOHN S. HICKY
JOHN LAWRENCE HIGGINS
DENNIS JOSEPH HOFFMAN
DONALD BERNARD HOFFMANN
RENE RAYMOND HOOPER
GARY ARTHUR HUSTON
JOHN SHELTON HYATT, JR
LOUIS G. KALMAR
MICHAEL ROBERT KAPSCH
JOHN JOSEPH KASO
DIANE CHRISTINE KELLY
CHRISTOPHER T. KIBLER
KIM FREDERICK KLINE
KENNETH R. KMIEC
MARK LEONARD KONETSKI
WILLIAM ARNOLD KOWBA
CHRIS ANDREW LAMONT
WILLIAM RONALD LAVENDER
FRANK COOPER LAWTON, III
JOSEPH W. LEMIRE, JR
JAMES MICHAEL LEVALLEY
CARL FRAZIER LOGAN
MICHAEL ALLEN LOVEJOY
ANDREW GOODWIN MACKEL
JOHN DANIEL MARTIN
DONALD WILLIAM MARTYNY
PAUL JOHN MASTERS
JAMES ALBERT MAUS
DONALD TELFORD MCBURNEY
WILLIAM DAVID MCCARTHY
MARC MCCONAHY
CHRISTOPHER M. MCGRATH
THOMAS PAUL MCILRAVY
CHRIS R. MCKELVEY
MICHAEL JOSEPH METTS
JOHN EDWARD MOONEY
ROBERT L. MOSES
JAMES WALKER MULLALLY
DAVID BRYAN NEWBERRY
STEPHEN COURTNEY OBER
RONALD L. OLSEN
RICHARD ALLEN PARKER
PAUL JOSEPH PETRILL
ROGER ELLSWORTH PETTY
DAVID LEE PORTER
GEORGE CURTIS POST
RICHARD GAVIN POSTON
WILLIAM ARTHUR POTTER
JEFFREY L. POTTINGER
ANTHONY F. PRESTO
STEPHEN ANTHONY PRINCE
JACK NMN PRPICH
PHILIP LEE PUCKETT
MICHAEL F. QUERY
PETER RAY RAYMOND
KENNETH JOHN RECLA
DALE CHARLES RIECK, JR
BERNARD LAFAYETTE ROPER
EDWARD J. ROURKE
PEGGY JO ROY
DAVID C. RUFF
JOHN CHARLES RUNYAN
DANIEL F. RYAN
TIMOTHY GARY SAWYER
RALPH OTTO SCHERINI
WILLIAM D. SCHILL
PATRICK M. SELLERS
DANNY ANDREW SHOCKLEY
WILLIAM B. SHORT
JOHN NMN SIEMBIEDA
LYNN PATRICIA SIMON
MARY LYNN SLOUGH
DAVID VAN SMITH
DONALD WILSON SMITH
JANE RENO SMITH
DANIEL REID SMOAK
RICHARD JAMES STAHEL
THOMAS E. STEFFEN
STEVEN CRAIG STERRETT
RUSSELL TENNENT STROTHER
CHARLES TOBIAS SWITZER
RODNEY M. THOMPSON
JAY R. TROWBRIDGE
MICHAEL PATRICK TRYON
CURTIS HEIGH TUCKER
RODNEY WILLIAM TURK
JERROLD LEON TWIGG
MYLES GARRETT VANSTON
ROBERT B. VASSIAN
FREDERICK RALPH VOELLM
KENNETH F. WALTER
JENNIFER GATLIFF WATSON
WALTER FREDERICK WATSON
MARVIN CARL WENBERG, II
GARY WAYNE WESTFALL
PETER LLOYD WHIPPLE
KEVIN LAWRENCE WHITE
VIVIAN THOMAS WHITLOCK
ROBERT LEON WILLIAMS
DAVID ALAN ZUCKER

CHAPLAIN CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

DONALD WEBSTER AVEN
DAVID MERYL BELT, JR
ROBERT PAUL BELTRAM
CHRISTOPHER P. BENNETT
CHARLES JOSEPH BURT, JR
SANTINO ANTHONY KE CASIMANO
ROBERT PERRY COOPER
ROBERT NELSON EDWARDS
RICHARD CARTER FLETCHER
GILBERT DARRYL GIBSON
JAMES MONROE HIGHTOWER
ALBERT L. HILL
LAWRENCE BALL KEITH
JAMES RODNEY KELLEY
JOHN STEVEN LINEBACK
JAMES BEATTIE MAGNESS
STANLEY HOWARD MCCREARY
WALTER ROBERTS MCIVOR
JOHN WESLEY MORRISON
ROY PALOMA PANES
GARY JOSEPH PARKER
JAMES FRANKLIN POE, JR
JAMES HOWARD POPE
ROBERT ALEX PRICE
LARRY ALDEN ROTH
ENOCH ARNOLD SIEGEL
RALPH HOWARD SODANO
PHILIP SIDNEY SPAIN
ROBERT EDWARD STONE
GEORGE LEWIS TUMLIN, JR
WAYNE THOMAS WEINLADER
MICHAEL LEONARD WILLIAMS
BERNARD RALPH WILSON

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

JAMES MORGAN BARRETT, III
FRED HANS BECKMANN
DONEL SCOTT BIANCHI
DENNIS NMN BIDDICK
WILLIAM FRANK BOUDRA
DANIEL SHELLING BRANIGAN
ROBERT PETER BUCHHOLZ
GLENN CLARK CYPHERS
PHILIP HAYS DALBY
WALTER DONALD DEKIN
CHUCK L. DOHERTY
MARK EDWARD DONALDSON
MICHAEL DUNCALF DONNELLY
WILLIAM A. DOSSANTOS
THOMAS F. DREYER
TIMOTHY KEITH EQUELS
RONNIE DEAN GROVER
JOSEPH BANCROFT HALL, JR
THOMAS JOHN HILFERTY
JAMES W. HOLLRITH
RICHARD BEGG HUNTER, JR
MARK DAVID HUNTZINGER
ALISON HARDY INGRAM
DAVID ALAN JONES
DESMOND EDWARD KELLY
MARK IRVING KIMBALL
THOMAS MARKERT LOWRY
LOUIS V. MARCHETTE
ROLAND STEPHEN MOREAU
THOMAS WILLIAM NIELSEN
ROGER LEE ORNDORFF
TERRENCE LEE RAYBACK
JOHN E. SURASH
HAROLD D. TAUNTON, JR
MICHAEL DALE THORNTON
JEFFREY TUBELLO
DENNIS E. WRIGHT

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

TERRY GLENWOOD BAKER
GARY DEAN BAXTER
JOSEPH P. CALLAHAN
PHILIP DOUGLAS CAVE
STEPHEN J. COYLE
DAVID L. GRIMORD
EUGENE ESKER IRVIN
NELS H. KELSTROM
MICHAEL WILLIAM LORD
WILLIAM KENT LUEKER

DAVID H. MYERS
GINGER CLARE PAAD
DAVID PAUL PRICE
ELDON DONALD RISHER, II
MARK E. ROSEN
FRANCIS VINCENT RUSSO
DAVID SUNDERL SHEPHERD
RICHARD ALLEN STEVENS
ROBERT BOYCE THOMAS, JR
MARK STEPHEN UTECHT
JANICE LYNNE WALLI
ROBERT WARREN WEDAN, JR
DAVID M. WHITE
RICHARD GENE WILLIAMS
PATRICIA ZENGEL

DENTAL CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

TERRENCE LYNN ALLEMANG
RONALD G. ALLUSHUSKI
JOSEPH D. BARNETT
KEVIN WARD BARNHART
RICHARD T. BEX
JAY ALLAN BLACK
BRUCE N. BLANDY
LELAND SPEICLE BLOUGH
ROBERT EUGENE BLUNDELL
DAVID MARK CHRISTENSON
DAVID P. COTE
MARC SCOTT CUNNINGHAM
JOHN PATRICK DEPNER
ROBERT F. DEVIN
CHRISTOPHER RO ERBLAND
HOWARD HENRY J. FISCHER
JOHN THOMAS FRENCH
ROBERT FRANKLIN FRISBY
MARK DAVID GILBERTS
WILLIAM GLEN GOLDEN
DAVID L. GROCHMAL
STEPHEN BECKLEY HAAS
BRADLEY ALAN HALVERSON
GREGORY JAMES HEISE
SCOTT WILLIAM IMRAY
JOHN FRANKLIN JOHNSON
JOHN ROBERT KELLY
LOUIS J. KITSLAAR
STEPHEN BLISS KNOFF
RICHARD J. LEUPOLD
MICHAEL D. MAIXNER
ALFRED J. MASKERONI
MICHAEL PICKAR MCCLAIN
LLOYD P. MCDONALD
BRADLEY GEORG MCKEEVER
KENNETH ALEXANDE MERTZ
ALLEN RAY MIKULENCAK
JAN K. MITCHELL
DAVID SCOTT MORESI
RAND HINTZE NELSON
EDWARD ANTHONY NEUPERT
BRIAN KEITH NICOLL
WILLIAM G. REYNOLDS
KURT CONRAD ROLF
MARIAN ANN ROYER
ANDRE CHARLES SANTOS
MICHAEL LEE SCHOLTZ
PETER SLEPSKY
THOMAS B. SMITH
GREGORY L. STOYER
MICHAEL GEOR TENENBAUM
JAMES STEVEN VACEK
JOHN ARTHU VANDERCREEK
TOMMY BERNARD WHITE
GERALD K. WONG

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

HARVEY JOHN ADKINS
MARK ALEXANDER
JAMES RUSSELL BEDDARD
DENISE C. BERRY
PAUL KINGSLEY BLAKE
FRANCIS CHRISTOP BROWN
RICHARD L. BURDESS
JAMES ROBERT CAMPBELL
RONALD JAY CARROLL
JOHN THOMAS COYNE
JOEL DAVID CROXTON
IRA NAPOLEON BON DAVIS
PATRICIA MARIE DENZER
DUANE MICHAEL DIAN
OSCAR WAYNE DICKEY
CYNTHIA A. DILORENZO
WILLIAM PETER FRANK
RUFUS EUGENE GODWIN
PETER C. K. GRAHAMMIST
CHARLES LESLIE HALL, JR
JOHN WILSON HALL
JESSE DONALD HARRAHILL
ELLIS EUGENE HODGES
DAVID HOWAR HOFFLINGER
EDWARD EWALD KARELIN
DAVID LAWRENCE KENNEDY
HERBERT DONALD KENNEDY
GEORGE D. KRAMER
NATHAN LACY
FRANK EDWARD LOIACONO
DAVID L. MALONEY
DENNIS KESSLER MCBRIDE
WILLIAM L. MCCULLOUGH
HERBERT KENNE MEREDITH
ROBERT JAMES MILLER, JR
MICHAEL HOWA MITTELMAN
WILLIAM SANFOR QUILLEN
SIDNEY DANA RODGERS
RICHARD R. ROSANDER
K. ADELE ROSSIMARSH
PAUL RALPH SANDOVAL
CHRISTOPHER L. SCHUYLER
DANIEL JAMES SNYDER
DAVID L. SPAULDING, JR
HUGH CORNELIO SULLIVAN
DAVID KIM TAYLOR
EDWARD ALAN TRAUTMAN
JERALD LEONARD ULMER
STEPHEN EDWARD WALZ
JOSEPH LLOYD WHITE
LARRY LEROY YOUNGER
GARY WAYNE ZUCKERMAN

NURSE CORPS OFFICERS

To be commander

MARGARET MARIE ALLARD
STEVEN EUGENE ANDERSON
CATHERINE MARY F. BAKER
KATHLEEN A. BAKER
BRIGITTE BALOG
DEBORAH JEAN BARKER
MARGARET ANN BARTON
DAVID JOHN BECKER
MARIANNE MIRALDI BENTZ
SANDRA COLETTE BIBB
PATRICIA M. BINNS
GERALD ANTHON BOECHLER
CAROL S. R. BOHN
MARY MASON BOSSICK
ROBERT EUGENE BOUTWELL
SUSAN COREDON BOWLES
JEAN NEWTON BRAKEBILL
SHARYN ANN BURKE
MARGARET LAURA BURNS
ROBERT EARL BUTZOW
SUZANNE MARIE PR BYRUM
KATHRYN ANNE CADWELL
GAYLAND JOHN CHAPMAN
KATHLEEN GRAC CHARTERS
JO ANNE CLANTON
JOANNE SUE CLARK
MARY EMALYNN COBB
DANIEL FRED COLVIN
MIRIAM NOWAK CORDELL
RITA A. COX
DONALD THOMAS CYR
JOANNE WHITNEY DAVIS
JOLINE IRENE WAT DEVOS
MARSHA HECKLER DEWEESE
JOHN ADAM DIXON
DIANE LYNN DREES
JANE KATHRYN EBERLEIN
GARY PAUL ELLIOTT
CHARLES BRUCE EMMERTON
JEAN MARIE ENSOR
CARL NELSON FARMER
SUSAN CLAIR FAUROT
LEAH STUART FEYH
RODNEY LEE FIEREK
JAMES VERLE FINCH
RICHARD PAUL FINK
DIANA LEE FLORIN
RONALD EDWARD FRALEY
BARBARA ANN FRITZ
ADELE DRAKE GABB
VANCE GLENN GAINER, JR
SUSAN LEARY GEORGE
LORA LYNN GIBSON
CANDACE M. GORTNEY
DEBORAH BUTTS GRAY
SUSAN LYNNE GRIFFIN
EDWIN HOWARD GULLISON
CYNTHIA ANN HAGSTROM
MARY M. HARDING
JANET MARIE HELLECKSON
LYNNE MARIE LU HINGSON
JOHN THADDEUS JACOBS
JAMES ALAN JONES
ADDIE LOUISE JORDAN
NANCY J. KALITOWSKI
DIANE JOYCE TH KIMBALL
MAJOR LEROY KING, II
LINDA GAY KLAMMER
TONIETTA LOUIS KUEHNLE
DIANE BEVERLY KUHNLY
HELEN ANTO LEBELEDMONS
BENNETT CERF LESHNOVER
CARL NORDWALL LEWIS
LARRY DEAN LINDERMAN
NANCY O. LINDSTROM
JEANNETTE A. LIVELY
JEANETTE LOUISE LONG
CYNTHIA POMINV LONGWAY
WENDY LYNN LUM
JEANETTE FRAHM LYNCH
PATRICIA ANN LYONS
ALVERINE JESSIE MACK
REBECCA ELLEN MAKDAD
DAVID CARL MANGLER
BEVERLY A. MATTHEWS
MAUREEN FRANCES MCAVOY
CHRISTINE MCKNIGHT
BARBARA STARR MCLEAN
NUTE CARL MEEKER, JR
LYLE DOUGLAS MELTON
SHELAGH THOMAS MEUSER
MARY MARGARET MEYER
CASHMERE FAYE MONROE
JANIE LINDEMANN MORGAN
ELLEN LOUISE MURPHY
JUDITH MAY NAKASHIMA
FRANCINE ANN NELSON
PATRICIA HURLEY NETZER
KAREN MARIE NOTO
TIMOTHY TRACY OBRIEN
SANDRA RODR OKATANROSA
LAURA PACE OMER
MARY ELLEN OROURKE
MARVIN PERRY
DEBORAH ANN PINTSCH
SHIRLI LYNN POLLARD
JAMES RALPH PUGH, JR
NANCY ANN PUKSTA
RICHARD SPENCE PURDHAM
JEAN EV QUINDAGRAFFELS
MARY ELLEN QUISENBERRY
LINDA M. REINERTSEN
KATHERINE ANN RIEF
KAREN S. ROPER
VERONICA WALSH RUBIN
ESSIE MAE RUCKER
SHARON FIGG RUSHING
DIANE LYNN RUSNAK
RUTH ANN RYAN
KAREN SUE SCHALLER
ELAINE MARIE SCHERER
GEORGE MCALISTER SCOTT
ALBERT JOSEPH SHIMKUS
THOMAS RAY SHIRK
SUSAN MARIE SMALLING
PATRICIA JOAN STEINING
EVELYN PARTRIDG STRODE
LAURENCE ANT TARNOWSKI
FRANK C. THOMANN
EDWARD ULDRICH, III
DORIS ANN VAIANA DEBORAH VANLANDINGHAM
LINDA MARTIN VIDRINE
DEBORAH LYNN WAGGONER
KAREN NATALIE WALLACE
JULIE IMBER WAREHAM
JOYCE CAMPANY WENDT
RUTH ELAINE WHEELER
SUSAN AGNES WIDHALM
CAROL IRENE WILSON
PATRICIA ANN WORKMAN
PATRICIA KAY YARBROUGH

LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS (STAFF)

To be commander

RONALD J. LAUSTER
RICHARD ARNOLD NELSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, June 3, 1991*

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 3, 1991.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY 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 earnestly pray, O gracious God, that You will continue to bless each person with Your grace and mercy. On this day we particularly remember in prayer the children of our families and of our communities, whom we name in our hearts before You, that they will be nurtured and sustained and loved as they grow in years. May their knowledge of Your bountiful creation and the daily presence of Your spirit increase and multiply in their lives so they will experience the wonder of life and the wisdom of all time. Bless all families, O God, that their love for each other will be a witness to Your love for each one of us. 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 California [Mr. LANTOS] will please lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANTOS 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-83) on the resolution (H. Res. 162) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1) to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore and strengthen civil rights laws that ban discrimination in employment, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

KING HUSSEIN OF JORDAN RAISES HOPE FOR MIDDLE EAST TALKS

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, we may—just may—be on the threshold of a significant step in the peaceful and diplomatic resolution of the Middle East conflict. King Hussein of Jordan, in an interview with a French newspaper, called for direct face-to-face negotiations with Israel.

Israeli Government officials immediately and enthusiastically responded by inviting King Hussein to direct face-to-face discussions in Jerusalem or Amman, Jordan. The ball is now in the King's court. He should accept without delay.

The King's apparent willingness to hold direct face-to-face talks should be an example for our erstwhile allies in the recent Persian Gulf war, who have thus far refused to participate in any of the discussions which Secretary Baker has so patiently attempted to set up. King Hussein's willingness to meet also puts the ball squarely in the court of Saudi Arabia, Syria, Kuwait, and the other Arab States.

ARIZONA SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN WHO DIED IN THE GULF WAR

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, during this 2 weeks between our celebration of Memorial Day and the national Desert Storm Homecoming Victory Parade on Saturday, June 8, 1991, we recognize the American heroes who served in the Persian Gulf war and who have and will return home to welcoming ceremonies across this land.

We must not, however, forget the 387 service men and women who died with honor in service to their country. Among them are five from Arizona who died during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

They will not hear the chorus of welcoming cheers; they will not see the flurry of colorful flags; they will not feel the comforting embrace of family and friends.

We honor:

Army Pvt. Dorothy Fails, 25, of Taylor, AZ. Dorothy was killed March 19, 1991, in a military traffic accident in Saudi Arabia. She served with the Arizona National Guard's 1404th Transportation Company.

Marine Pfc. Michael Noline, 20, of Peridot, AZ. Michael died January 26, 1991, in the collision of two armored vehicles near the Kuwaiti border;

Marine LCpl. Eliseo Felix, 19, of Avondale, AZ. Eliseo was killed February 2, 1991, when his convoy was hit by friendly fire cluster bombs near the Saudi-Kuwaiti border;

Marine LCpl. James Cunningham, 22, of Glendale, AZ. James was killed as he slept on November 9, 1990, when a fellow marine's rifle discharged accidently.

Marine Sgt. Aaron Peck, 22, of Phoenix, AZ. Aaron, a radar-operations repairman, was killed by enemy fire on February 23, 1991, as United States forces swept into Kuwait from Saudi Arabia.

These five young soldiers died in service to America. As President Lincoln said, they gave "the last full measure of devotion."

We remember them. We honor them. And we pray for them and their families.

WE NEED A TOUGHER NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION POLICY

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the French Government has announced today that France is joining the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

That welcome and long overdue announcement from Paris leaves the People's Republic of China as the last major power remaining outside the international nuclear nonproliferation regime.

China's reckless nuclear proliferation policies and practices have barred it from receiving any nuclear cooperation

with the United States, because China has proved unwilling to meet the conditions established for such cooperation under United States law. China has been unable to provide the United States with clear and unequivocal assurances required under the Markey-Solomon amendment that it is not assisting and will not assist any nonnuclear weapons state, either directly or indirectly, in acquiring nuclear explosive materials and components for such devices.

China's political leaders follow Mao Tse-tung's precept that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. They will not change their ways until they find themselves staring down the barrel of America's economic gun.

It is time for the United States to stand up to ensure that we do not send the wrong signal to the Chinese, so to the rest of the world we know that these technologies are moving through China into Pakistan, into the Middle East. If we we are to have credibly fought the war over in the Persian Gulf, it has to have been over a strong nuclear nonproliferation policy, if nothing else, and let the United States now stand and send a strong signal to China and to all other countries in the world that we will not tolerate that activity. We will not give most-favored-nation status to the Chinese.

UNITED STATES STANDS FIRM FOR FREEDOM

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, there is good news from Angola. It appears that that country's civil war is at long last over. In Ethiopia, the statue of Lenin and the statues to other Communist dictators are falling. In South Africa we see a greater chance for democracy than at any time in our lifetime.

We should be reminded of the Reagan doctrine which, during the last decade, had the United States supporting the Afghan freedom fighers, and now the Soviets have marched out of Afghanistan. Yes, we supported in Angola, Jonas Savimbi, and in Nicargua we supported the Contras. Now today in Nicaragua, as these other countries, they have a democracy or a greater chance for democracy than ever before.

We stood firm and we supported those who were struggling for freedom. That is why we have been successful, because we had the courage to take on the right policies and stand besides those who were indeed fighting for freedom.

□ 1210

Today we hear that the Soviets are asking for billions of dollars worth of aid. Well, this aid, if we give it, which is a major question, should not go to prop up the last remnants of Communist power in the Soviet Union. If we do give aid, it should be channeled to those people within the Soviet empire and to those people in Yugoslavia who are struggling for freedom.

I would suggest that my colleagues join with me in supporting the Dole-Rohrabacher bill which would channel any aid to the Soviet Union to democratic republics, rather than Communist central governments.

LET'S NOT FORGET CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, we will have a very important piece of legislation on the floor tomorrow, the civil rights bill, H.R. 1, which I certainly hope will pass, and I hope eventually will be signed into law by the President.

But, even as we are speaking about that important issue, we cannot forget other important issues which are pending, one of which I will speak to briefly, and that is the question of campaign finance reform.

We in Kentucky have just gone through a major primary election for our gubernatorial candidates and for the Lieutenant Governor and other statewide candidates. One thing stands out, and that is the low voter participation. It was below 40 percent. One party had a turnout of below 30 percent.

I think what that suggests, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Kentucky, and by extension the people of the United States, are voting with their feet. They are staying away from the polls because they really do not think that politics is representative anymore.

I think that one of the several bills on campaign reform which are pending ought to pass, and I believe that will do many things. That will improve the ability people have of running for office and that will make the people of America vote in higher proportions.

CIVIL RIGHTS

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

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, shortly this body will take up H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991. I am confident that this House will pass this critically needed legislation by an overwhelming bipartisan majority.

I rise at this point not to discuss the substance of the bill that we will debate tomorrow, but rather to make a simple appeal to the President.

I appeal to the President to abandon the effort to manipulate our racial fears and prejudices for self-serving political ends. Let there be no mistake: The only conceivable purpose of the White House characterization of the pending civil rights legislation as a "quota" bill is to raise the spectre of racial minorities seeking to gain an unfair economic advantage. In effect, the quota charge is the legislative equivalent of the Willie Horton campaign commercial—and just as irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, the President is playing with fire. Racial and ethnic tensions have intensified in cities throughout America. Our society is increasingly polarized along racial, ethnic, and economic lines. And we are beginning to see the riots and violence that are the inevitable byproduct of continued injustice. Surely if there were ever a need for our national leaders to speak honestly and forthrightly to the issue of civil rights—and to the continuing racial and gender inequities born of past discrimination—it is now.

The President knows that nothing, absolutely nothing in H.R. 1, is about quotas. Quotas are illegal. They would remain illegal under H.R. 1. The harsh but unmistakable truth is that the issue of quotas is wholly contrived and is being used as a smoke screen.

Mr. Speaker, the President should be reminding all of us not of our differences, but of what we Americans hold in common. He should be rejecting the counsel of those who would seek to manipulate racial fears and prejudices for self-serving political purposes and he should, instead, be joining with the Congress in affirming the paramount importance of the effective enforcement of our civil rights laws.

THE NEW SOVIET LOBBY

(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, talking about danger, the Soviet Union is hiring a Washington lobby. They are going to pay the lobby $250,000 a month, $3 million a year, because the Soviet Union says, "If everybody else can do it, so can we."

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union wants 250 billion dollars' worth of American aid.

Now, if that is not enough to scorch your glasnost, some White House spokesman said, "Wow, that's really a lot of money."

Yes, some real Dick Tracy over there; but the President said, "I like what I heard at the meeting."

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, was a Soviet band playing the Stars and Stripes when the Soviet Union asked for 250 billion dollars' worth of aid? We have 37 million people without health insur-

ance, 23,000 murders. We already spend $160 billion to protect Japan and Europe from an invasion by the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is not foreign affairs. This is stupidity.

PRESIDENT ONCE AGAIN SHOWS HIS TRUE COLORS, THREATENS CIVIL RIGHTS VETO

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, once again, this President has shown his true colors. As a candidate for the U.S. Senate, George Bush opposed the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and now, as President, he wants to veto the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Last Saturday, his speech at West Point was the most divisive and demogogic one that any President has made on civil rights in modern times.

The President should be ashamed of himself. His speech has done more to divide and polarize the American people along the lines of sex, race, and religion than any other speech given by any President in the last 30 years.

Quota has become a code word. Along with Mr. Bush at West Point, we had Clayton Yeutter, Chairman of the Republican Party, speaking in Wisconsin, telling the American people that this bill is a quota bill, that women and minorities do not need it, and that white people do not want it. If this speech is not a reminder of the days of George Wallace and Bull Connor, what is?

A SOVIET ORWELLIAN LIE

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

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, George Orwell in one of his famous works said that, "love is hate, war is peace and ignorance is truth."

The chief Soviet prosecutor today issued a report which has done George Orwell proud. He has said that the Lithuanian massacre last January, Bloody Sunday, as it has become known, was not the doing of the Soviet troops. It was the doing of the Lithuanian peaceful demonstrators themselves.

Twice in the last year I have gone to Lithuania. I have spoken with the people there. I have seen the Soviet troops, tanks, and personnel carriers, that still surround that radio and TV tower.

Like many Americans, I have seen the photos, the gruesome carnage caused by those Soviet troops, including that picture of the Soviet tank running over a young Lithuanian girl.

This Soviet coverup of the Lithuanian Bloody Sunday is a bald-faced Orwellian lie. Ironically, it comes in the very week that Gorbachev is traveling to Oslo to deliver his Nobel Peace Prize lecture.

Mr. Speaker, I say to Mr. Gorbachev that when he is in Oslo to take up his Nobel Peace Prize, there are two honorable things that he can do: condemn this Orwellian coverup of the Lithuanian Bloody Sunday, or give his Nobel Peace Prize back.

1991 CIVIL RIGHTS/ECONOMIC RIGHTS

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said concerning the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1991, a law frankly that should have been enacted in 1990.

This civil rights measure really goes to the very core of what our society is about. I know that many citizens wonder how does this proposal affect them.

The Civil Rights Restoration Act holds up the basic proposition of equal economic opportunity for all in our Nation the fair access to employment, the basic economic opportunity that people need to attain and maintain economic well-being in our society.

We know from history, we know from statistics and from past practices that that economic opportunity for employment has not been extended in a fair or on an unbiased basis. Historically, if you are black, if you are a minority, if you are a woman, if you had disabilities, you often were subject to discriminatory practices in seeking employment. The record is replete with examples of denial of economic opportunity for such individuals in our society. The Civil Rights Restoration Act is a means of re-enacting into law the court interpretations that embrace the appropriate meaning of our civil rights laws which are the hopes and promises of our Constitution. Such statements ought to exist in practice beyond just the written words of promise in our Constitution and of course they did prior to a series of six court cases that badly undercut the meaning of important laws such as the 1964 civil rights law.

I implore my colleagues as we look at the subject this week and debate in the House to vote and overturn all six of these court cases not just the two cases that the Justice Department argued against but also those that the Reagan/Bush Justice Department argued in favor of. We need to restore our Nation's civil rights policy to the path of progress, to move forward into the 1990's, the next century, with a strong opportunity for everyone to have access to employment and economic well-being. A true economic stake in a just society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the strong civil rights restoration measure that I've cosponsored, H.R. 1, that recognizes the strong tie between civil rights and economic rights for all Americans.

□ 1220

LUKE EASTER POST OFFICE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 971) to designate the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 630 East 105th Street, Cleveland, OH, as the "Luke Easter Post Office" with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, after line 5, insert:

SEC. 3. LEAVE BANK FOR JUDICIAL BRANCH EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN RESERVES WHO WERE ACTIVATED DURING PERSIAN GULF WAR.

(a) JUDICIAL BRANCH EMPLOYEES.—The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall establish a leave bank program under which—

(1) an employee of the Judicial Branch may (during a period specified by the Director of the Administrative Office) donate any unused annual leave from the employee's annual leave account to a leave bank established by the Director.

(2) the total amount of annual leave that has been donated under paragraph (1) shall be divided equally among the annual leave account of all employees who have been members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty during the Persian Gulf conflict pursuant to an order issued under section 672(a), 672(g), 673, 673b, 674, 675, or 688 of title 10, United States Code, and who return to employment with the Judicial Branch; and

(3) such Persian Gulf conflict participants who have returned to Judicial Branch employment may use such annual leave, after it is credited to their leave accounts, in the same manner as any other annual leave to their credit.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term "employee" means an employee as defined in section 6301(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(c) DEADLINE FOR REGULATIONS.—Within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Administration Office shall prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of subsection (a).

Mr. McCLOSKEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment requires the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to establish a leave bank program under which employees of the judicial branch may donate any of

their unused annual leave for use by Persian Gulf participants who have returned to employment with the judicial branch. This Leave Bank Program is similar to that established earlier this year for employees of the executive branch by section 361 of Public Law 102-25.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLOSKEY. 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 the bill, H.R. 971, and the Senate amendments thereto.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

FOLLOW THROUGH ACT AND THE HEAD START TRANSITION PROJECT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rule and pass the bill (H.R. 2312) to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Follow Through Act and the Head Start Transition Project Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2312

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE FOLLOW THROUGH ACT.

(a) CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS.—Paragraph (5) of section 663(b) of the Follow Through Act (42 U.S.C. 9862(b)) is amended by inserting after "technical assistance" the following: "(in the case of any applicant eligible for such assistance)".

(b) PARTICIPATION IN OTHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—Subsection (b) of section 669A of the Follow Through Act (42 U.S.C. 9869) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall—

"(1) consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services in the coordination of the program established under this Act with the programs established under the Head Start Transition Project Act;

"(2) provide, to the extent practicable, for the coordinated review of applications for funds submitted under each such program; and

"(3) coordinate, to the extent practicable, the issuance of regulations governing such programs.".

SEC. 2. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE HEAD START TRANSITION PROJECT ACT.

Section 139 of the Head Start Transition Project Act (42 U.S.C. 9855g) is amended—

(1) by striking "to enable" and all that follows through "both such programs,", and

(2) by inserting after "practicable," the following:

"provide for coordinated review of applications submitted for funds available under this subtitle and applications submitted for funds available under such Act, and".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2312 makes two technical amendments to the Follow Through Act, as well as a conforming amendment to the Head Start Transition Act.

The first Follow Through amendment clarifies congressional intent in the reauthoirzaion of that act last year.

The Department of Education has interpreted new application requirements in a manner which would restrict the number of years that an otherwise eligible school district can receive follow through grants.

This amendment makes a minor change in the law to clarify that the Follow Through Act only limits the time that a school district can receive technical assistance—not the amount of time that it can receive follow through grants.

The second follow through amendment makes a minor correction in the law related to the joint review of applications for Follow Through and Head Start transition project funds.

Last year, the House agreed in conference to a Senate provision which directed the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services to coordinate their grant review processes so that a school district can simultaneously apply for Follow Through and Head Start transition funds.

Thus far, the two departments have been unsuccessful in implementing this requirement because they have very different grant review processes and may review grants at different times of the year.

This second amendment softens the requirement directing the two departments to jointly review applications by providing that it should be done "to the extent practicable."

The third amendment makes the identical change to the joint application provisions of the Head Start Transition Project Act.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2312 clarifies and improves the provisions of law authorizing two important programs and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am here to present the views of the minority with respect to H.R. 2312. The minority members on the committee are not opposing passage of H.R. 2312 but would like to express concerns about this legislation and the Follow Through Program.

Mr. Speaker, the concern with the enactment of this legislation is that it would, in effect, continue to provide grants to programs which have been operational far beyond what could be considered a normal demonstration grant period.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Follow Through Program, until 1986, even had the word demonstration included in its title. However, at least 32 of the current 63 grantees have received funding for more than 20 years. The program needs new blood.

New grantees would benefit the program by broadening its support and diminishing the criticism that the program only benefits a select few. If Follow Through is a successful program, then the time has come to change the program to allow the broadest number of schools to participate and benefit. On the other hand, if it is not a successful program, then we should not continue to authorize it.

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the program will tell you that the Follow Through Program is now a competitive grant program. This is true. However, because current grantees have had a great deal of experience in the preparation of applications, they have a distinct advantage over new applicants and generally continue to receive grant awards.

Whether or not H.R. 2312 is enacted, the Follow Through Program will continue to operate. Without this amendment, there would be a greater chance that new grantees could receive funding.

Enactment of H.R. 2312 will allow Follow Through dollars to continue to go to the same grantees. It is time for a change.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the minority are not opposing this bill, and the question which has been raised by the minority member will be under discussion by myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr.

GOODLING] before the reauthorization of this bill the next time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I rise in support of H.R. 2312, a bill which makes technical amendments to the Follow Through Act and the Head Start Transition Project Act.

Last year we extended the Follow Through Program through 1994. A number of program improvements were made at that time to define more clearly the activities to be funded. For example, the legislation provided that 70 percent of the funds would be used for direct services, a portion would be reserved for training and technical assistance, and some funds would be used for a national clearinghouse. To enhance program effectiveness, applicants were also required to include a training and technical assistance component in their applications. A limitation placed on the number of years for which a project could receive such technical support has apparently caused some confusion concerning overall limits on program participation.

The amendments before us today clarify that the limitation on training and technical assistance in no way limits the number of years that a project may receive funds to administer a Follow Through Program. In addition, the amendments remove the cumbersome requirement that the Department of Health and Human Services coordinate with the Department of Education in the review of grant applications for the Follow Through Program and the Head Start Transition Project. While the coordination measure seemed to be a good idea in theory, in reality it burdened the agencies involved and could delay the selection and funding of grantees needlessly.

I would like to compliment my colleague, Chairman KILDEE, for taking swift action on this measure. Representative KILDEE has been one of the most vigilant and forceful Members over the years on behalf of Follow Through. Despite the administration's repeated recommendations to discontinue Follow Through, Mr. KILDEE successfully guided legislation through the Congress last year, extending the program for another 4 years.

The Follow Through Program began in 1967, 2 years after Project Head Start. It was designed to capitalize on the gains made through Head Start by helping young poor children make a successful transition into school. Like Head Start, the Follow Through Program provides comprehensive services, including both instructional and social service components, to young children. Almost 25 years old, Follow Through embodies a common sense approach to educating our children and has achieved remarkable successes.

I urge my colleagues to approve passage of H.R. 2312 without delay.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2312, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCHOOL DROPOUT DEMONSTRATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1988, AUTHORIZATION

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2313) to amend the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 to extend authorization of appropriations through fiscal year 1993 and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2313

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 6003(a) of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 (20 U.S.C. 3243(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this part $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1991 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1992 and 1993.".

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 6004 of the School Dropout Demonstration.

Assistance Act of 1988 (20 U.S.C. 3244) is amended:

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "$1,500,000" and inserting "$2,000,000";

(2) in subsection (c) by inserting after "value as a demonstration." the following: "Any local educational agency, educational partnership, or community-based organization that has received a grant under this Act shall be eligible for additional funds subject to the requirements under this Act.";

(3) in subparagraph (B) of subsection (f)(1) by striking "for the second such year" and inserting "in each succeeding fiscal year".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on October 1, 1992.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.

Section 6006(b) of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988 (20 U.S.C. 3246(b)) is amended:

(1) in paragraph (8) by striking "and";

(2) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(9) mentoring programs; and

"(10) any other activity described in subsection (a).".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am truly pleased to be able to bring H.R. 2313 to the House floor.

H.R. 2313 represents a bipartisan effort to address our country's overwhelming dropout crisis.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2313 extends the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act through 1993 at authorization levels consistent with current law, and makes minor changes to the program.

There are four minor amendments to the program which are included in the bill.

The first amendment is in response to a request from the Department of Education. It raises the amount of funds reserved to conduct evaluations from $1.5 to $2 million.

The second amendment, included at the request of Mr. GOODLING, adds mentoring programs to the list of allowable educational activities for which funds may be used.

The third amendment simply clarifies that existing grantees are eligible to apply for additional grants.

The fourth amendment clarifies that the current second year match requirement of 25 percent applies to all succeeding years, not only the second year.

It is estimated that each class of dropouts earns $240 billion less than high school graduates. This translates into a loss in tax revenues of over $70 billion and does not include the human costs.

The extension of this program, will ensure a continued Federal effort to address the formidable national problem of school dropouts. It is estimated that between 600,000 and 700,000 young adults between the ages of 14 and 24 drop out of school each year. At the present time 4.3 million people between the ages of 16 and 24 are neither enrolled in high school, nor have a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Additionally, the national education goals established by the Nation's Governors lists improving on the number of students that graduate as one of its six goals. The Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act has been one of Congress' strongest tools to achieve this goal.

The Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act was authorized as part of the Hawkins-Stafford Act in 1988. The program has been reauthorized once since that time, Mr. Speaker, the current authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 1991.

The subcommittee has worked with the administration to develop this legislation and I know of no objection to it.

I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2313, which would continue School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act through fiscal year 1993.

This program is vitally important if our country is to continue to compete in the world marketplace. Not only do we need to provide our nation's students with the best possible education,

we need to keep them in school to insure they develop the skills they will need to obtain jobs.

Students dropping out of school 20 to 30 years ago, could obtain jobs which would allow them to provide well for themselves and their families. This is no longer true. In our highly technological society, higher levels of education and training are required for students to obtain and keep jobs.

The legislation before us today would continue the current Student Dropout Demonstration Act until the reauthorization of the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and secondary school improvement amendments in the 103d Congress.

When this act was originally authorized, it was to be a 1-year demonstration program and the School Dropout Prevention and Basic Skills Improvement Act was to take its place. However, funds have never been appropriated for the latter act and it is important that we have some type of program in place which addresses the school dropout problem.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the national education goals is that the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent by the year 2000. If we are to achieve this goal we must find out what school dropout prevention programs work. It is our hope that this demonstration grant program will provide us with information on successful models.

I do want to point out that we have included several amendments requested by the administration. The first would increase the amount of funding available for evaluation of the dropout program from $1.5 to $2 million. The second amendment clarifies that the 25-percent matching requirement applies to the third year and any succeeding year for which a grantee receives funding. Current law only spells out the 25-percent matching requirement for the second year of funding received by a grantee and we need to clarify that funding received after the second year will also be subject to the 25-percent matching requirement.

Mr. Speaker, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act is an important program. I urge my colleagues to support is reauthorization.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 miutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 2313, legislation which reauthorizes the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988. As the original author of this legislation, the issue of school dropouts has long been of great concern to me. As you know, in my district the dropout rate looms somewhere near 50 percent for public school children. I am certain that other urban and rural centers suffer comparably. It has been reported that 4,000 young people drop out of American schools every day. This means that for every four students who start shoool, one will drop out. In urban centers, the rate is as high as 6 out of 10. Also, according to the children's defense fund, at least one in three Latino youths is out of school without a diploma, and only half have even completed the ninth grade. These figures are unacceptable to me and should not be tolerated.

We know that young adults without college degrees, and especially those without high school degrees, find it hard to earn a decent living. Often we find these children later in life caught in the cycle of poverty, stuck in low-paying jobs with little if any chance of advancing. For dropouts, as well as for society, the cost of not completing school is high. For every $1 spent on dropout prevention, $12 can be saved in lower benefits and higher tax revenue later down the line.

Let me take this brief moment to recommend to my colleagues the series, which just began yesterday, in the Washington Post concerning the issue of dropouts. I think that we must really begin to take a closer look at what impact this desperate problem will have on our Nation if it is not seriously addressed by this Congress.

Nonetheless, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act attempts to address these issues by funding programs which seek to reduce the number of children who drop out of elementary and secondary education. The program serves fewer than 100 schools nationwide and really barely touches the tip of the iceberg in terms of the real needs on the dropout frontline. So, approving the legislation before us today is crucially important because, at this time, this program is the only Federal program exclusively addressing the dropout problem.

In closing, I want to thank my Chairmen, Mr. KILDEE and Mr. FORD, for bringing this legislation to the floor in such a timely manner. I have had great support in my efforts on dropout prevention, and I am grateful. I certainly look forward to again working with my colleagues as, I hope, we look to expand and broaden this much needed program in the next reauthorization cycle.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

□ 1230

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I just might point out that the administration supports this bill, and it is a bipartisan effort.

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would concur in that. The administration worked very closely with us on this.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. I rise today in support of H.R. 2313, the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Act of 1988. This bill addresses a problem of great significance, not only in the area of education, but also for society at large.

Statistics show that more than 550,000 students in grades 8 through 12 drop out each year. Also of concern to the committee is that there are over 4 million young adults, ages 16 to 24, without a diploma or certificate and are not in school.

The Washington Post yesterday, in a series of two articles, points out the many problems in determining accurate dropout rates. I certainly recognize, through the years, the problems in attempting to arrive at accurate dropout rates within school districts. In this connection, the Department of Education reports one of its dropout rates—that is, the cohort rate which measures what happens to a single group of students over a period of time—to be approximately 17 percent nationwide; some Members cite the dropout rates in their school districts to be as high as 50 percent. Whatever the exact percentage may be, this is a national problem which we need to resolve.

The program which is being extended today was included in the last major reauthorization of elementary and secondary education programs in 1988. The program was included as a national demonstration program for 2 years. At that time, the committee had hoped that in 2 years there would be sufficient money available so that each State could receive funding in order to improve upon its own dropout rate. This hope was never realized because the States' program was never funded.

The national school dropout demonstration program as enacted includes four types of projects: Dropout prevention, reentry programs for students who previously dropped out, early intervention programs, and model systems for collecting and reporting information about dropouts.

In terms of a historical development of this program, the Congress extended this program in 1989 for 2 years. During deliberation on that extension, three amendments were added to: First, require that at least 25 percent and no more than 50 percent of the funds be granted to partnerships; second, authorize the Secretary of Education to use no more than $1.5 million for evaluating the program; and third, require that the report on the evaluation conducted be submitted within 6 months after the end of the grant period.

The legislation we are considering today also includes several amendments: (a) Increased funds for evaluation purposes from $1.5 to $2 million; (b) clarification of eligibility criteria to make current grantees eligible for additional grants; (c) clarification that "mentoring programs" are allowable activities, and (d) clarification that the current 25 percent match is not only through the second year but for the duration of the grant.

While the consequences of dropping out cannot easily be separated from the effects of other problems, it is clear that dropouts often face many disadvantages in life. Among the many consequences is that adults without diplomas are less likely to be employed or to have good jobs. They earn less income and are more likely to be poor. Not only do school

dropouts fail to reach their full potential, but society as a whole suffers.

Congress should have some sound evaluations of these national demonstration programs prior to the next reauthorization in 1993, and the committee will thoroughly review this program.

I urge my colleagues to support this extension.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the reauthorization of the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program.

As you know, goal 2 of the national education goals is to increase the high school graduation rate to 90 percent by the year 2000.

If we are to accomplish this goal, we need dropout prevention programs which work.

Evaluation of the most recent cycle of grants funded under the School Dropout Demonstration Assistance Program will begin later this year. Once the evaluation has been completed, we should have important information on successful dropout prevention programs which can then be forwarded to schools throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that we have added mentoring programs to the list of eligible activities for educational partnerships.

This provision was added at my request. It is my intent that grantees under this section of the law will provide students with job experiences as well as necessary tutoring. From their exposure to the work environment, potential dropouts would see firsthand the skills they will need to obtain a job—hopefully keeping them in school until they graduate. It is also my intent that mentors will participate in activities with at-risk students outside of the workplace, providing them with experiences and support they may not receive from other sources.

I have firsthand knowledge that these programs can be successful. My office has been the mentor of two students from D.C. public schools and has found the experience to be very rewarding.

As a result of my personal experience, I have forwarded to all the businesses in my congressional district a pamphlet produced by the Department of Labor which promotes business and community involvement in one-to-one mentoring of students. I am hopeful a large number of businesses in my district will implement mentoring programs.

I want to commend my chairman, Congressman KILDEE for his work in the reauthorization of this important program. I support the legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. 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 Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2313, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2313, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MICHIGAN SCENIC RIVERS ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 476) to designate certain rivers in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 476

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 "Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) The State of Michigan possesses many outstanding free-flowing rivers which with their adjacent lands have resource values of national significance, such as outstanding wildlife and fisheries, ecological and recreational values, and historic and prehistoric sites;

(2) many of these rivers have been found to be eligible for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system by the United States Forest Service while others possess outstanding values that make them eligible for wild and scenic river designation; and

(3) the conservation of these river areas and their outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values is important to the heritage of Michigan and to its tourism and outdoor recreation industry and long-term economic development.

SEC. 3. WILD, SCENIC, AND RECREATIONAL RIVER DESIGNATION.

(a) Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"( ) BEAR CREEK, MICHIGAN.—The 6.5-mile segment from Coates Highway to the Manistee River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

"( ) BLACK, MICHIGAN.—The 14-mile segment from the Ottawa National Forest boundary to Lake Superior, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

"( ) CARP, MICHIGAN.—The 27.8-mile segment from the west section line of section 30, township 43 north, range 5 west, to Lake Huron, to be adminstered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 2.3-mile segment from the west section line of section 30, township 43 north, range 5 west, to Forest Development Road 3458 in section 32, township 43 north, range 5 west, as a scenic river.

"(B) The 6.5-mile segment from the Forest Development Road 3458 in section 32, township 43 north, range 5 west, to Michigan State Highway 123, as a scenic river.

"(C) The 7.5-mile segment from Michigan State Highway 123 to one quarter of a mile upstream from Forest Development Road 3119, as a wild river.

"(D) The 0.5-mile segment from one quarter of a mile upstream of Forest Development Road 3119 to one quarter mile downstream of Forest Development Road 3119, as a scenic river.

"(E) The 4.9-mile segment from one quarter of a mile downstream of Forest Development Road 3119 to McDonald Rapids, as a wild river.

"(F) The 6.1-mile segment from McDonald Rapids to Lake Huron, as a recreational river.

"( ) INDIAN, MICHIGAN.—The 51-mile segment from Hovey Lake to Indian Lake to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 12-mile segment from Hovey Lake to Fish Lake, as a scenic river.

"(B) The 39-mile segment from Fish Lake to Indian Lake, as a recreational river.

"( ) MANISTEE, MICHIGAN.—The 26-mile segment from the Michigan DNR boat ramp below Tippy Dam to the Michigan State Highway 55 bridge, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.

"( ) ONTONAGON, MICHIGAN.—Segments of certain tributaries, totaling 157.4 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) the 46-mile segment of the East Branch Ontonagon from its origin at Spring Lake to the Ottawa National Forest boundary in the following classes:

"(i) The 20.5-mile segment from its origin at Spring Lake to its confluence with an unnamed stream in section 30, township 48 north, range 37 west, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 25.5-mile segment from its confluence with an unnamed stream in section 30, township 48 north, range 37 west, to the Ottawa National Forest boundary, as a wild river.

"(B) The 59.4-mile segment of the Middle Branch Ontonagon, from its origin at Crooked Lake to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest in the following classes:

"(i) The 20-mile segment from its origin at Crooked Lake to Burned Dam, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 8-mile segment from Burned Dam to Bond Falls Flowage, as a scenic river.

"(iii) The 8-mile segment from Bond Falls to Agate Falls, as a recreational river.

"(iv) The 6-mile segment from Agate Falls to Trout Creek, as a scenic river.

"(v) The 17.4-mile segment from Trout Creek to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, as a wild river.

"(C) The 37-mile segment of the Cisco Branch Ontonagon from its origin at Cisco Lake Dam to its confluence with Ten-Mile Creek south of Ewen in the following classes:

"(i) The 10-mile segment from the origin of Cisco Branch Ontonagon at Cisco Lake Dam to the County Road 527 crossing, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 27-mile segment from the Forest Development Road 527 crossing to the confluence of the Cisco Branch and Ten-Mile Creek, as a scenic river.

"(D) The 15-mile segment of the West Branch Ontonagon from its confluence with Cascade Falls to Victoria Reservoir, in the following classes:

"(i) The 10.5-mile segment from its confluence with Cascade Falls to its confluence with the South Branch Ontonagon, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 4.5-mile segment from its confluence with the South Branch Ontonagon to Victoria Reservior, as a recreational river.

Notwithstanding any limitation contained in this Act, the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in land which, as of August 1, 1990, were owned by Upper Peninsula Energy Corporation, and notwithstanding any such limitation, such lands shall be retained and managed by the Secretary as part of the Ottawa National Forest, and those lands so acquired which are within the boundaries of any segment designated under this paragraph shall be retained and managed pursuant to this Act.

"( ) PAINT, MICHIGAN.—Segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, totaling 51 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) The 6-mile segment of the main stem from the confluence of the North and South Branches Paint to the Ottawa National Forest boundary, as a recreational river.

"(B) The 17-mile segment of the North Branch Paint from its origin at Mallard Lake to its confluence with the South Branch Paint, as a recreational river.

"(C) The 28-mile segment of the South Branch Paint from its origin at Paint River Springs to its confluence with the North Branch Paint, as a recreational river.

"( ) PINE, MICHIGAN.—The 25-mile segment from Lincoln Bridge to the east 1/16th line of section 16, township 21 north, range 13 west, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a scenic river.

"( ) PRESQUE ISLE, MICHIGAN.—Segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, totaling 57 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) The 23-mile segment of the mainstream, from the confluence of the East and West Branches of Presque Isle to Minnewawa Falls, to be classified as follows:

"(i) The 17-mile segment from the confluence of the East and West Branches Presque Isle to Michigan State Highway 28, as a recreational river.

"(ii) The 6-mile segment from Michigan State Highway 28, to Minnewawa Falls, as a scenic river.

"(B) The 14-mile segment of the East Branch Presque Isle within the Ottawa National Forest, as a recreational river.

"(C) The 7-mile segment of the South Branch Presque Isle within the Ottawa National Forest, as a recreational river.

"(D) The 13-mile segment of the West Branch Presque Isle within the Ottawa National Forest, as a scenic river.

"( ) STURGEON, HIAWATHA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 43.9-mile segment from the north line of section 26, township 43 north, range 9 west, to Lake Michigan, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 21.7-mile segment from the north line of section 26, township 43 north, range 19 west, to Forest Highway 13 as a scenic river.

"(B) The 22.2-mile segment from Forest Highway 13 to Lake Michigan as a recreational river.

"( ) STURGEON, OTTAWA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 25-mile segment from its entry into the Ottawa National Forest to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 16.5-mile segment from its entry into the Ottawa National Forest to Prickett Lake, as a wild river.

"(B) The 8.5-mile segment from the outlet of Prickett Lake Dam to the northern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, as a scenic river.

"( ) EAST BRANCH OF THE TAHQUAMENON, MICHIGAN.—The 13.2-mile segment from its origin in section 8, township 45 north, range 5 west, to the Hiawatha National Forest boundary, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classes:

"(A) The 10-mile segment from its origin in section 8, township 45 north, range 5 west, to the center of section 20, township 46 north, range 6 west, as a recreational river.

"(B) The 3.2-mile segment from the center of section 20, township 46 north, range 6 west, to the boundary of the Hiawatha National Forest, as a wild river.

"( ) WHITEFISH, MICHIGAN.—Segments of the mainstream and certain tributaries, totaling 33.6 miles, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as follows:

"(A) The 11.1-mile segment of the mainstream from its confluence with the East and West Branches of the Whitefish to Lake Michigan in the following classes:

"(i) The 9-mile segment from its confluence with the East and West Branches of the Whitefish to the center of section 16, township 41 north, range 21 west, as a scenic river.

"(ii) The 2.1-mile segment from the center of section 16, township 41 north, range 21 west, to Lake Michigan, as a recreational river.

"(B) The 15-mile segment of the East Branch Whitefish from the crossing of County Road 003 in section 6, township 44 north, range 20 west, to its confluence with the West Branch Whitefish, as a scenic river.

"(C) The 7.5-mile segment of the West Branch Whitefish from County Road 444 to its confluence with the East Branch Whitefish, as a scenic river.

"( ) YELLOW DOG, MICHIGAN.—The 4-mile segment from its origin at the outlet of Bulldog Lake Dam to the boundary of the Ottawa National Forest, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a wild river.

"( ) BRULE, MICHIGAN AND WISCONSIN.—The 33-mile segment from the Brule Lake in the northwest quarter of section 15, township 41 north, range 13 east, to the National Forest boundary at the southeast quarter of section 31, township 41 north, range 17 east, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river.".

SEC. 4. WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDIES.

(a) STUDY RIVERS.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraphs at the end thereof:

"( ) CARP, MICHIGAN.—The 7.6 mile segment from its origin at the confluence of the outlets of Frenchman Lake and Carp Lake in section 26, township 44 north, range 6 west, to the west section line of section 30, township 43 north, range 5 west.

"( ) LITTLE MANISTEE, MICHIGAN.—The 42-mile segment within the Huron-Manistee National Forest.

"( ) WHITE, MICHIGAN.—The 75.4-mile segment within the Huron-Manistee National Forest as follows:

"(A) The 30.8-mile segment of the main stem from U.S. 31 to the Huron-Manistee National Forest boundary at the north line of section 2, township 13 north, range 15 west, 1.5 miles southwest of Hesperia.

"(B) The 18.9-mile segment of the South Branch White from the Huron-Manistee National Forest boundary east of Hesperia at the west line of section 22, township 14 north, range 14 west, to Echo Drive, section 6, township 13 north, range 12 west.

"(C) The 25.7-mile segment of the North Branch White from its confluence with the South Branch White in section 25, township 13 north, range 16 west, to McLaren Lake in section 11, township 14 north, range 15 west.

( ) ONTONAGON, MICHIGAN.—The 32-mile segment of the Ontonagon as follows:

"(A) The 12-mile segment of the West Branch from the Michigan State Highway 28 crossing to Cascade Falls.

"(B) The 20-mile segment of the South Branch from the confluence of the Cisco Branch and Tenmile Creek to the confluence with the West Branch Ontonagon.

( ) PAINT, MICHIGAN.—The 70-mile segment as follows:

"(A) 34 miles of the maintstream beginning at the eastern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest in section 1, township 44 north, range 35 west, to the city of Crystal Falls.

"(B) 15 miles of the mainstream of the Net River from its confluence with the east and west branches to its confluence with the mainstream of the Paint River.

"(C) 15 miles of the east branch of the Net River from its source in section 8, township 47 north, range 32 west, to its confluence with the mainstream of the Net River in section 24, township 46 north, range 34 west.

"(D) 14 miles of the west branch of the Net River from its source in section 35, township 48 north, range 34 west, to its confluence with the mainstream of the Net River in section 24, township 46 north, range 34 west.

"( ) PRESQUE ISLE, MICHIGAN.—The 13-mile segment of the mainstream from Minnewawa Falls to Lake Superior.

"( ) STURGEON, OTTAWA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 36-mile segment of the mainstream from the source at Wagner Lake in section 13, township 49 north, range 31 west, to the eastern boundary of the Ottawa National Forest in section 12, township 48 north, range 35 west.

"( ) STURGEON, HIAWATHA NATIONAL FOREST, MICHIGAN.—The 18.1-mile segment from Sixteen Mile Lake to the north line of section 26, township 43 north, range 19 west.

"( ) TAHQUAMENON, MICHIGAN.—The 103.5-mile segment as follows—

"(A) the 90-mile segment of the mainstream beginning at the source in section 21, township 47 north, range 12 west, to the mouth at Whitefish Bay; and

"(B) the 13.5-mile segment of the east branch from the western boundary of the Hiawatha National Forest in section 19, township 46 north, range 6 west, to its confluence with the mainstream.

"( ) WHITEFISH, MICHIGAN.—The 26-mile segment of the West Branch Whitefish from its source in section 26, township 46 north, range 23 west, to County Road 444.".

(b) STUDY PROVISIONS.—Section 5(b) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) The study of segments of the Carp, Little Manistee, White, Paint, Presque Isle, Ontonagon, Sturgeon (Hiawatha), Sturgeon (Ottawa), Whitefish, and Tahquamenon Rivers in Michigan under subsection (a) shall be completed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the report submitted thereon not later than at the end of the third fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph. For purposes of such river studies, the Secretary shall consult with each River Study Committee authorized under section 5 of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act of 1990, and shall encourage public participation and involvement through hearings, workshops, and such other means as are necessary to be effective.".

SEC. 5. RIVER STUDY COMMITTEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND MEMBERSHIP.—At the earliest practicable date following the

date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary"), in consultation with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, shall establish for each river identified in section 4 a River Study Committee (hereinafter in this section referred to as "Committee"). Membership on each Committee shall consist of members appointed as follows:

(1) Two members appointed by the appropriate Secretary.

(2) Two members appointed by the Secretary from recommendations made by the Govenor of the State of Michigan from the Department of Natural Resources.

(3) Two members appointed by the Secretary from among representatives of local or State conservation and environmental groups.

(4) One member appointed by the Secretary from among representatives of each of the towns included in the study area.

(5) Two members appointed by the Secretary from commercial timber interests in the State of Michigan.

(6) One nonvoting member who shall be an employee of the Forest Service.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—(1) A vacancy in a Committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(2) The Chair of a Committee shall be elected by the members of the Committee.

(3) The members of the Committee who are not full-time offices or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation.

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FROM THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall provide such technical and financial assistance to each such committee as the Secretary deems necessary.

(d) STATE AND LOCAL SERVICES.—Each such committee may accept services and other assistance from State and local governments.

(e) STUDY PROCESS.—Each river study committee shall advise the Secretary in the preparation of the report to Congress required by section 4 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1275(a)) for the rivers specified in section 4 of this Act.

(f) TERMINATION.—Each such committee shall terminate upon submission of the report to Congress referred to in subsection (e) for the river concerned.

SEC. 6. MISCELLANEOUS.

(a) HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.—Consistent with section 13(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), nothing in this Act shall be construed to enlarge, diminish, or modify the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State of Michigan with respect to fish and wildlife, including hunting, fishing, and trapping on any lands administered by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to this Act.

(b) SEA LAMPREY CONTROL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the installation and operation of facilities or other activities within or outside the boundaries of those river segments designated by this Act for the control of the lamprey eel shall be permitted subject to such restrictions and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe for the protection of water quality and other values of the river, including the wild and scenic characteristics of the river: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall determine in the river management plan for each such designated river that such facilities or activities are necessary for control of the lamprey eel.

(c) ACCESS.—The Secretary shall maintain traditional public access to the river segments designated by this Act, except that the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, shall provide in the river management plan for each designated river segment for maintenance, closure, relocation, stabilization, improvements, or other appropriate adjustments as may be necessary for the management of such river segments.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as enlarging, diminishing, or modifying the limitations on the acquisition of lands within a designated river segment contained in section 6(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271(b)).

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the principal sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act will designate 15 rivers, covering 554 miles, as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

This bill will double the number of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System east of the Mississippi River.

The bill also calls for the study of nine rivers for possible inclusion into the system.

All of the rivers in this bill are within the boundaries of Michigan's three national forests.

The Forest Service has studied all of these rivers and have found them all to be eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

That is why the Forest Service supports this bill, with a few minor changes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly address two issues that have been raised about this bill.

First, several people have expressed deep concerns over the ability to build a bridge across the Brule River which straddles the Michigan and Wisconsin borders.

At my request, the subcommittee has added report language that states that such a bridge would be permissable under the National Wild and Scenic Act, particularly since the Brule River is classified as a recreational river, which means it qualifies for such construction projects.

Second, I have been working with the U.S. Forest Service, the State of Michigan, and several national fishing groups to draft report language concerning the construction of structural and nonstructural fish habitat projects, and the ability to repair riverbanks that have suffered ecological degradation due to past human activity.

I am pleased that we were able to reach an agreement on this most important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the Great Lakes are the economic ace in the hole for the Midwest region.

With 95 percent of our Nation's fresh water located in the Great Lakes, it is vitally important that we protect these truly remarkable resources.

It is equally important that we protect the rivers and tributaries that feed into the Great Lakes, rivers that enhance the fish habitat and water quality of the lakes.

That is why this legislation is so important.

Most of the rivers in the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act do indeed flow into the Great Lakes.

This legislation will ensure that no dams or other water diversion projects will adversely impact the free-flowing nature of the rivers.

This bill also ensures that water quality will be maintained, it ensures that a sound management plan will be developed to protect the river corridor, and most importantly, this bill ensures these rivers will be around for the enjoyment of future generations.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this bill enjoys the support of the majority of the Michigan congressional delegation, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, as well as many national and State conservation groups.

We must be careful custodians of our Nation's natural resources.

And with the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act, we provide a framework for Federal and local officials, to work with public groups and private landowners, to develop a management plan to maintain these rivers.

I urge my colleagues to join me, and a majority of the Michigan congressional delegation, in supporting this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the House Interior Committee is once again bringing to the floor a wild and scenic rivers bill that is strongly opposed by the Members whose district is principally affected.

If memory serves me right, we had a very similar situation before us several

weeks ago with the Niobrara River where the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] was the victim. Needless to say, I believe our committee system must make a better attempt at reaching a consensus rather than bring bills like these to the floor prematurely.

I would like to correct some fundamental misconceptions about H.R. 476. Although proponents claim this bill is needed to prevent imminent development of these rivers, this is not the case. At the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands' hearing on this bill, the Forest Service witnesses were not able to identify any threats to these rivers. This should not be surprising since the Upper Peninsula of Michigan has consistently lost population since the Second World War. It is an economically depressed area that is hundreds of miles away from major metropolitan areas.

Another common assertion by supporters of H.R. 476 is that most of these rivers are on Federal land so that impacts for private landowers are minimal. According to Forest Service statistics, 30 percent of the lands in the proposed river corridors—or 45,000 acres—are private property. Even though most of these rivers have over 50-percent public ownership, thereby preventing condemnation through fee acquisition, the Federal Government still has unlimited authority to condemn through scenic easements. In fact, the mere threat of condemnation through scenic easement effectively results in Federal land use planning of private property along every river corridor in this bill.

Finally, we are told that since the rivers included in this bill are already managed in as wild and scenic under existing forest plans, there is little or no reason for concern among local citizens. We should remember that the Ottawa Forest plan was appealed partially because of its inclusion of the Ontonagon River as an area to be managed as a wild and scenic river. This appeal was supported by the boards of commissioners of all four counties surrounding the Ottawa National Forest and ultimately was decided in Washington, DC. This controversial river is included in H.R. 476.

Mr. Speaker, the three witnesses from local government that testified against this bill in April had an alternative to Federal designation. They told the subcommittee about the formation of the Great Lakes Resource Watch—a coalition of sportsmen, local government, private landowners, and organized labor—which is currently developing a river protection plan on the local level that will prevent the need for costly and controversial legislation at the Federal level. All these folks requested from the committee was a 1-year delay in passing H.R. 476 so they could have an opportunity to complete their plan and report back to the Michigan congressional delegation and the committee. Unfortunately, our action today will go a long way toward making their grassroots solution impossible.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD resolutions from the Marquette County Labor Council and the Upper Peninsular Building & Construction Trades Council endorsing a local solution to this issue, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MARQUETTE COUNTY LABOR COUNCIL AFL-CIO

LOCAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

Whereas the Federal Legislation known as the Michigan Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 has been opposed by many U.P. County Commissions and has created controversy and discontent with the federal process; and,

Whereas an association of county commissions and boards, township governments, and a broad spectrum of outdoor recreation, tourism, organized labor, and business interests are in the process of proposing a local initiative to plan and manage Upper Peninsula of Michigan rivers, lands and streams; and,

Whereas this local initiative process has been tried, tested and proven effective in other locations of the country, and been given support by federal, state, and local parties as a successful alternative which preserves local input and local prerogatives; and,

Whereas the Marquette County Labor Council, AFL-CIO, on behalf of itself and its six thousand (6,000) affiliated membership in Marquette County, believes that interlocal leadership, such as that proposed for river planning and management, is preferable to that of federal or state alternatives; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the Marquette County Labor Council, AFL-CIO, fully supports the local alternative for river and land use planning and management, and will actively participate in this process; and,

Be it Further Resolved, that this labor council calls on the Marquette County Board of Commissioners to also endorse and support by resolution those efforts to bring about a process for local river and land use planning and management.

Approved on February 21, 1991.

RESOLUTION OF THE UPPER PENINSULA BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL

LOCAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

Whereas the Federal Legislation known as the Michigan Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1991 has been opposed by many U.P. County Commissions and has created controversy and discontent with the federal process; and,

Whereas an association of county commissions and boards, township governments, and a broad spectrum of outdoor recreation, tourism, organized labor, and business interests are in the process of proposing a local initiative to plan and manage Upper Peninsula of Michigan rivers, lands and streams; and,

Whereas this local initiative process has been tried, tested and proven effective in other locations of the country, and been given support by federal, state, and local parties as a successful alternative which preserves local input and local prerogatives; and,

Whereas the Upper Peninsula Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO, on behalf of itself and its four thousand (4,000) affiliated membership in Marquette County, believes that interlocal leadership, such as that proposed for river planning and management, is preferable to that of federal or state alternatives; now, therefore be it

Resolved, that the U.P. Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO, fully supports the local alternative for river and land use planning and management, and will actively participate in this process; and,

Be it Further Resolved, that this council calls on the Upper Peninsula County Boards of Commissioners to also endorse and support by resolution those efforts to bring about a process for local river and land use planning and management.

Approved on March 6, 1991.

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

Mr. Speaker, this measure was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and it is cosponsored by the majority of the members of the Michigan delegation. It is a good bill.

The bill, as amended, designates 15 rivers totaling 568 miles in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System and provides for a study of 10 other river segments totaling 432 miles as potential additions. So the fact is that it affects almost 1,000 miles of river in Michigan.

The State of Michigan possesses, of course, a large and significant network of rivers and streams. Many of these rivers are located within national forests in the State. As part of the national forest planning process, these rivers were reviewed over the past decade to determine their eligibility for wild and scenic river status. And as a result of this review process, a significant number of rivers were found eligible and suitable for wild and scenic designation. It was on this basis that the measure before us was developed and introduced.

H.R. 476, as introduced, is identical to the bill which passed the House by voice vote last September. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs expended considerable time and effort in providing for public input in this legislation and its predecessor in the last Congress. The committee has held a total of three hearings on the legislation in the past year, including the field hearing in Marquette, MI, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] alluded to. There is also a long public record on these rivers. We received testimony from numerous groups, individuals and organizations on the preservation and use of the nationally significant resource values found in these rivers.

The legislation is supported by the Bush administration, the National Forest Service, the State of Michigan, and the major sports and conservation groups in the State, and they are significant in size and diversity. As a result of a long and extensive review process, the bill before the House today

is, I believe, responsive to the resource needs of these rivers and to the legitimate interests of the upper peninsula region of the State of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the Forest Service is currently managing these rivers for wild and scenic values, so that designation would not substantially change current management practices. It will, though, give legislative standing to those practices and thus enhance the preservation and use of these nationally significant rivers on a more lasting basis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this measure, as amended, will contribute to a sound public policy for rivers located within the national forests in upper Michigan. I support its adoption, and I recommend passage of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, 12 of the 15 rivers slated for immediate designation in this bill are in my congressional district and I do not support this legislation. From my constituents—from the people who live and work on or near these rivers—this bill has very little support. Their opposition has been overwhelming to say the least.

While the bill is highly unpopular in my district, the people of northern Michigan realize that it is very popular in Congress. They understand that passage is inevitable. They also understand the intent of the legislation and they, too, believe that these beautiful, pristine rivers should not be destroyed or drastically altered.

This bill will affect my constituents more severely than any other segment of the population. My opposition to this bill is rooted in the lack of consideration my constituents have been given since this bill's conception. Their input was not requested until the bill was ready for introduction. And although some changes have been made, northern Michigan residents would like a chance to outline for Congress their ideas for managing the rivers.

Northern Michigan residents believe they can manage the rivers properly while being sensitive to the needs of the community—a combination essential in my economically troubled district. These people have lived and worked in the Upper Peninsula for generations. They too love the land and the rivers. They understand the need to keep the community alive and the importance of a balance between preservation and community progress.

My constituents have asked for a 2-year hold on this bill so that they can put together a management plan for these rivers. After 2 years of planning, they would present their local option to Congress. Congress would then decide whether the local plan is acceptable, or whether Congress should go ahead with legislation.

The requests of my constituents went barely noticed. They were told that the legislation has been under consideration for some time now and that Congress is looking to move forward on it. They were told that Congress does not want to wait a year or two to implement this legislation.

My constituents are not asking for anything unreasonable. They are asking for a chance to present their ideas to Congress. And we don't have time for that? Since when do we keep participation in this democracy to the barest minimum. I cannot tell you the frustration my constituents feel with the legislative process at this point.

I ask, as I have before, what is the hurry with this bill? There is no mad rush to dam or build condos on those rivers now. My constituents have obviously been good stewards of those rivers for hundreds of years. Had they not, there would be no Michigan scenic rivers bill.

The residents of northern Michigan and I realize that this bill is slated for easy passage today. I am not alone in my frustration with this body's failure to accept the best solution because we are in a hurry or because it is easier to just push forward with what we began. Politics is the art of compromise—my constituents have offered a workable, reasonable compromise. By not accepting it, we have passed up the perfect solution to this controversial bill. When this bill goes to the Senate, it is essential that changes are made to reflect the needs of northern Michigan. Those changes then must be supported by the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer my support to the passage of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act. This legislation is a tribute to the beauty of Michigan's rivers and to the commitment among the Michigan Congressional delegation that we need to act now to preserve some of our most precious resources. This bill establishes a strong Federal role in the custodianship and protection of Michigan's rivers.

The Michigan Scenic Rivers Act is critical for Michigan. Many of Michigan's cherished national forests and scenic areas are feeling the strain of increased development. This bill will permanently set aside fifteen Michigan rivers from environmentally unsound development and exploitation. These fourteen rivers, covering 634 miles, are all within the boundaries of the Huron-Manistee, the Hiawatha, and the Ottawa National Forests.

In Michigan, our rivers play a vital role in our environment. Our great forests and our abundant fish and wildlife rely on Michigan's rivers for their survival. The people of Michigan and tourists from all over the country use these rivers for their recreation and their enjoyment. This legislation will ensure that these rivers will be used in an ecologically responsible manner for many generations to come

The Michigan Scenic Rivers Act is the right answer to dealing with the increased strain on our natural resources. Including these fifteen rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System will require the Forest Service to develop long-term plans for the sound management of their watersheds. In accordance with these long-term plans, this legislation will also prevent the damming or diversion of these rivers.

My colleague from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE, deserves a great deal of credit for drafting this landmark legislation and for again working for its passage in the 102d Congress. In addition to having an exemplary record on protecting our environment and natural resources, Mr. KILDEE also knows these rivers well—he has canoed almost all of them and has long recognized their beauty and the need to preserve them in their current unspoileld state.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Michigan Scenic Rivers Act and I look forward to its swift passage by the House of Representatives. The passage of this legislation will make great strides toward setting aside and managing Michigan's most vital wilderness areas for the enjoyment of future generations.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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 Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 476, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONOCACY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 990) to authorize additional appropriations for land acquisition at Monocacy National Battlefield, MD, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 990

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL LAND ACQUISITION.

There are authorized to be appropriated up to $20,000,000 for acquisition of lands and interests in lands for purposes of the Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland; such sums shall be in addition to other funds available for such purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 990, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, at Monocacy Junction two major roads, as well as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, came together. On July 9, 1864, the Union and Confederate Armies met at the Battle of

Monocacy. While the Confederates defeated the Union, the Union forces succeeded in delaying the Confederate advance on Washington, DC, for a single day—sufficient time for reinforcements to arrive to protect the Nation's Capital. After the Battle of Monocacy, the Confederates proceeded toward Washington, DC, arriving there the next day at Fort Stevens. Reinforced Union forces drove the Confederates back to Virginia. The Capital City was not again so threatened by the Confederacy.

H.R. 990, introduced by our colleague, Congresswoman BEVERLY BYRON, will protect a key part of the Battle of Monocacy by increasing the authorized land acquisition ceiling at Monocacy National Battlefield. Doing so will allow the National Park Service to purchase the Trail-Mathias Farm, a historic farm located inside the park's boundary. The farm, located next to an industrial park, is threatened with development if it is not made part of the park in the near future.

In testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the administration and public witnesses testified in favor of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, I also endorse this legislation and look forward to its passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of actions on behalf of this body to support the acquisition of key tracts of land at Monocacy National Battlefield. There is little doubt that acquisition of the two large farms, where most of the fighting in this battle to prevent the Confederates from capturing the Capital took place, is key to interpretation and protection of the battlefield.

As the National Park Service testified at our hearing on this measure, these tracts of land are far more historically significant than the recent additions to Manassas Battlefield, which may cost the American taxpayer in excess of $150 million for about 550 acres. However, since the National Park Service considers the annual appropriations act to be self-authorizing, it is not clear that passage of this measure is a necessary prerequisite to securing the funding needed to carry out this important acquisition.

I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] for her efforts to secure not only the necessary funding to buy these critical parcels, but also for her efforts to secure operational funding in order to make this park available to the public for the first time in its almost 60-year history. With the location of this battlefield so close to Washington, DC, it is clear this area offers important opportunities for many persons to better appreciate the Civil War.

I encourage my colleagues to support funding sought to purchase these historically significant lands at Monocacy.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I commend this bill to the House, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 990, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1250

PALO ALTO BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1642) to establish in the State of Texas the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site, and for other purposes; as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1642

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 "Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that:

(1) The study conducted by the National Park Service under section 506(b) of Public Law 95-625 has resulted in a precise identification of the location of the Battle of Palo Alto and the area requiring protection.

(2) Palo Alto is the only unit of the National Park System directed to the preservation and interpretation of resources related to the Mexican-American War.

SEC. 3. PALO ALTO BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to preserve for the education, benefit, and inspiration of present and future generations the nationality significant site of the first battle of the Mexican-American War, and to provide for its interpretation in such manner as to portray the battle and the Mexican-American War and its related political, diplomatic, military and social causes and consequences, there is hereby established the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site in the State of Texas (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "historic site").

(b) BOUNDARY.—(1) The historic site shall consist of approximately 3,400 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site", numbered 469-80,002, and dated March 1991. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(2) Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall file a legal description of the historic site with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. Such legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographic errors in such legal description and in the map referred to in paragraph (1). The legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary may, from time to time, make minor revisions in the boundary of the historic site.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall manage the historic site in accordance with this Act and the provisions of law generally applicable to the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666). The Secretary shall protect, manage, and administer the historic site for the purposes of preserving and interpreting the cultural and natural resources of the historic site and providing for the public understanding and appreciation of the historic site in such a manner as to perpetuate these qualities and values for future generations.

SEC. 5. LAND ACQUISITION.

Within the historic site, the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interest in lands by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Lands or interests in lands owned by the State of Texas or political subdivisions thereof may be acquired only by donation.

SEC. 6. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the United States of Mexico, in accordance with existing international agreements, and with other owners of Mexican-American War properties within the United States of America for the purposes of conducting joint research and interpretive planning for the historic site and related Mexican-American War sites. Interpretive information and programs shall reflect historical data and perspectives of both countries and the series of historical events asscociated with the Mexican-American War.

SEC. 7. MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Within 3 years after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and transmit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, a general management plan for the historical site. The plan shall be consistent with section 12 of the Act of August 18, 1970 (16 U.S.C. la-7) and with the purposes of this Act and shall include (but not be limited to) each of the following:

(1) A resource protection program including land acquisition needs.

(2) A general visitor use and interpretive program.

(3) A general development plan including such roads, trails, markers, structures, and other improvements and facilities as may be necessary for the accommodation of visitor use in accordance with the purposes of this Act and the need to preserve the integrity of the historic site.

(4) A research plan.

(5) Identification of appropriate cooperative agreements as identified in section 6.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated $6,000,000 for acquisition of lands and interests in lands for purposes of the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on H.R. 1642.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site, which was authorized by Public Law 95-625 in 1978 is the only unit in the National Park System that preserves and interprets the history of the Mexican-American War. The battle of Palo Alto, fought on May 8, 1846, was the first battle in the Mexican-American War. That war shaped this country significantly. The lands acquired under the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo that ended the war included all or parts of Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and California. The war has also profoundly shaped our relationship with Mexico.

H.R. 1642, introduced by Congressman SOLOMON ORTIZ increases significantly the authorized acreage at the Mexican-American Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site in Texas. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute that follows the administration's suggestion concerning the cooperative agreements with the United States of Mexico and the United States of America. The legislation, as amended, authorizes instead of directs the Secretary of the Interior to enter into such cooperative agreements. The special resource study on the Battle of Palmito Hill is deleted from this bill because it will be studied in the larger Civil War study authorized in the last Congress. The authorization of appropriations for land acquisition is set at $6 million. In addition, several minor technical changes were made, such as correcting the map reference.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy with H.R. 1642, as amended. I look forward to passage of this legislation and the establishment of Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site as a full-fledged unit of the National Park System.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1642, a bill which provides for expansion of the existing Palo Alto battlefield. As has already been explained by subcommittee Chairman VENTO, Congress recognized at the time of initial authorization of this unit in 1978, that further park expansion would be likely upon completion of needed research documenting the actual battle location.

In 1982, the National Park Service completed the necessary research. The agency has recently worked with the subcommittee and bill's sponsor, Mr. ORTIZ, to ensure that a reasonable park boundary proposal was developed. While the administration has supported a slightly smaller boundary, I am convinced that the 3400-acre boundary provided under Mr. ORTIZ' legislation will prove more manageable. Other concerns raised in the testimony of the administration have been adequately addressed in this bill as revised.

While some could question whether setting aside a 3400-acre battlefield is the best way to commemorate and remember the Mexican-American War; if Congress makes such a determination, this bill at least represents a reasonable and feasible unit of the National Park System. It is time to begin implementation of legislation which authorized this park 13 years ago.

I commend this bill to my colleagues.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this legislation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1642, a bill I introduced that would expand the boundaries of the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site. I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman VENTO and Chairman MILLER for their efforts in expeditiously approving this bill.

I would also like to thank the many individuals from my congressional district who traveled all the way from Brownsville, TX, to participate in the hearing before Chairman VENTO's Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. I congratulate their support and enthusiasm for this legislation.

The Palo Alto battlefield is the site of one of the two most important battles of the Mexican-American war fought on American soil in 1846. The historical significance of this war was great, as it led to the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, granting the United States the land from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean. This caused the retreat of Mexican sovereignty from the territories they occupied in the west, and encouraged the expansion of United States settlement in that direction.

The commemoration and interpretation of the Battle of Palo Alto and the Mexican-American War is strongly supported by individuals and groups within the Brownsville, TX, area and within Mexico.

I would like to especially recognize the vision and leadership shown by Albert Alfonso Champion, without whose historical research and documentation the actual battlefield may have been forever lost to future generations.

It is fitting to commemorate the bravery of all who fought there by preserving this landmark in the spirit of international amity with the United States of Mexico. The battle fought on this field represents the rupture of relations between the United States and Mexico, which are still in the process of healing today, and reminds us that we must strive for brotherhood, unity and peace with our neighbors to the south.

Two future presidents served in this campaign: General Zachary Taylor was in charge at the time of this battle and Lieutenant Ulysses S. Grant gained valuable experience during this war that he would later use to lead the Union Forces in the American Civil War.

This war served as a test-case for the first West Point-trained soldiers, and the U.S. Army's success assured the academy's continued funding.

It was during this battle that the U.S. Army explored the use of light and heavy artillery rather than large calvary and infantry maneuvers, and explosive shells against the Mexican Army's solid shot; these new battle techniques contributed to the development of American warfare.

The Mexican-American war was the first to be reported by telegraph. Also, this was the first war in which railroads and steamboats were used to transport troops and war supplies. U.S. Army surgeons introduced ether as an anesthetic for the wounded, and combat photography made its debut. Samuel Colt's new revolver was introduced into the fight, resulting in a major contract for his company with the War Department. The occupation of Matamoros, Mexico, during the war led to the development of nearby Brownsville as an important military/economic center.

There has been a great desire on the part of Mexico to preserve this area in order to commemorate the site in honor of those Mexicans who perished in the Battle of Palo Alto. It is probable that both Mexican and American remains are buried on this site. Anthropological exploration of the area indicates that many artifacts dating from the battle still remain undiscovered. As a benefit for historic research purposes, the landscape, setting, and ground cover remain largely undis-

turbed, and alteration of the terrain has been minimal. It would be desirable to protect this historic area in light of the archaeological evidence that in all probability lies below the battle site.

Presently, there is an upright cannon that memorializes the site, set up in 1914 by General James Parker of the FIrst Calvary Brigade at Ft. Sam Houston. In 1893, a local Brownsville patriotic group erected a marble marker which later disappeared. It was reported that two Mexican survivors of the battle were in attendance at the ceremonies.

It is my hope that necessary funding will soon be provided to implement proposed activities at the site which will enhance visitorship.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation by suspending the rules and unanimously approving this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ] on his work. This is a noncontroversial measure, one that I think deserves the support of all Members, and, as such, I hope it receives it.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1642, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SAGUARO NATIONAL MONUMENT EXPANSION ACT OF 1991

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 292) to expand the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 292

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 "Saguaro National Monument Expansion Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the area generally to the south of the Rincon unit of the Saguaro National Monument contains—

(1) prime Sonoran desert habitat including an exceptionally rich area of Saguaro cactus and palo verde uplands;

(2) an outstanding riparian corridor of large Arizona sycamores and cottonwoods;

(3) important archaeological and cultural sites; and

(4) important habitat for the desert tortoise, gila monster, javelina, and other species of reptiles, mammals, and birds.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize the addition of approximately 3,540 acres to the Rincon unit of the Saguaro National Monument in order to protect, preserve, and interpret the monument's resources, and to provide for the education and benefit of the public.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "expansion area" means the approximately 3,540 acres to be added to the monument pursuant to this Act;

(2) "monument" means the Saguaro National Monument; and

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. EXPANSION OF MONUMENT BOUNDARIES.

(a)(1) IN GENERAL.—The monument boundaries are hereby revised to include the approximately 3,540 acres of lands and interests in land as generally depicted on the map entitled "Saguaro National Monument Enhanced Boundary", numbered 151/91,001-D, and dated September 1990.

(2) The map referred to in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) ACQUISITION OF LANDS.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands and interests in lands within the monument boundary by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or transfer from another Federal agency, except that lands or interests therein owned by the State of Arizona or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation or exchange.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—Lands and interests in lands acquired pursuant to this Act shall be administered as part of the monument and shall be subject to all laws applicable to the monument.

(d) AMENDMENT TO GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary is directed to amend the monument's general management plan with respect to the use and management of the expansion area.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on S. 292.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 292 authorizes the expansion of the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument in Arizona. Similar legislation was passed by the House of Representatives late in the 101st Congress but was not acted on by the Senate prior to adjournment. This session, the Senate has already passed S. 292, introduced by Senator MCCAIN. Similar legislation (H.R. 664) was introduced on the House side by Representative KOLBE and cosponsored by the former Interior Committee Chairman Representative Morris Udall and the other members of the Arizona delegation.

Saguaro National Monument is comprised of 2 unconnected units located in the fast-growing Tucson area. Because of the monument's urban location, development has steadily expanded around its boundaries. What was, only a few decades ago, open space is now dotted with commercial and residential development. While these changes have altered large sections of land south of the east unit's boundary, significant Saguaro stands still exist in this area, along with important desert wildlife habitat and undeveloped riparian corridors that are uncommon in this desert environment.

S. 292 presents us with a rather unusual situation. Its genesis arises from negotiations between the major affected landowners, the local units of government, and a broad range of local and national groups concerned about the nationally significant resources located in this area. It is obvious that if these lands immediately south of the monument boundary are not protected, at least in part, by inclusion in the monument, they will be developed and the resource values which have a direct relationship to the monument will be lost. We cannot address all the development that will occur adjacent to the monument nor should this bill be construed in any way, shape, or form as endorsing such a procedure but nor do we endorse development, rather in this instance where we have the opportunity to preserve important resource habitat and ecological values, we cannot afford to pass up the opportunity and risk the consequences of further damage to the monument.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that this legislation has the endorsement of the Pima County Board of Supervisors and the Tucson City Council. If the Federal Government is to make this effort to preserve significant resource values in the area, I believe it is incumbent upon the local governments to do their part to address development around the monument boundary in a manner that recognizes the significant resource values found within the Saguaro National Monument. With the high public recognition and interest in these resources, we have the opportunity here

to address resource issues on a cooperative basis before damages occur and confrontations arise. I believe S. 292 can be a positive part of this process and I recommend its adoption by the House.

□ 1300

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 292, a bill to add approximately 3,500 acres to the existing Saguaro National Monument on the outskirts of Tucson, AZ. The measure we are considering today is similar to legislation passed by this body last year.

As stated by the subcommittee chairman, rapid urban expansion in the Tucson area has brought development to the doorstep of Saguaro National Monument. This development has resulted in a permanent loss of natural resource values from much of the land in the Tucson basin. The parcel added to Saguaro National Monument under my colleague, Mr. KOLBE's bill, would preserve an area immediately adjacent to the monument. This is an area which still retains such outstanding natural values as high quality saguaro stands and important riparian corridors, as well as habitat for the desert tortoise, gila monster, and javelina.

The administration opposes this bill due to the lack of a formal boundary study. However, I note that the National Park Service has, within the last 2 years, completed a general management plan for the park. Had the National Park Service complied with existing law and completed a boundary study for that park at the time they were completing their management plan, they would be prepared to respond to this legislation. It is hard to understand why the National Park Service would complete a management plan for Saguaro National Monument and not address boundary questions.

I also want to recognize the efforts of the Rocking K Corp. which is pursuing a development in the vicinity of the proposed park addition. Urbanization is a major issue facing many of our national park system areas today. In order to address the issue of potential impacts on adjacent park resources, this company has proposed to: protect sensitive riparian corridors considered essential for wildlife movement, create a nonprofit corporation focusing on environmental preservation issues, provide public access to the park, and retain almost 70 percent of their total land holding in open space. This is a model which could go a long way on a national basis toward resolving urban encroachment problems at National Park Service areas.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which enjoys broad support from groups in the Tucson area. This bill deserves the support of the House and I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the prime sponsor in the House of this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 292, the Saguaro National Monument boundary expansion bill. This bill, sponsored by Senator JOHN MCCAIN, is identical to H.R. 664, introduced on January 28 and sponsored by me and the other Members of the Arizona House delegation. It is a special honor to have as an original cosponsor of this bill my former colleague and friend, Mo Udall. It is fitting that Mo Udall's final bill be one that seeks to protect a national ecological treasure.

The Saguaro National Monument truly is one of the gems in the Nation's string of national parks. It is located at the northern edge of the Sonoran desert and is home to a diverse and spectacular array of plant and animal life. Most notable, of course, are the thick stands of towering, majestic saguaro plants for which the monument is named and which have come to symbolize the southwest desert.

The monument, however, is confronted with increasing urban encroachment and development, the outgrowth of significant population increases in the Tucson metropolitan area that could hardly have been imagined at the time of the monument's creation in 1933. As a result, a coalition of environmental organizations contacted land owners in the area and other interested parties to explore possible additions to the monument. The group reached a consensus and then approached the Arizona delegation with the boundary expansion proposal embodied in H.R. 664 and S. 292—the bill that is before us today.

The additional land will include prime habitat for the desert tortoise, gila monster, javelina, and other reptiles, birds and mammals. One of the highest quality saguaro cactus stands in the region will be added as well. This is especially important because of the significant decline, estimated at more than 50 percent in the monument's saguaro population.

The bill is drafted to give maximum flexibility in the acquisition of the land. In these times of fiscal restraint, however, it is probable that if the land is to be brought under Federal ownership soon, it would have to be acquired through an exchange, thus eliminating the need for taxpayer expenditures. It should be noted that the proposed expansion area has been part of a major study by some of the foremost experts on the Saguaro National Monument-Rincon area, making unnecessary further taxpayer dollars for a Federal boundary study.

Last year, Chairman UDALL and I introduced legislation identical to this year's bill. The merits of this proposal were then recognized by this body. Despite being introduced late in the session, the bill passed the subcommittee, full committee and the full House in quick order. Unfortunately, time ran out on this legislation in the Senate last October. But the Senate did not miss the opportunity in 1991: S. 292, was adopted by the Senate on voice vote on April 25.

The House began consideration of the boundary expansion bill on May 7, in the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee. On May 14, the subcommittee considered the bill and forwarded it to the full committee.

The House Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs considered the bill on May 22 and ordered it favorably reported.

The success of this bill would not have been possible without the help of a number of my colleagues. I would like to especially thank Chairman VENTO and Congressman JAY RHODES for their assistance, as well as Chairman MILLER, ranking minority member on the Interior Committee, Mr. YOUNG, and on the subcommittee, Mr. MARLENEE.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a must for all those concerned with preserving and enhancing a national treasure. The proof can be seen in the wide-spread support for the bill, including a host of environmental groups, affected landowners, the city of Tucson and Pima county. S. 292 deserves the same enthusiastic endorsement it received last year from this body. I urge your support.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I yield myself a minute.

I just want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the Arizona delegation. They have a remarkable record of working on land use policy, conservation, environmental issues, in the past years that I have chaired the subcommittee. Obviously part of it is due to the leadership of former Chairman Mo Udall, but a lot of it is also the fact that they have done their homework and themselves are strong supporters of the measures before us, such as Senator MCCAIN is. And when he worked in the House, that was evident from his work in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as that of the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. JAY RHODES, and the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. JIM KOLBE, both of whom I have worked with on a number of different measures.

This is a good measure. It adds nearly 3,500 acres to an existing monument, which is a substantial addition. It does it in such a way, a cooperative manner,

with the local community and the county.

I wish, obviously, that these problems had been solved yesterday, but they were not, so we have to deal with them today. I hope that we continue to address the threat to our national parks in terms of the boundaries, trying to provide some rational administrative boundaries, and to include in significant resources such as this riparian resource, which does have a large number of specimens.

Nobody has said so this afternoon, but the saguaro cactus have had a very tough time in recent years. We do not know quite what the cause of it is. It is important that we continue to pay attention to the existing national monuments and parks such as saguaro, which have been established for a long time. We should not take them for granted. This action obviously does not take it for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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 Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 292.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the following rollcall vote, I was unavoidably detained in Texas. I would submit this statement to be included in the RECORD after the votes.

On rollcall No. 122, H.R. 1642, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1310

DESIGNATING CERTAIN SEGMENTS OF ALLEGHENY RIVER IN PENNSYLVANIA AS COMPONENT OF NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1323) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating certain segments of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1323

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF ALLEGHENY RIVER.

In order to preserve and protect for present and future generations the outstanding scenic, natural, recreational, scientific, historic, and ecological values of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and to assist in the protection, preservation, and enhancement of the fisheries resources associated with such river, section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end:

"( ) ALLEGHENY, PENNSYLVANIA.—The segment from Kinzua Dam downstream approximately 7 miles to the United States Route 6 Bridge, and the segment from Buckaloons Recreation Area at Irvine, Pennsylvania, downstream approximately 47 miles to the southern end of Alcorn Island at Oil City, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river through a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the counties of Warren, Forest, and Venango, as provided under section 10(e) of this Act; and the segment from the sewage treatment plant at Franklin downstream approximately 31 miles to the refinery at Emlenton, Pennsylvania, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as a recreational river through a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Venango County, as provided under section 10(e) of this Act.".

SEC. 2. ADVISORY COUNCILS FOR THE ALLEGHENY NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Agriculture (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall establish within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act 2 advisory councils to advise him on the establishment of final boundaries and the management of the river segments designated by section 1 of this Act (hereinafter referred to as the "Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River"), as follows:

(1) The Northern Advisory Council, to provide advice for the management of the segments of the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River between Kinzua Dam and Alcorn Island; and

(2) The Southern Advisory Council, to provide advice for the management of the segment of the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River between Franklin and Emlenton.

(b) NORTHERN ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The Northern Advisory Council shall be composed of 9 members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(A) The Forest Supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest, or his designee, who shall service as chair of the Council and be a nonvoting member.

(B) The Secretary of the Department of Environmental Resources of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or his designee.

(C) 6 members, 2 from each county from recommendations submitted by the County Commissioners of Warren, Forest, and Venango Counties, of which no fewer than 2 such members shall be riparian property owners along the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River.

(D) One member from a nonprofit conservation organization concerned with the protection of natural resources from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(2) Members appointed under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1) shall be appointed for terms of 3 years. A vacancy in the Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(3) Members of the Northern Advisory Council shall serve without pay as such and members who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay by reason of their service on the Commission. Each member shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(4) The Northern Advisory Council shall cease to exist 10 years after the date on which the Secretary approves the management plan for the Allegheny National Recreation River.

(c) SOUTHERN ADVISORY COUNCIL.—(1) The Southern Advisory Council shall be composed of 7 members appointed by the Secretary as follows:

(A) The Forest Supervisor of the Allegheny National Forest, or his designee, who shall serve as a nonvoting member.

(B) The Secretary of the Department of Environmental Resources of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or his designee, who shall serve as chairman.

(C) 4 members from recommendations submitted by the County Commissioners of Venango County, of which at least one shall be a riparian property owner along the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River.

(D) One member from a nonprofit conservation organization concerned with the protection of national resources, from recommendations submitted by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

(2) Members appointed under subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1) shall be appointed for terms of 3 years. A vacancy of the county representatives on the Council shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(3) Members of the Southern Advisory Council shall serve without pay as such and members who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay by reason of their service on the Commission. Each member shall be entitled to reimbursement for expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(4) The Southern Advisory Council shall cease to exist 10 years after the date on which the Secretary approves the management plan for the Allegheny National Recreation River.

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATION OF ALLEGHENY NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—After consultation with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, advisory councils, local governments, and the public, and within 18 months after the enactment of this Ac', the Secretary shall take such action with respect to the segments of the Allegheny River designated under section 1 of this Act as is required under section 3(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(b) INTERIM MEASURES.—As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary, shall issue guidelines specifying standards for local zoning ordinances, pursuant to section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, with the objective of protecting the outstandingly remarkable values of the Allegheny Wild and Scenic River, as defined by the Secretary. Once issued, such guidelines shall have the force and effect provided in section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN SEGMENTS.—(1) Land and mineral rights acquired by the Secretary for the purpose of managing the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River segments located between Kinzua Dam and Alcorn Island shall be added to and become part of the Allegheny National Forest.

(2) Land and mineral rights acquired by the Secretary for the purpose of managing the Allegheny National Wild and Scenic River segment located between Franklin and

Emlenton may be managed under a cooperative agreement with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

SEC. 5 STUDY RIVERS.

(a) STUDY.—Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287) is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"( ) CLARION, PENNSYLVANIA.—The segment of the main stem of the river from Ridgway to its confluence with the Allegheny River. The Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct the study of such segment.

"( ) MILL CREEK, JEFFERSON AND CLARION COUNTIES, PENNSYLVANIA.—The segment of the main stem of the creek from its headwaters near Gumbert Hill in Jefferson County, downstream to the confluence with the Clarion River.".

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Vento].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1323, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1323 is a bipartisan measure introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLINGER, and our Interior Committee colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. KOSTMAYER.

The bill would designate some 85 miles of the Allegheny River, in northwestern Pennsylvania, for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System. It is similar to a bill that was approved by our committee and passed by the House late in the last Congress on which action was not completed. The major difference in the legislation introduced this year is the addition of provisions for study of two tributary streams.

The bill is not controversial, so far as I am aware. There is agreement by all concerned, including the administration, that the segments of the river that would be designated by the bill are deserving of management consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Similarly, the proposal to study the additional areas was supported when the bill was being considered by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands.

The Interior Committee did adopt some amendments, primarily of a technical nature, including one that would revise section 3(b) of the bill, related to interim measures, in accordance with a suggestion made by the Forest Service at our hearing on the bill.

The revised language would direct the Secretary to use existing authority, under section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, to issue guidelines for local actions to protect the values of the designated segments of the Allegheny River.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill and basically the same as one that was approved by the House in the last Congress. I urge its approval again, and I hope that the Senate will be able to complete action on it reasonably soon.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1323, a bill to designate 85 miles of the Allegheny River in northwestern Pennsylvania as a unit of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This is an important measure which will protect certain "outstandingly remarkable" river values that were first recognized 13 years ago.

The Forest Service has studied and fully evaluated the resources of this river. The provisions of this bill regarding specific river segments to be designated are consistent with the results of their studies. The administration has testified in support of non-Federal management for those river segments entirely outside the forest boundary. Such a position is reasonable in terms of Federal fiscal limitations, as well as recognition of the outstanding river protection program implemented by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am pleased to see that while Federal management for the entire 85 miles has been retained, the revised language in this bill does set the proper parameters for limiting Federal control over local land use measures.

This is a bipartisan effort, representing the close cooperation between Mr. CLINGER and Mr. KOSTMAYER. I commend them for working together and bringing forward a bill which builds upon the thorough planning conducted by the Forest Service.

I urge my colleauges to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. As has been indicated, it covers 85 miles of the Allegheny River which qualify for management as wild and scenic river under the law, has been studied by the Forest Service, and has been through all the procedures that I think are necessary.

We set in motion some additional analysis to be done on some tributaries.

As has been indicated, it is a measure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER], who serves on the committee, had worked on. It passed in the last session.

I think that there is no controversy that I am aware of with regard to the Members, and so I just commend it to you. It deserves to be enacted today—passed by the House today.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1323, which will designate 85 miles of Allegheny River in northwestern Pennsylvania as recreational under the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Last October, the House passed this legislation, but unfortunately, the other body could not act before the 101st Congress adjourned.

Many people deserve thanks for bringing this legislation to the floor today in a bipartisan manner. I would especially like to thank my colleague, Congressman PETER KOSTMAYER. His help and hard work have proved invaluable in moving this legislation forward. Also, I'm pleased that we have had the support of the entire Pennsylvania delegation in designating the Allegheny River as a valuable recreational resource for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Allegheny River flows through some of the most beautiful forests in America. Its soft, rolling hills and majestic trees make a trip along the river truly inspirational and bring to mind the grandeur that makes up so much of America's wilderness. A brief excerpt from Frederick Way's 1942 book, "The Allegheny," sums it up nicely:

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

This bill will formalize and continue the long tradition of recreation on the Allegheny River. For generations, people have used this waterway for fishing, canoeing, camping, and other recreational activities. This designation would ensure that that tradition continues.

Of the 85 miles that would be designated, 30 percent cuts through the Allegheny National Forest, with the rest flowing through States and private lands. The national recreational river designation will also add additional protection to the many islands of the Allegheny River, including those designated as wilderness in the 1984 Pennsylvania Wilderness Act.

Because some of the lands are private, this bill sets up two citizen advisory councils to ensure a high level of input from private citizens and local governments. In fact, the local residents will have a major voice in drafting the management plan that will be the U.S. Forest Service. This plan will determine final boundaries and allow local citizens a large role in managing the river in the future.

Besides protecting the Allegheny, this legislation will also study the Clarion River from Ridgway to its confluence with the Allegheny to see if it too can be protected. A stream in Jefferson and Clarion Counties, the Millcreek, would also be studied.

The Allegheny River is a beautiful natural resource and this legislation will ensure that it receives protection as soon as possible.

I strongly urge all of my House colleagues to join the Pennsylvania delegation in supporting this important environmental legislation. We've crafted a good bill and it deserves to be enacted into law.

Additionally, I am very hopeful that the companion legislation the late Senator Heinz introduced, which is now being moved by Senator ARLEN SPECTER, will pass soon in the other body.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives takes another step in helping to protect the beauty of western Pennsylvania, by considering H.R. 1323, a bill that would designate 85 miles of the Allegheny River as a component of the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and study the Clarion River for potential addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I would like to thank both Chairman VENTO for moving so rapidly on H.R. 1323, and Congressman BILL CLINGER for all of his work and support, and for introducing the bill that he and I have been working on for several years to protect the beauty and scenery of the Allegheny River.

The Interior Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I chaired, held a hearing in 1989 in Pittsburgh to review operations and policies in the Allegheny National Forest [ANF]. One of the major focal points was the draft Forest Service report on recommending protection strategies for the Allegheny River. Congressman CLINGER and I became convinced that indeed the river was worthy of Federal protection and that there was substantial public support for such a proposal. Representative CLINGER, who represents that region of Pennsylvania, and I developed a piece of legislation that would bring 85 miles of the Allegheny River under the protection of the U.S. Forest Service, and yet it would be done so in cooperation with local communities and landowners. This bill enjoys the support of the entire Pennsylvania delegation.

H.R. 1323 calls for Forest Service management both inside and outside the proclamation boundary of the ANF. But this should present no problem. The U.S. Forest Service can and should provide leadership in protecting resources in and near national forests. Additionally, the Forest Service plays a vital role in advising private landowners and communities how to protect important forests, watersheds, and open space through the State and Private Forestry Program.

Mr. Speaker, this would be only the second wild and scenic river designation in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I look forward to working with Congressman CLINGER and the rest of the Pennsylvania delegation to bring this kind of protection to many other rivers in our beautiful State. In fact, I hope to bring to the floor sometime this summer my bill to designate portions of the Delaware River as wild and scenic, and will be working with the Pennsylvania delegation on an omnibus river protection bill for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Again, I appreciate the House acting on this bill at such a busy time and I look forward to enacting this bipartisan effort this year.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1323, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2042) to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2042

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 17(g)(1) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2216(g)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking the period the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(D) $25,550,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992;

"(E) $26,521,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993; and

"(F) $27,529,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994.".

SEC. 2. PRIORITY ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—In expending funds appropriated pursuant to the amendments made by section 1 of this Act, the United States Fire Administration shall give priority to—

(1) reducing the incidence of residential fires, especially in residences of the very old or very young in urban and rural areas, through the development and dissemination of public education and awareness programs, through arson research and technical assistance programs, and through research and development on new technologies;

(2) working with State Fire Marshals and other State level fire safety offices to identify fire problems that are national in scope;

(3) disseminating information about the activities and programs of the United States Fire Administration to State and local fire services;

(4) enhancing the residential sprinkler program, including research, demonstration activities, and technical assistance to the public and private sectors;

(5) enhancing research into sprinkler programs in areas or structures with limited or no domestic water supply;

(6) through the National Fire Academy, enhancing the residential and field program in support of State level training programs, particularly those that support the volunteer fire service; and

(7) strengthening programs that help protect the lives and safety of fire and emergency medical services personnel, including research into causes of death and injuries, research and development on new technologies to mitigate and prevent injuries, dissemination of information, and technical assistance to State and local fire departments.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The United States Fire Administration shall, within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report to Congress on the activities taken pursuant to subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 3. REPORT ON PUBLIC LAW 101-391, THE HOTEL AND MOTEL FIRE SAFETY ACT OF 1990.

The United States Fire Administration shall, by October 15, 1991, report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committtee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on its progress in implementing the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act of 1990. Such report shall specify the nature of expenditures made to that date, as well as including an estimate of the costs and a specific schedule for implementation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2042, the reauthorization of appropriations under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

The current authorization of appropriations under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

Fire is the third leading cause of accidental death, resulting in more than 6,000 deaths each year. At least 80 percent of all fire fatalities occur in homes. Due to the serious nature of the residential fire problem, H.R. 2042 directs the Fire Administration to submit a report to the Congress within 1 year on activities taken to give priority to reducing residential fires.

In human terms, far too many people die needlessly by fire each year. Senior citizens over 65 and children under 5 are disproportionately represented in fire deaths. Blacks and native Americans have extremely high fire death rates. People living in large cities and rural areas have a much higher risk of death from fire than those in suburban areas and small towns. In economic terms, the total cost of fire to the American public is about $30 billion annually.

The U.S. Fire Administration is striving to reduce the incidence of accidental fires. Its programs include smoke detector research, fire prevention, arson research, management and firefighter health and safety research, data collection and analysis to enhance

our knowledge of the scope and magnitude of fire problems, public fire education campaigns, and specialized training and management programs for the fire services.

H.R. 2042, authorizes appropriations of $25,550,000 for fiscal year 1992, with inflationary increases for fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994. The authorization level for fiscal year 1992 is consistent with the administration's budget request.

The bill directs the Fire Administration to give priority to seven activities, including the reduction of residential fires, among the groups most vulnerable to fire and in geographical areas hardest hit by fire. It requires research into the development of sprinkler programs for areas or structures with limited or no domestic water supply.

And the bill requires the Fire Administration to report on its progress in implementing the Hotel and Motel Fire Safety Act of 1990.

I want to acknowledge the contributions of the gentleman from California, Mr. PACKARD ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Science, particularly with regard to the need to improve fire fighting capabilities in areas with limited water supplies.

I urge support for H.R. 2042.

□ 1320

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2042, which reauthorizes appropriations for fiscal years 1992 through 1994.

The U.S. Fire Administration was created by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 as the Federal agency with responsibility for fire reduction efforts at the national level. This country loses almost 6,000 people each year to fires. Out of this tragic number, the most vulnerable groups are the very young and the very old.

A statistic which is truly alarming to me is that the vast majority of fire deaths occur in the home. That is why H.R. 2042 requires the U.S. Fire Administration to report to the Congress, within 1 year, on the activities taken by the Fire Administration to reduce the number of residential fires.

The bill directs the Fire Administration to give priority to seven activities—including an area which is of great importance to me—enhancing research into sprinkler programs in areas or structures where there is little or no domestic water supply. This provision has applicability to mobile homes and rural areas, and of particular significance to me is its applicability to drought-striken California.

California has been devastated by the ongoing drought conditions. Conservation of the precious water supply is absolutely essential, especially now since 1991 ranks as the driest of the 5 years of drought. It is reported that so far, California has reduced its normal deliveries of water to municipal and industrial users, including the metropolitan water district of southern California, by 80 percent. Deliveries to agricultural users have been eliminated and are not expected to be resumed this year.

I am hopeful that the provision on sprinkler systems for limited water supplies will have a positive impact on the drought-striken Southwest which literally has no water to spare.

In conclusion, I want to state that I support this bill because it provides funding for essential fire prevention efforts and it accomplishes this at the level of the President's request for fiscal year 1992. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, for his efforts to work cooperatively on this bill and for his efforts to move this bill to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

I urge all members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I am pleased to add my support to this legislation. The authorization level represents the President's request for fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

The success of the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy are obvious in the dramatic decrease in fire-related deaths over the past 15 years. These organizations are responsible for the dissemination of up-to-date fire prevention information to fire companies across the country, and it is this network that has enhanced fire service training and reduced fire loss.

Although all firefighters benefit from the training efforts of the U.S. Fire Administration and the National Fire Academy, the thousands of small volunteer fire companies across the country are perhaps the most dependent on these programs. The fire programs have provided invaluable assistance to individual communities, and have resulted in real savings of human life and property.

I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2041, a bill to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as a Member who has seen the tragedy of fire strike in my own congressional district.

On March 29, 1991, in Port Jervis, New York, a tragic fire killed three children and their grandfather during the early morning hours. The family died from smoke inhalation after being overcome by smoke even before the flames raced through their wood-frame home. Fire investigators have found no evidence of smoke detector devices.

Following this tragedy, I learned that the family received section 8 rental assistance and that HUD does not require smoke detectors in section 8 subsidized housing rented to low-income and/or elderly individuals. In addition, I have been apprised that the Nation's taxpayers will spend $11.6 billion this year on federally subsidized section 8 housing programs. However, the 2.6 million families receiving section 8 across America do not have the protection needed by smoke alarms.

Accordingly, along with Senator D'AMATO, I have introduced H.R. 2099, the Fire Safety Enhancement Act, requiring the installation and maintenance of smoke detectors in all households financed with HUD programs—the only chance that this Port Jervis family had for survival.

Mr. Speaker, while it is too late to help the family in Port Jervis, with the support of my colleagues, we may be able to save other families throughout our Nation. Similarly with the support of the House today, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act authorization can strengthen our Nation's ability to protect its citizens against the horrors and tragedy of fire.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for this legislation. As the chairman of the congressional fire services caucus, I am pleased that Congress is again renewing the Federal commitment to reducing fire injuries and deaths.

As we are all too well aware, more than 6,000 people lose their lives to fire each year. The U.S. record of fire losses is among the worst of any industrialized nation. Fire kills, and its victims are often those least able to escape its clutches: The very young, the very old, and the sick.

The key to reducing the record of fire deaths is prevention. For that reason, I am extremely pleased that this committee made fire prevention in residential areas the No. 1 priority for the U.S. Fire Administration. Fully three-quarters of the deaths and two-thirds of the injuries caused by fire occur in the home. Renewed emphasis by the USFA on this problem will help reverse these terrible statistics.

I am also pleased to see that the bill directs the USFA to expand its efforts to promote the use of residential sprinklers. The majority of residential fires in 1987 occurred in homes without smoke detectors. In an alarming 41 percent of such fires where smoke detectors were present, the units either failed to operate or activated too late to save the residents. Expanded use of sprinklers will save hundreds and hundreds of lives in the years to come. I would also mention the importance of considering other fire safety technologies, including building design and materials, which can have a significant impact on fire safety.

I would like to take a moment to express my appreciation to the President of the United States. For years, this committee and other concerned Members of Congress had to fight to keep these programs alive. Each year, the Office of Management and Budget recommended elimination of the Federal fire programs, and each year, this committee restored them. Fortunately, the current resident of the White House understands the nature of the fire problem in America and included an increase in funds for the U.S. Fire Administra-

tion in his fiscal year 1992 budget. The President's cooperation and concern for America's domestic defender has been truly outstanding.

I would like to commend the chairman of the committee, Mr. BROWN, and the ranking minority member, Mr. WALKER, for bringing this important legislation to the floor. Subcommittee Chairman RICK BOUCHER and the ranking member RON PACKARD also deserve a great deal of credit for their work in crafting this bill. It is this committee which stood against previous efforts to eliminate the Federal fire programs, and it is clear that their efforts are being recognized by those of us inside the beltway. I know that the American Fire Service is glad to have strong allies on the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2042 is a good bill, one that will help save lives and property. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, in 1974, Congress passed the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act, which established the U.S. Fire Administration. The Fire Act created new national authorities and a Federal focus to reduce the devastating fire losses that occur annually in this Nation. Each year, fire kills more Americans than all other national emergencies combined, including floods, hurricanes, tornadoes, and earthquakes.

Many of the programs of the U.S. Fire Administration have been responsible for cutting fire fatalities in half over the past 20 years from roughly 12,000 in the early 1970's to about 6,000 now. However, in spite of the progress that has been made in reducing fire deaths, the United States still has one of the highest fire-death rates per capita in the industrialized world. The total cost of fire which includes losses plus the cost of protection, fire departments, and insurance overhead is $30 billion per year.

H.R. 2042, directs the U.S. Fire Administration to give priority to several areas which include: First, reducing the residential fire problem; second, working with State level fire safety offices to identify fire problems that are national in scope; third, disseminating information about the activities of the U.S. Fire Administration to State and local fire services; fourth, enhancing research into the establishment of sprinkler programs in areas or structures with limited or no domestic water supply; fifth, enhancing the residential sprinkler program; sixth, enhancing fire fighter training programs at the National Fire Academy, particularly those that support the volunteer fire services; and seventh, strengthening programs that help protect the lives and safety of fire and emergency medical personnel.

The funding level in the bill for fiscal year 1992 is consistent with the administration's request and for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 the funding levels reflect increases for inflation.

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues on the Subcommittee on Science, RICK BOUCHER, chairman, and RON PACKARD, ranking Republican member, and my distinguished colleague, ROBERT WALKER, ranking Republican member of the committee, for the expeditious manner in which this bill has been brought to the floor.

By one's and two's, fire claims an average of 16 victims each day and continues to be a serious burden on the national economy. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 2042, the authorization of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act for fiscal year 1992–94, to provide programs that mitigate the enormous fire threat in this Nation.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2042, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2042.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I was unexpectedly detained on my return from an Education and Labor field hearing in the 19th District of Pennsylvania, and was unable to participate in activities on the floor of the House. Had I been present, however, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2042, "yea" on S. 483, and "yea" on H.R. 1642.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, a prior commitment in my district prevented me from being present on the House floor when recorded votes were ordered on several suspensions. Had I been present at the time of the votes, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 2042, H.R. 1642, and S. 483.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, due to previously scheduled hearings on health care and on Lake Champlain, I was unable to be present for the three recorded votes taken. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 1642, the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991; "aye" on H.R. 2042, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act Authorization, and "aye" on S. 483, the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on official business during rollcall votes No. 122, 123, and 124. Had I been present on the House floor I would have cast my vote as follows:

Roll No. 122: "Yea" on passage of H.R. 1642, establishing in the State of Texas the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site.

Roll No. 123: "Yea" on passage of H.R. 2042, authorizing appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

Roll No. 124: "Yea" on passage of S. 483, the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

MANAGING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request involving a special order coming up directly after the conduct of business by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA]. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] be designated as the manager of my special order in my absence. I expect to be gone for just a few minutes.

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

There was no objection.

TACONIC MOUNTAINS PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 483) entitled the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 483

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) large tracts of undeveloped forest land in Vermont's Taconic Mountain Range are threatened by conversion to nonforest uses;

(2) lands included in the Green Mountain National Forest are forever open to all Americans;

(3) the Green Mountain National Forest permanently protects forest for their environmental and economic benefits through the management of range, recreation, timber, water, wilderness, and fish and wildlife resources;

(4) the Bennington County Regional Commission supports expanding the Green Mountain National Forest boundary to include the Taconic Mountain Range; and

(5) the Vermont General Assembly has enacted legislation consenting to the acquisition by the Federal Government of lands throughout the Taconic Mountain Range within Bennington County for inclusion in the Green Mountain National Forest.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to expand the boundaries of the Green Mountain National Forest to include the Taconic Mountain Range within Bennington County.

SEC. 2. GREEN MOUNTAIN NATIONAL FOREST EXPANSION.

The boundaries of the Green Mountain National Forest are hereby modified to include all lands depicted on a map entitled "Taconic Mountain Range Expansion" dated March 1, 1991, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office

of the Chief of the Forest Service, Washington, District of Columbia. Within the area delineated on such map, the Secretary shall utilize his authorities under the Act of March 1, 1911 (chapter 186, 36 Stat. 961 as amended), to acquire lands, waters, and interests therein. Lands so acquired shall be managed under such Act for National Forest purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 483—the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991—authorizes the expansion of the Green Mountain National Forest to include the 185,000 acres of the Taconic Mountain Range within Bennington County, VT.

This proposed expansion of the Green Mountain National Forest has the support of the people of Bennington County, VT, and the State's congressional delegation.

S. 483 will protect and guarantee public access to an important natural resource that is now threatened with conversion to nonforest uses, particularly residential development. Most of the lands within the proposed expansion area are rugged, undeveloped forest and meadow areas, and it also includes the headwaters of two highly rated trout streams. The U.S. Forest Service has stated its intention to acquire these privately owned lands on a willing-seller basis.

Mr. Speaker, the Taconic Mountain Range is a logical addition to the Green Mountain National Forest and I urge the House to support this legislation.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of S. 483. It passed our committee on a voice vote. I urge its adoption.

S. 483 will protect and guarantee public access to an important natural resource that is now threatened with conversion to nonforest use, particularly residential development. Most of the lands within the proposed expansion area are rugged, undeveloped forest and meadow areas, and it also includes the headwaters of two highly rated trout streams. The U.S. Forest Service has stated its intention to acquire these privately owned lands on a willing-seller basis.

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

□ 1330

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support of our colleagues on this legislation, and 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 Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 483.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which the motion was entertained later today following the recognition of Members for special order speeches.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order today may be called at a later time so we may allow the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] to proceed.

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

There was no objection.

BASIC RESEARCH IS THE WELLSPRING OF KNOWLEDGE FROM WHICH ALL TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION IS DERIVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for allowing me to proceed at this time.

Today, members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, are engaging in special orders for the purpose of underscoring the value of federally funded research. I will initially deliver a set of remarks concerning that subject and then yield to other members of the full committee who are scheduled to deliver remarks as well.

Mr. Speaker, high technology innovation—the innovation that drives our economy forward and contributes most directly to increasing our standard of living—can only occur if new knowledge is constantly generated through basic research. But it has been estimated that there is, on average, a 7- to 20-year lag between the time that an innovative concept is discovered by a basic researcher, and the time that this innovation can be commercialized by the private sector. Furthermore, there can be no way to control the direction or predict the results of basic research in order to guarantee a particular type of innovation in a particular amount of time.

For example, the great British scientist Ernest Rutherford studied the structure of atoms, and early in this century determined that the heat produced by radioactive elements was caused by changes in their atomic makeup. When asked about the practical applications of his discovery, Rutherford said: "Anyone who expects a source of power from the transformation of these atoms is talking moonshine." Yet the radioactive decay which he investigated is the very process that allows us to generate electricity from nuclear reactors.

The most important high technology innovation of the past 50 years—the transistor—could not have been developed without fundamental discoveries in the basic science of quantum physics. The implications of these discoveries could not have been predicted by anyone. Walter H. Brattain, one of the original discoverers of the transistor effect, stated:

> The transistor came about because fundamental knowledge had developed to a stage where human minds could understand phenomena that had been observed for a long time. It is noteworthy that a breakthrough came from work dedicated to understanding fundamental physics, rather than from the cut-and-try method of producing a useful device.

Furthermore, it was more than twenty years between the invention of the transsitor, in 1947, and the emergence of a mature industry based on integrated circuit technology in the 1970's. It was almost 50 years between Rutherford's discovery of radioactive decay and the development of the controlled fission reactor. These types of time lags are typical.

In other words, the investment that we make in basic scientific and engineering research today will be the source of knowledge for our high technology industries in the first decades of the 21st century. If we chose to reduce our R&D budget now, we cannot know the specific consequences of our action, we cannot know what we will not discover. We do know, however, that the other industrialized nations of the world are choosing this time to increase their R&D investments, and that the discoveries we fail to make at home today may well be made by scientists abroad tomorrow.

The slow and unpredictable nature of scientific and technological innovation prevents private industry from funding a significant portion of our nation's basic research. Yet a continued flow of basic scientific discoveries is abso-

lutely critical to maintaining our high technology competitiveness and economic vitality. For these reasons, the Federal Government has always been—and must continue to be—the primary sponsor of basic research.

The rationale for federal sponsorship of basic research was perhaps best expressed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, in his 1945 work "Science, the Endless Frontier." He wrote:

> Without scientific progress the national health would deteriorate; without scientific progress we could not hope for improvement in our standard of living or for an inceased number of jobs for our citizens; and without scientific progress we could not have maintained our liberties against tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I think those words speak eloquently to the need for a sustained Federal commitment to basic research. I know now that other of my colleagues on the Science, Space, and Technology Committee will underscore those very points.

First, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, space station Freedom represents a major element of the U.S. presence in space. It will contribute to the continuing U.S. space leadership far into the 21st century.

□ 1340

This leadership will be evident not only in space technology and operations but also in education, economic competitiveness, space science and commercial applications. Undoubtedly, the area where elimination of the U.S. presence on the space station will have the most profound impact is in the area of international cooperation. The Europeans, the Japanese, and the Canadians are relying on the United States to honor the commitment we made when we first entered into the international agreement to work together to build space station Freedom.

The concept of space station Freedom was actually initiated by the United States when, in 1984, then-President Reagan invited friends and allies of the United States to participate in its development.

The intergovernmental agreement was signed in September 1988. Shortly after the action taken by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the director general of the European Space Agency, Jean-Marie Luton, wrote to Vice President DAN QUAYLE expressing ESA's grave concern over the apparently imminent cancellation of the space station. He stated that the threat to the station does great damage to the credibility in U.S.-international cooperative agreements.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs for Japan, Taro Nakayama, has written Secretary of State James Baker to express that country's concern. He states that elimination of the U.S. commitment to the space station would result in nullification of agreements for major joint efforts among the international partners and inevitable damage to U.S. credibility as a partner in any major and big science project.

The president of the Canadian Space Agency, Larkin Kerwin, in his letter to Admiral Truly, has stated,

> I fear that withdrawal of the U.S. from this program after all of the international partners have invested so much in good faith will have far-reaching implications for the future of international cooperation in space.

These are, to me, extremely ominous and foreboding messages that should seriously be considered in the debate over the station. Backing out of this crucial international commitment could have devastating and longlasting ramifications for the United States' ability to enter into other international cooperatives in the future.

I might mention that on the Subcommittee on Space and on the full Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, we are planning international cooperation on other major big science projects, the superconducting super collider being one of them.

So we are not just talking about the space station or space-related initiatives.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes a very important point with regard to the superconducting super collider. This Nation is attempting to embark on a number of major items that will influence basic science research for some time to come. The space station is one of those, the superconducting super collider is another. If in fact we were to back out of the space station, the chances of getting any international partners willing to come in on a superconducting super collider are almost impossible. They are going to see that the investments they have made on the space station went down the tubes, and they are not going to put billions of dollars into a project that we may not be able or may not be willing to follow through on.

It is my understanding that the Japanese have already indicated that if the space station falls through, there is no way that they are going to come in on the superconducting super collider. Why is that important? Well, because the Japanese are expected to come up with maybe as much as a billion dollars of money for the superconducting super collider, a billion dollars of money that the American taxpayers would not have to put into that project. That kind of international cooperation will be essential to making certain the superconducting super collider goes forward. And if the space station fails, then the SSC will fail and this Nation will be left with a dearth of big science projects.

Now, of course, there are some people who say, "Well, we do not need these big science projects." Well, the fact is we ought to be very careful about what we commit to. But in the case of the space station, we now have a 6- to 7-year commitment that we have regularly followed through on, only to have it knocked out as we get into the fundamentals of it by the Appropriations Committee. It is that kind of unreliability that will make it impossible not only to do big science projects but also to do small science projects with our international partners. So, the gentleman makes an absolutely essential point in all of this, that we will have no international cooperation on science at all if we continue this pattern of backing out at the last moment after international partners have made commitments to cooperative scientific efforts.

Mr. PACKARD. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right on target. I think the most intriguing part of this whole debate and question is that this is at the very moment when the United States is trying to encourage international cooperation in space. We are even looking to the Soviet Union, which we have never done before, for cooperative efforts and to eliminate duplication in space. I think all countries involved in space recognize it has got to be a global effort because of the costs and because of the experimentation and the development that could take place there. Certainly we are looking to enhance our cooperative efforts with foreign countries, and this would come at the very moment that when we want their help, when we will be seeking their help on other programs even in space, and it would be ludicrous for us to send the messge that this will send that in fact we do not want to cooperate, we are not reliable partners. And on most of these big science projects we know we cannot do them alone. I think most Members of Congress, certainly many members of the committee, realize that the superconducting super collider project is dead if we cannot get international cooperation. We simply cannot afford that kind of a project with our budget as it is today, its limited budget.

Mr. WALKER. I would like to underscore the point: These international partners of ours, this is not a minor matter for them because in several cases they have already invested hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars into the space station. The Japanese are developing a module for the space station. They have gone ahead and done the work on that module and have literally hundreds of millions of dollars of investment that have been put forward already. They are out that money. If there is no space station for them to put that module on, that is

going to be lost money for them. They are going to be very unhappy, and rightfully should be. The Europeans the same way. There is an ESA module to go on that station. If we back out, the Europeans will have put hundreds of millions of dollars into that particular project, only to find that the United States is not going to fly the station for which it was designed.

Those kinds of problems have long-term ramifications to them. That will not be forgotten soon, and it will certainly undermine our efforts to get additional cooperation. As the gentleman pointed out, we are seeking other cooperation with nations like the Soviet Union. They will certainly look upon what has happened here with a great deal of suspicion.

Mr. PACKARD. I thank the gentleman for that very timely statement.

Perhaps even more pressing than the damage to our international credibility is the fact that America will lose its dominant leadership in space. We have led the world in space up till this point. We will be at risk of losing that dominant leadership role.

Let us all realize that the space agencies will quickly—foreign space agencies—will quickly fill this void. Japan is aggressively increasing its space commitment. The European Space Agency has evolved into a diversified and efficient organization with programs in fundamental research, Earth observations and telecommunications. It has become a dominant player in both space research and commercial space activities.

They will quickly fill the void if the United States loses or even falters in its leadership in space. It is clear that if America abdicates its leadership role, these other countries will take over the leadership role and America would have no hope of playing a role, a permanent role, as a permanent manned infrastructure in space developed.

And then, in addition to that, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania eloquently pointed out that these other countries, our foreign partners in the space station, have spent millions and in some cases billions of dollars to this point because of these international agreements and commitments and now they will lose that. That says nothing for the billions that the American people have paid into the space station program to this point. And if we scuttle it now, we will lose, we will have lost those billions of dollars of investment. So it is very short-sighted for us to lose the billions that the American taxpayers have paid into the space station to this point. We are essentially on schedule. We have revised the program to where it is doable, and it would be a tragic mistake for us to now pull the economic and budget rug out from under the space station and then throw down the tube the billions of dollars that the American taxpayers have put into our portion, not to say anything of the, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania already pointed out, the foreign investments in their modules.

We have spent billions on the space station, and that would be money wasted. That would be a tragic replay of what this Government does, and this Congress often also all too often does, and that is we start a major program, we put billions of dollars of taxpayers' money into it only to pull the rug out at the most inopportune time and lose that investment. Here we are talking about a major investment into America's future, into the space future, and into the education of this country.

We would lose one of the significant inducements and exciting opportunities for young science students as they begin to start a science career, if we pulled out of the space station.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman makes another, I think, essential point in this debate, and that is that the U.S. Government has invested, as the gentleman pointed out, billions of dollars already into the space station.

□ 1350

Just as important as that investment though is what it has accomplished. With that investment teams of industries have been put together in this country, and they have hired on people who are devoted to work for the space station, supposedly over a long period of time. Now if we pull out now, all of those teams will have to be disbanded so that we will lose all the scientific talent that was brought together in order to move ahead with the space station, so the unreliability of the U.S. Government will not only be an issue with our foreign partners, it will be an issue with American aerospace industries that are geared up to do this work. Those industries are going to become very suspicious of putting their own money up front on some of these projects if in fact it appears as though the American Government can never get its act together well enough, and the blame is here, in the Congress, and I think Congress has to accept the blame for this because the fact is each administration, including the Bush administration, has wanted to proceed forward on the space station, and the frustration we have run into now is on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has its role to play in all this, if we understand that, but somewhere along the line, once full commitments are made, we do have to have the will, and in some cases the courage, to follow through on the projects that involve, not only commitments of the U.S. Government, but involve commitments of private enterprise, involve commitments of international partners and a whole series of other people.

So, the gentleman makes an important point, that to back out now is going to be very costly in terms of taxpayer dollars, but also in terms of our ability to at some point in the future be able to continue doing the kinds of work that the Federal Government has always done in basic research.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my statement with one other comment, and that is to me a very, very significant part of this whole issue, whether we ought to continue this space station or not. Up to this point, and I believe for the foreseeable future, the space station is the centerpiece, it is the linchpin, of our space program for as far as I can foresee in the future. We take that very, very important component out of our space planning and our space future, and we may jeopardize exploration of other planets because we needed and we will need a platform from which to launch our exploration into outer space, and, if we do not have the space station, which is part of that plan, we will end up jeopardizing other major components of our space planning and space future, and thus, being the centerpiece and, to me, the linchpin of this entire, our entire, space future, it would be very short sighted to throw that out at this point in time.

I think also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is very much aware of the efforts that are being made. He has been a very important part of that effort, as I have been, of trying to encourage more and more privatization of our space program, and we foresee that the space station is one of the major portions of the space program that we will encourage and be able to involve private enterprise in research, in development, and in activities with the space station.

But in order for that to take place, we must have a Government commitment to the space station. The private sector will not be able to manage to come up with the funds, nor the ingenuity, to put a space station up from the private sector. But there is no question that the private sector will use that space station and will establish laboratory facilities and development facilities in the future, and so we will be losing the credibility of the private sector, and our efforts to move our space program more and more into the private sector will be significantly jeopardized if we pull the space station rug out from underneath this effort to move more and more to the private sector.

So, my colleagues, I truly hope and pray that the Congress will be wise enough to recognize the value of the space station, will reinstate it into the budget, and it will allow us to move forward with the space station as planned and thus retain the credibility of our foreign partners, retain the credibility of the science community of

this country, and retain the credibility of the private sector, as they have made their plans to be involved in this space station.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] for his extremely important statement, and I want to associate myself with his remarks. I will probably repeat some of them as a matter of fact, but repetition in this case is intended to provide emphasis, and the points that the gentleman has made require a great deal of emphasis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago President John F. Kennedy challenged our Nation to put a man on the Moon before that decade was over and America charged into the space race with this mission. We accomplished in those 8 years something that has not been repeated since the Apollo Program was completed.

Today we face no less a challenge. There are scientific and technological difficulties that exist now that are equally pressing. We face the possibility of the loss of our global economic competitiveness in high-technology fields. Space station Freedom will be a vital part of helping maintain America's preeminence as a technology-based society. For the past three decades we have been the leader in space exploration, both manned and unmanned. The achievement of permanent manned capability of the space station will insure that our leadership will continue into the 21st century.

We funded the Apollo Program during the 1960's at a yearly funding level that was six times greater than the baselined yearly funding level for the space station. The Apollo Program was designed for the specific purpose of putting an American on the Moon, not to carry out specific scientific capabilities. Yet a tremendous amount of scientific and technological benefit resulted from those early programs. Space station Freedom on the other hand is specifically designed to carry out scientific research among its other capabilities. It has also been designed to be expanded in scope in the future if we so desire. Funding for the space station Freedom program is an excellent investment.

A strong manned-space program has always been a part of our civil space objectives. We began with the success of the Mercury Program. The names of these early pioneers invoke a sense of national pride and accomplishment. The undaunted American spirit throughout this program and through the Gemini, Apollo, and space shuttle successes led to achievements unparalleled in the history of mankind. These successful years have stimulated overall NASA program growth. This has resulted in increased support for all of NASA's programs particularly space science. The space station project will insure the continued success of not only our manned space program, but of all of our space efforts.

Space station Freedom is the centerpiece, an important part of the U.S. civil space program. We have established the goal of returning to the Moon and proceeding with the manned exploration of Mars. If these worthwhile goals are to be achieved, we must be able to study and experience the effects of long-term manned existence in space. Space station Freedom is crucial to this effort. It is the only credible laboratory within which to study the effects on humans of the space environment, an environment in which we must learn to live safely and productively if we are to accomplish our space exploration goals. As the Augustine committee on the future of the space program has concluded,

> The committee holds the strong conviction that if the U.S. is to have any significant long-term manned space program, a space station is the next logical and essential element of that endeavor.

I wholeheartedly agree.

The National Academy of Sciences, in its 1988 report to the incoming Bush administration, stated that "some form of space station is essential to establish the feasibility of extended human space flight." The Academy's space studies board, in its recent report that was critical of some aspects of NASA's restructure of the space station, stated, "The space studies board strongly endorses the position that a space-based laboratory is required to study the physiological consequences of long-term space flight." The space station is the ideal means to meet this requirement. The necessity for a space station as a link to our future manned-space projects is clear.

Space station Freedom will provide a world-class life-science and microgravity space-based research laboratory that is unparalleled. The potential for scientific breakthroughs in the medical, biological, metallurgical, materials science, and other fields is extraordinary. Numerous technologies are already being developed and will be advanced by space station Freedom. These include power generation and control, closed loop environmental control, structures and materials robotics, and crew health care. The scientific potential of the station together with the other benefits to be derived from it provides overwhelming justification for its funding.

Japan, the Soviet Union, Canada, and the European Space Agency are committed to long-term manned-space programs. If the United States gives up its position as the acknowledged leader in manned-space efforts, these other nations will be ready to move in to fill this vacuum. Do we really want to give up this major high-technology field that is without equal? I think not. Continued manned exploration of space, with America as the unquestioned leader, is important to our future and that of our children. We need to complete space station Freedom to keep us in the forefront of the exploration of space.

Space station Freedom is truly an international project. It is a cooperative effort among the United States, Japan, Canada, and the European Space Agency and is the world's largest cooperative science and technology project ever undertaken. There will be considerable cost sharing on this program with our partners. We and our partners have invested significant sums in the development of the station as of this date and are committed to this project. How the United States handles the continued development of space station Freedom will be a gauge to our partners of our ability to be a reliable partner in significant, large-scale science and technology initiatives such as the supercollider and the global-change program. It is important for us to live up to the international agreements we enter into in the science and technology fields.

Our Nation is currently facing a crisis with the scientific literacy of our young people. Science, mathematics, and engineering excellence have emerged as a central goal of education. This trend must continue. A viable, energetic space program extends a challenge to our young people by its very existence. The surge in scientific and technological advancement following our early successes in space is proof of the cause and effect relationship. Space station Freedom will provide a focal point to motivate more young people to study science and engineering. The space station provides the vision and inspiration for future generations of Americans to pursue excellence in education and the expansion of knowledge.

Last year Congress mandated that the space station be restructured to meet certain congressionally imposed requirements. NASA reacted to this mandate swiftly and appropriately. The cost of the station has been reduced, adequate power has been made available for users, the requirements for maintenance and extravehicular activities have been reduced, there is a less ambitious shuttle schedule, and the station will be made available for science research as soon as possible. This restructure was accomplished in cooperation with our international partners and consistent with the recommendations of the Augustine Report. We, in Congress, should not now tell NASA and the Nation that we do not want space station Freedom. I cannot agree with the Appropriations Subcommittee recommendation that space station Freedom be terminated.

This Congress has continuously supported the space station over the last 7

years. Through our legislative process in both Houses of Congress, we have provided the funds to make the dream of a permanently manned presence in outer space a reality. I see no good reason to withdraw any of our support now or in the future.

This issue of deleting funding for the space station is not merely one of changing our space priorities. It is a complete shift away from any space program and the technological investment associated with it. We are talking about abandoning this vital field to the competition. Make no mistake, we are talking about the beginning of the end for the U.S. manned-space program. I will not accept that ending.

The continuation of the manned-space program is consistent with our national goals. As President Kennedy expressed with vision in 1962:

> The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join it or not. And it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space.

NASA has met the challenge and now we must look to the future. Let us continue to move forward.

□ 1400

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the contribution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER]. He is a very valuable member of the committee. Even though he is in his first term in Congress, he has mastered the arcane details of the space program in an exceptional way. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and commend him for his contribution.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate very much his establishing this special order on a topic that is so important not only to us in Congress as we direct the policies of the country but to all the American people.

In saying this, we may well be repeating, but I think in repetition we indicate the stress and we indicate the importance and the emphasis that is needed. I concur also with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER] said so very eloquently with regard to the need for continuing the funding for the space station.

Again I wish to comment on the statement made by the late President, John F. Kennedy, in 1961. He stood in this House Chamber before a special joint session of Congress, and he firmly seized upon the challenge of this Nation to send a man to the Moon and return him safely to Earth. He told us that "we do these things not because they are easy but because they are hard."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, let me interrupt the gentlewoman from Maryland at this point.

Mrs. MORELLA. Yes indeed.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would take this opportunity to indicate one of the visual displays which I think well illustrates the hard choice that President Kennedy made 30 years ago. What we see on that display to my right is a chart of the funding for the Apollo Program as compared to the space station in real dollars. At that point, in 1961, President Kennedy decided to commit this country to the Apollo Program, no matter what the cost, and it cost roughly four times the amount which the space station Freedom is going to cost. We hear about unbalanced space programs from people who are saying today that space station Freedom takes up too much of the budget. We made a commitment in the committee that the space station will never take up more than 20 percent of the NASA budget, and it does not.

□ 1410

Apollo took up something like three-quarters, possibly 80 percent of the NASA budget, at that point. In fact, Apollo was the NASA budget.

At the peak, the expenditure represented roughly 0.8 of 1 percent of the gross national product. The space station will never come even close to that, because the gross national product has increased extremely, so that even using constant dollars, you do not get the right perspective.

The total NASA budget, as recommended by the Augustine Report, was intended to level out at 0.4 of 1 percent, half of what it was at the peak of the Apollo years. I make these points just to illustrate the comment of the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] about the difficulty of a decision to commit this share of our Nation's resources to something which, if you want to talk scientific justification, it did not have a scientific justification.

The Soviets learned as much as we did by sending an unmanned rocket to the Moon and bringing back soil samples. Essentially that is all we ever did, was bring back soil samples. But we landed human beings, and we excited the imagination of the entire Earth global population. That is the sort of thing we have at stake today.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we hope we will be able to continue. I think it is very appropriate that the gentleman pointed out these visual aids, along with his commentary, that indicate we are not putting that much into it, and it is imperative that it continue.

Today, 30 years later, as we seek to move forward to implement long-range programs for human exploration of the Moon and the planets, we are once again faced with hard choices. The NASA Appropriations Subcommittee recently defunded much of the Science Committee's request for the space station Freedom.

I am very concerned that the defunding of the space station will cause, in its totality, a severe impact. The Augustine Committee stated that "If the United States is to have any significant long-term manned space program, a space station is the next logical and essential element." NASA's loss of such a long-term goal for the manned space program will be deeply felt.

The cancellation of the space station program also endangers our international cooperative agreements with our space partners. Each of our partners has indicated that cancellation would make future cooperation on any large-scale international science and technology venture highly unlikely for a considerable period of time.

That was articulated earlier by one of the Members who pointed out, as did the gentleman from Alabama, time and time again we begin to lose our credibility in terms of international cooperation and agreement. Our agreements do not mean much.

The Japanese have already put approximately $300 million into their part of the space station, and they have indicated that they may well remove their desire to engage in other major scientific projects with the United States if we do not mean what we say.

The European Space Agency has called the space station the cornerstone of the European Space Agency's long-term space effort. The Canadian Space Agency, of course, has also contacted us, urging that we continue funding.

These are just part of the international agreements and cooperation that we have already engaged in, and we will, if this is not funded, be removing ourselves with incredible impact from so many other projects with these countries.

In addition, and perhaps most importantly, the defunding of the space station will have a severe rippling effect upon our Nation's economy. The space station program has a procurement constituency of over 2,000 businesses in 40 States, employing over 50,000 workers. I am proud to represent a great number of those workers' some of whom have committed their careers to developing a space station.

Mr. Speaker, due to the appropriations procedure, NASA is in the unenviable task of competing with some very important social programs. Consequently, we, in Congress, are faced with the hard choices of funding investments in the future or addressing current needs. When the time comes for us to cast our votes on the space station, I urge all of my colleagues to give every consideration for allowing

NASA to continue the rich tradition of our space program.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for her contribution. It is extremely helpful. As she indicated, we will need to raise those points over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, this is sort of a dress rehearsal for our debate on Thursday. I hope the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] will be equally eloquent when that time comes.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], a very active member of the committee, and one who is thoroughly familiar with the nuts and bolts of the space program, including the space station.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank our fine colleagues, Mr. BROWN, chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, and Mr. WALKER, the ranking Republican, for reserving this time to discuss the future of the American Space Program.

Part of that future, Mr. Speaker, must be an American space station.

It is no coincidence that the creation and growth of America's Information Age, fueled by our high-technology industries, have paralleled the years of NASA's greatest activity and accomplishment.

Space exploration has been one of our best public policy vehicles for boosting our economy, enhancing our international competitiveness, improving our national security, and improving our quality of life.

But just as it was more than 30 years ago, when Newsweek editor Kermit Lansner warned of the brain drain born of delays and ignorance, today the United States risks the loss of all that we have achieved in our space program if we delay the construction of space station Freedom any further.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, it has been my privilege for many years to work with NASA and help shape our Nation's space program.

I have attended countless hearings and listened to countless hours of testimony on space station Freedom.

During these hearings, I have become convinced that space station Freedom is a necessity, not a luxury.

The space station is a building block to a true new world order that will include continued exploration of space and eventually, a permanent human presence in space.

I have voted, along with a majority of the members of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, to authorize funding for the space station.

I have voted, along with a majority of Members of the House of Representatives, to authorize funding for the space station Freedom.

But now, Mr. Speaker, funding for space station Freedom has been vetoed.

It has not been vetoed by the House.

It has not been vetoed by the Senate.

It has not been vetoed by the President.

It has been vetoed by an appropriations subcommittee that had only a few hours to consider what had been years in the making.

Mr. Speaker, legislating on an appropriations bill is an age-old debate here in the House. The subcommittee technically has not done that with their cleverly drawn provisions.

But the actions by the Appropriations subcommittee demonstrate clearly the dangers of that practice are now out of control.

Mr. Speaker, housing is important.

Education and veteran's programs and health care are all important.

So, too, is the exploration of space.

I believe there is no substitute for making choices about our space program and then moving ahead to make those choices work in our national interest.

This is what the Science, Space, and Technology Committee did.

This is what this House did when it voted for the space station.

Mr. Speaker, an entire generation has now matured since Neil Armstrong took his first historic steps on the Moon.

An entire generation has never known a day when it was beyond the ability of this Nation to send men and women into space and return them safely to the Earth.

That, ironically, seems to be part of the problem today.

Space exploration is mistakenly viewed by too many Americans either as routine or as a past glory. It is neither.

In the days of the Apollo program, the drive to explore space and reach the Moon was partly a result of the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Today, the space race is one of economic and scientific competition—and less and less one with geopolitical or even military overtones.

The lesson and legacy throughout American history is that much of our prosperity has come about through hard-won technological advances.

But our space program is not about hardware, it is about where this Nation will go and what it will do with the resource of outer space.

I believe that we cannot be content to abandon the centerpiece of our future space program and watch other nations overtake us in space exploration.

In its report to Congress several months ago, the well-respected Advisory Committee on the Future of the U.S. Space Program, the so-called Augustine Committee, agreed.

The Augustine Committee also concluded that the most significant feature of the space station involves research to determine how human physiology functions in space.

Space station Freedom will be an international laboratory and serve as a stepping stone toward further exploration of this planet and our solar system.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to live in space, biotechnology and life sciences must be developed far beyond their present capabilities. This is the most critical contribution to be made by the space station: Life sciences experimentation.

Continued space exploration necessitates strong life sciences research to ensure the health of crew members.

Humans must be able to adapt to the microgravity, radiation, and isolation of, say, a permanent settlement on the Moon, or a manned mission to Mars.

Mr. Speaker, no matter where our space efforts are focused—toward Earth, toward our solar system, or toward the universe beyond—the ultimate goals of the space program will always remain to improve the human condition.

Perhaps it is this point which best justifies space station Freedom.

How can we even consider shortchanging future generations of Americans by ignoring the vast opportunities of space exploration?

The answer is, I don't believe we can, and why we must restore the funding for space station Freedom.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, to illustrate the point of the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] in the chart to the left, we have a comparison of the R&D investments or expenditures as a percentage of GNP by country, showing the great lead that Japan and West Germany hold for investments in R&D as a total. That includes defense R&D.

Looking only at civilian or nondefense R&D, the chart on the right is even more striking, because it shows that not only is the United States below Japan and West Germany, but, if I am not incorrect, below France, and possibly even the United Kingdom, as a result of the fact that more than half of our R&D expenditures are military.

□ 1420

Mr. MINETA. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for this time and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], for taking this time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his important contribution. As I said earlier to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], I trust that this is just a warmup for when we get into our debate on Thursday and that the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] will have more extensive remarks at that time in which we can explore this further.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to alternate the parties here. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for yielding time to me. I was struck during the comments by the gentleman from Alabama of something we need to remind ourselves of every now and then. A program as complicated as the space station may provoke some disagreement among Members of this body. The particular point that the gentleman made with which I do not agree is that the reconstructed, reconstituted space station Freedom has adequate sources of energy, of power. I happen to know that this is something that concerns the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and concerns me and that we have expressed our interest in this subject to NASA and have suggested strongly to them that they should be looking to alternative sources of electrical generation, such as solar dynamic power.

To date, NASA has chosen to reject our nontechnical but nonetheless brilliant expertise, and we will continue to discuss this with them. This by no means indicates that we are not committed to the continuation of manned exploration of space and to the space station.

I think that word "commitment" is what we are probably talking about here today. I have the very definite feeling that over the course of the past 10 months or so, culminating in the conflict in the Persian Gulf, that the American people rediscovered the concept of commitment, rediscovered the fact that we are a technologically superior Nation, that we can establish goals and we can go out and we can meet them and that we can overcome challenges and obstacles.

I think that they expect us to reflect that new found spirit of commitment that our constituents, the people of this country, believe and feel. I honestly think that the country itself, as a whole, is committed, is committed to the space station, is committed to the continued manned exploration of space. I think they also agree that when the United States makes a commitment to another country, that we should live up to it. And I am disappointed a little bit at the reaction of some of our colleagues to the expressions of concern by Canada and Japan and our European partners about our apparent wavering in our commitment to work with them to produce space station Freedom.

I have heard reactions that indicate that some of our colleagues feel that these nations are threatening us in some way. They are not threatening us; they are reminding us that we made agreements with them, that we made commitments to them that we would be a partner in this grand venture to establish a manned platform for the exploration of space.

□ 1430

We should not look askance at countries that call to our attention our commitments, because we do that constantly right here in the well of this House in terms far more bellicose than the language that was used by our partners in expressing their concern about our wavering commitment to the space station.

I for one do not believe that our commitment is wavering. I for one do not believe that the people of this country are wavering in their commitment to the continued excellence of the United States in technology and in space exploration, and I believe that when we have the appropriate opportunity, the people of this House of Representatives will accurately reflect the deep desire of the people of this country to maintain our leadership in space.

I look forward to that opportunity, and I hope it comes sooner, not later, because our partners in the rest of the world need to have demonstrated to them forcefully and immediately that this country is committed and we are a good partner and we are going forward with manned exploration.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for his very important contribution. We need to explore this issue of the impact of the space station on our relationships with our allies in much greater detail than we may have time to do, and it is very appropriate that we should bring it up here.

I think the gentleman would agree with me that not only does it endanger our relationships with regard to the space station but we are constantly hearing a chorus of voices that all big science ought to be international and cooperative and that if we cannot establish a basis on the space station, then we will not have a basis on the superconducting super collider or the human genome project or the Earth exploration-observation program, all of which are programs based upon international cooperation, and if we felt that we needed that in order to be able to finance them, how precarious is our position when we do not have the partners that we would need to carry out these very important global programs in the future.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], not a member of the committee and, therefore, we doubly appreciate his contribution at this point, and we hope to involve many more noncommittee members in this debate on Thursday when the issue comes up.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I came here for the purpose of correcting the record and became fascinated in the discussion.

As the gentleman pointed out, I am not a member of this committee, but I have often thought about the topic that is being discussed here this afternoon and would like to make some remarks beginning with a paraphrase of some wise man of years past who said that it is each generation's responsibility not only to chart the new frontiers left it by its forefathers and not only do discover its own frontiers, but it is also the responsibility of every generation to lead its children to the edge of the unknown wood and say, "Now, press you on." It sounds both stirring and quaint. It sounds a little old-fashioned, because as everyone knows, we do not have any frontiers anymore.

Perhaps when John Kennedy said we will go to the Moon and when we achieved that is the last time that the imagination of all of mankind was captured by exploration. Oh, some say we have frontiers in the sea and some say we have frontiers in social programs and some say we have frontiers in art and so forth and so on, and all of that is true. But the term "frontier" is not used precisely in the same way, and I would suggest perhaps does not have the same compelling force to mankind that a real, honest-to-goodness frontier that needs to be discovered and explored can provide.

Other nations in centuries past have been nations of explorers, Scandinavia, England, Spain, and France, and many, many others. Ours, too, although I think we tend to think of ours more as a nation of pioneers, both exploring and settling.

But I have often wondered how important the concept of a frontier, of new worlds, of places where no man has been, how important that concept is to our perception of the role of mankind in this universe, to mankind's concept of himself, of mankind's concepts of the role and purpose here and toward our very own future. That sounds a little flaky perhaps, but let me give an example of how something that we all take for granted can have an enormous impact on concepts.

I was meeting with some young people, and young people, by that I mean people in their late twenties and early thirties, a hard group, I think the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] would agree, to get together with. They do not tend to join the Kiwanis Club like older people used to and so forth, and they were there with what they called the rug rats, the children that were crawling around as we held our meeting. We began to discuss things, and I discovered something that I had never before realized, a concept between my generation and theirs.

My wife and I, when we were married, knew we could buy a home whenever we wanted to. It was a matter of getting the downpayment together. And these young people believe that if they had not bought a home already they would never have the opportunity to do so.

My purpose now is not here to argue whether or not they were correct in that belief, although clearly it has become much more difficult in these days for young people to purchase a home than it used to be. My point is, rather, that if you remove that concept from the mind of young people, you also change a whole lot about their attitudes toward the world they live in, their attitudes toward what limits they may face as they move in the world, limits on what they can provide for their children, the simple idea that, as so many of us in our middle age took for granted, home ownership is not one that many of our young people have, and it changes their attitude toward their options. If that simple concept has any validity, then is it not worth considering at this juncture with this issue of the space station not only the arguments we have heard about our commitments to other nations and not only the costs and not only the scientific gains that can be lost, but also is it not worthy of some consideration what this program does?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my support for the space station Freedom program as requested in the President's fiscal year 1992 budget submission. The space station is of vital importance to maintaining the United States' role as a world leader in advanced technology, research and manned space exploration. Although I understand the budget constraints that faced members of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies subcommittee, I believe it would be a mistake to terminate funding for the space station. We should all be aware of the many benefits we as a nation will receive as a direct result of continued support for the space station.

Space station Freedom is a vital initiative which is fundamental to the United States' goal of expanding the exploration of the final frontier. As President Kennedy stressed in his address to Congress in 1961 following the launch of sputnik by the Soviets, there was a clear need for a firm commitment by the Nation to new courses in the manned United States space program. To remain competitive in this arena required dedication and discipline in research and development. By focusing our momentum and commitment, we were able to regain technical and scientific superiority and land a man on the Moon. We must take the same approach today. We must push foward to develop and deploy a manned, orbiting research facility so that the United States will lead the world in space exploration.

But there is much more than national pride at stake. As the flagship of the U.S. civilian space program, space station Freedom is a critical element in strengthening our nation's global competitiveness and technology base. In addition to providing critical microgravity and life sciences research capability that will benefit health care on Earth, the station will contribute to advances in new technologies such as robotics, high speed computers, lightweight alloys, high-accuracy navigation, and rocket propulsion, among many others. By establishing intensive research and development programs, Space station Freedom will allow the United States to dramatically push back the high technology frontiers of science and engineering and significantly improve the existence of mankind well into the next century. This is a crucial step in finding a world where all people can flourish.

Beyond the technical benefits derived from the program, the space station will also serve as a source of inspiration to American youth to achieve excellence in education. If the United States hopes to remain at the forefront of high technology research and manufacturing, we must encourage our students to expand their knowledge in the areas of math, science and engineering. The United States currently faces a crisis in these areas as the number of bachelor of science and Ph.D. science degrees earned has declined since 1986. The number of doctoral degrees awarded to Americans has fallen from 2,400 per year in the early 1970's to 1,300 per year recently. Overall, projected shortfalls in Ph.D. and bachelor of science degrees are expected to number 78,000 and 675,000 respectively by the year 2006. Between 1982 and 1987, the percentage of college freshmen who planned to pursue engineering degrees dropped from 22 to 17 percent for men and from 4 to 3 percent for women. Overall interest in pursuing degrees in computer science majors declined from 4 percent in 1982 to 2 percent in 1987. What message would we send to these young people if we kill the space station? The space station Freedom program should serve as a focal point to motivate young Americans to pursue degrees in science and engineering, and will serve as a symbol of our country's commitment to achieving excellence in education.

I support continued funding of the space station Freedom program because it will assure U.S. leadership in space. It is important for us as a nation to rise to the challenges before us now as we did some 30 years ago. There were, and will continue to be, many domestic concerns that must be addressed. But we must retain our vision for the future because it is that ambitious pursuit of leadership and excellence that will provide the momentum for us as a nation to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. Space station Freedom will serve as a symbol of American dedication and competitive spirit. Leadership in space exploration means world leadership in education, competitiveness, and high technology. We simply cannot afford to compromise our Nation's leading role in these vital areas. Space station Freedom is a critical element of America's future as we look toward the 21st century, and I urge my colleagues to support continued funding for the space station Freedom program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise the gentleman that the time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPACE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington is making a very important statement and one that I think is very worthwhile for us to have completed, so I will yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding the time, and I am almost completed.

The point I was making was that if the concept of whether or not you are able to own a home can have a very substantial impact on your psychology, on how you look at the world, then should we not, in considering this issue, also consider what this program, this space station, does in terms of that attitude of discovering new frontiers for ourselves and our children to chart, and what this program does in the way of offering an opportunity for us to lead our children to the edge of the unknown wood where we can say, "Now, press you on?"

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement. It is an excellent statement. Because much of what we are talking about when we are talking about the space station or the space program is the risks of the unknown and what we benefit from moving out to unknown frontiers and taking the risks necessary in order to pursue our options there.

I think the gentleman has made a very important statement, because history tells us that some of the nations who came up to those frontiers and refused to move on to them were also nations that ended up failing. In fact, it was the British statesman Disraeli to whom the quote is attributed when he said that men move from bondage to faith, from faith to courage, from courage to freedom, from freedom to abundance, from abundance to complacency, from complacency to dependency, and from dependency back to bondage.

1440

Nations continued to move in that direction, too. In my mind, when we talk about the space program, we are talking about courage. We are talking about that element of our Nation where we have been fortunate. Our faith has led the United States to freedom. Our freedom has led the United States to a great deal of courage. That is producing an abundance like none that the world has ever seen, but if we do not have the courage to continue at the frontiers, if we do not pursue those options we will, in fact, become complacent, dependent, and ultimately see

our people move back toward bondage. That is what this is all about.

I think the gentleman helped put it into a lot of perspective. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I'm happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished minority leader of the committee in speaking out concerning the merits of the space station which is under, as we all know, jeopardy.

I do not think it is something that cannot be worked out. I hope that the individuals who have some control are not sealed in cement.

I wanted to speak extemporaneously a little bit about the program in general, because I think perhaps we do not realize what the space program in general, and the space station specifically, has meant and will mean to the future of our country and, indeed, the world.

In the late 1950's, I recall being in a chemistry class and hearing the news that the Soviet Union had developed sputnik. I remember President Eisenhower indicating that we could not afford not to compete in civilian space programs with the Soviet Union, and thus the harmony and the pursuit of the space technology in full gear got under way, as I recall it anyway.

Americans have always been known for their spirit of adventure. We are the frontierspeople in many ways in varieties of technology. Through the years we have seen so many advances. I think they are advances that the American people and indeed perhaps some people in Congress are not aware of. They are not aware of what space exploration has meant to our country and to the world. There is not one area, I do not think, that we live in, one type of area that relates to our quality of life that does not relate to some spinoff from the space program, from the clothes that we wear, the insulation of our homes. Think of the people in this country who are homebound, who cannot get out, and who need to count on the preservation of food. That is technology. Simple things that were developed as result of this space program.

Think of your loved ones who may have had ambulatory cataract surgery. Years ago a person would have to spend weeks in a hospital if they wanted to have cataract surgery. Today, so many older Americans and others go in, have the surgery performed, and come back out the same day. The success of that type of operation, which was developed through the wonderful heart and soul of the space program, is something that so many Americans, I know, are grateful for. Laser surgery, which is the technology that is being developed and has been developed; nuclear medicine; the purification of medicines and pharmaceuticals in space. These are things that we would not purify on Earth for a variety of reasons. There is satellite television. The satellite programs that were developed with respect to the weather monitoring that we are so aware of. These are all byproducts. The list goes on and on.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentlewoman will allow me to reclaim my time, I want to emphasize the point that the gentlewoman is making with a quote that I think bears on the point about how well our aged have benefited from the space program.

Back when John F. Kennedy made his famous speech in which he committed this Nation to going to the Moon within the next decade, it was about this time of year. It was May 25, 1961, just about 30 years ago as we speak, that he made that speech. There was reaction to the speech. Some of our colleagues at that time reacted in ways which indicated this might not be such a good idea. They thought there were other things that we ought to be doing. I have a quote from a Congressman from Minnesota who said, "It is important, of course"—meaning the race to the Moon—"but it has to be kept in perspective. There are lots of things to do like taking care of the aged." He was absolutely right, but I wonder if he had any idea what that race to the Moon was going to mean for the aged? That, in fact, his statement was a proposal related to the amount of money we are going to spend in a variety of government programs, but he had absolutely no idea what the end result would be, as the gentlewoman has pointed out.

The gentlewoman did not mention things like heart pacemakers, and monitoring equipment. We now have people able to live quality lives in their homes because of monitoring equipment that can be kept there with them, and they do not have to be institutionalized. All of that comes out of the space program, and has improved the quality of life of older people enormously as the result of what we did in the space program.

Had we not made the investment, had we said that this was something we cannot afford to do right now, if we said that 30 years ago, then we would not have the benefits today, and we would not have had to press the frontiers in order to get those products developed.

So the gentlewoman is absolutely right on target in what she is saying, that across the whole spectrum of American life we have been the beneficiaries of the commitment we made to the Apollo program. We will continue to be the beneficiaries as far as we are willing to make further commitments such as the space program.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I will ask the page to put up two additional charts. These two additional charts show the decline relative to our opposition of our investments in research and development.

Now, the next two charts dramatize a couple of the effects of this reduction. Let me explain just briefly what they are.

On the left is a chart that shows our decline in balance of trade to the first in the non-high-technology areas, and then beginning in about 1984 or 1985 in the high technologies areas, which went negative for the first time in 1986. On the other chart we have a chart that shows the relative number of scientists and engineers engaged in R&D for 10,000 of our labor force, and here where the United States has always led, and this chart ends in 1986, it shows the Japanese as passing the United States in 1986. If we carry that out for 3 or 4 more years up to the present, the charts are even more impressive because it shows not only is Japan passing the United States, but West Germany is passing the United States.

It is the evidence that our drop in investments is affecting our trade balance and the number of people working in these areas that is threatening the continued advance in these various areas that the gentlewoman has pointed out. The NASA Program, which would be mortally struck by the ending of the space station accounts for more than half of our Government investments in civilian R&D. That is why it is so important that we keep in mind what this will do to our posture in the world in terms of trade balance and the number of trained people doing scientific and technological work.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from California is absolutely right. Of course, there have been two studies that have shown what the Apollo Program paid back. One study was done immediately after the Apollo Program ended in 1972, and another one done in the early 1980's, to look at the space program from that period of time on. Both studies show that the payback was 9 to 1 to our gross national product.

So if we look at it in pure economic terms, we have, as a result of the development of new projects, gotten a major payback to our gross national product.

As the gentleman from California points out, also it has improved our trade balance. It has done remarkable things in terms of improving our R&D posture in the world. All of that has been a major benefit growing directly out of the space program which, as the gentleman points out, we will lose, perhaps irrevocably, if the space station is not pursued, and we do not take the next step in space.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

□ 1450

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding further to me.

First, let me express my delight at the gentleman's eloquence and erudition. It is truly outstanding, and then I want to point out that these charts were not concocted in my office. These are merely duplicates of the science indicator chart prepared by the National Science Foundation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Now I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I think this is very interesting. You know, we always learn from each other, do we not?

I think the point of the chairman about the number of scientists and engineers, and we are always saying we want our young people to go into the math, science, and computer technology areas; as a matter of fact, as the gentleman knows, in the Northeast-Midwest region, the Lewis Research Center is located in Cleveland, which is a wonderful research center devoted to NASA. It has been in existence, it is celebrating its 50th anniversary. One of the wonderful things about it is that 9 Ohio institutions of higher learning, along with 17 corporations, are now forming this consortium so that young people can literally take their classes right at Lewis and learn the sciences and computer technology and engineering hand in hand with our dedicated civil servants and those who are on contracts in the private sector, and to think this may be jeopardized for our region, to me I think is so sad.

Mr. WALKER. The gentlewoman also knows that around the country we are developing what is known as Challenger Centers, based on the Space Shuttle *Challenger*, which met such a tragic end; but the Challenger Centers are aimed at doing the same thing, bringing young people into a place where they see the space program and have a real hands-on ability to work with it, and they are working with shuttles, working with space station mockups, and it is something where young people become extremely excited about the future that is available to them.

In fact, there is a story told about the Challenger Center out here at Alexandria that the President's wife visited the other day. Mrs. Bush was out there and she was introduced to a young lady who was working at a console. They thought the young lady would be thrilled to meet the President's wife, and the young lady turned around and she said, "Oh, Mrs. Bush, it's very nice to meet you, but I'm sorry, I have to continue to work here. I have a crew that is in trouble out in space."

Mrs. Bush when they left said, "Well, that is one of the most dedicated young people I have ever seen."

The point being this was somebody who was absolutely enthralled with what they were doing. We are able to produce that level of excitement because young people intuitively understand that the space frontier is their future. They operate on a level that we sometimes do not wholly understand, because they are projecting out many years ahead of where we will be.

If we lose the space station, we will lose the ability to tell those young people that we have committed to their future in a way that assures them of the ability to live and work in space.

I think it will be tragic for what the Challenger Centers are trying to accomplish, what the Lewis Space Center and others of our Space Centers are trying to accomplish and what education as a whole is trying to portray to young people as being the real excitement that exists for them on the space frontier.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield further to the gentlewoman.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for that addition, because it is true that there are all these other centers. I know in Alabama they have a fabulous center for young people to take these classes at their institute. One of the heartening things was to see individual young people who are in the eighth and ninth grades, mostly minorities, take advantage of these seminars and institutes that they have for youngsters in elementary and high school areas as well.

Just finally, I would like to direct my attention just for a minute or two on what to me this space station means. It is a laboratory in space. I think sometimes we call it by the wrong name. It is going to be a lab in space.

For anyone who is an environmentalist, for example, and really cares about the layers and layers of products surrounding our Earth that produce what some scientists call the greenhouse effect, for any individual who is interested in the ozone depletion that is facing our planet, I do not see how you can be opposed to the space station when the scientists will be able to really focus in on those environmental problems.

I feel confident they are going to find solutions by taking a look from that laboratory at Earth and figure out ways in which we can address this enormous problem, not only in our country, but certainly throughout the world.

For anyone who is interested in finding an end to world hunger, how can we not want to know and be able to predict agricultural production throughout the world which people who are manning that space laboratory will be able to view from that lab and take a look at where the pockets of world hunger are and what we can do agriculturally in fulfilling the needs of the global community.

For anyone like myself who is interested in finding a cure for diseases, is interested in medical research like finding a cure for cancer or diabetes or various forms of heart disease, and the list goes on and on, how can you be opposed to a laboratory in space where scientists have told us that one of the areas where we can truly study immunology and purified pharmaceuticals is in that type of atmosphere.

I think the practicality of this station, let alone the fact that our sense of competitiveness and our sense of wanting to have an economic and technological base for our country's future makes it just imperative that we save this program.

Let me tell you, I know for those of you on the Science and Technology Committee, led by these two gentlemen who have done such outstanding work in this area over the years, I know that many of us do not realize that gutting the space station guts the core of the NASA Program. It is the next step in the program. To take it away is to take away, in my judgment, the program itself.

I feel strongly that while we have engaged in international scientific research experiments with other countries, and we have commitments with other countries, the fact is that the United States of America is the leader in space exploration.

The Japanese, the French and others, are frankly waiting in the wings to become the leader in that technology. I know we are cooperating with them now and so on, but we are the leader and they are the followers.

I think it is just terrible, it would be tragic and terrible for the future of our country's high technology and industrial base if we gave up what has been one of our greatest claims to fame.

So for the sake of the quality of life of our own people, let alone the global community, I hope that Congress in its wisdom will reject what has taken place in one of the subcommittees, one little subcommittee zeroing out a whole program that relates to the future of our country.

I want to compliment these two gentlemen for having this special order and I urge all Americans who feel this is important to call their Members of Congress and to tell them they do not want an end to this wonderful program that has meant so much to the quality of life of the American people.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her statement. Just to build on a couple things the gentlewoman has said a moment ago, which I think is important for the American people to understand, that a lot of this goes well beyond even what our imaginations allow us to dream.

I had some scientists in my office awhile back. When you talk about what can be done in medicine aboard spacecraft; what they are looking at doing is growing new nerve tissue in space. The reason that is important, when you grow nerve tissue on Earth, gravity distorts it. The reason why they were looking at growing this in space was they felt what they could ultimately do was grow new optic nerves in a space laboratory.

□ 1500

And that they would be able thereby to cure blindness. They were able to dream even beyond that to say that if we can grow optic nerves, we think maybe at some point we can grow spinal columns and cure some forms of paraplegia.

And now imagine what the world looks like if you begin to understand that some of those opportunities are available to us. The gentlelady is absolutely right, this is a laboratory. Beyond that, though, it is something else; it is a permanent presence in lower orbit.

No frontier is conquered until you establish a permanent presence on that frontier. Other than that, you have just visited.

Now you may have learned something important by visiting it, but in the Apollo Program we visited the Moon; we never established a permanent presence there. So, therefore, our learning curve ended when we came back from the Moon and did not go back.

One of the things that is absolutely essential to the space program is to establish a permanent presence in low Earth orbit, which allows us to learn things that we do not expect to learn, that we do not have any reason to learn. Some of the things the gentlewoman mentioned about the environment and so on, some of our critics will claim that we can do all of those things robotically. Well, the problem with robots is robots can only do those things that we already know should be done. We can program for the things that we expect them to see. What you cannot do is you cannot program robots to find the unexpected.

The fact is that much of what we may want to learn about the Earth from orbit are things that only man, with his ability to evaluate, will be able to understand.

By establishing a permanent presence in space for men and women to monitor the Earth, we may in fact learn much more than our robots ever were able to tell us.

So, the gentlewoman is right on target. There are so many aspects of this program that it is difficult to understand why anyone would be shortsighted enough to believe that a mere cancellation of this program somehow gets you better science in the future, as some of them have claimed.

It just does not add up when you understand the total nature of the program.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Before the gentlewoman leaves, would she be kind enough to listen to a few compliments?

Ms. OAKAR. I would love to.

Mr. BROWN. I think her remarks are extremely important in focusing on the research capabilities of the space station because this has become a major issue. The criticism from some people in the scientific community is that the research facilities, which are basically life science and materials research, in neither area are as good as they should be and they do not justify the investment in the space station. I cannot argue with that.

They are not perfect, and they probably do not justify it, and we should not seek to have it justified on the basis of the research. But let me tell you what will happen. Both the Japanese and the Germans are partners and intend to provide for the space station these laboratory facilities a materials laboratory and, of course, I think all of them expect to benefit from the life sciences research with regard to man in space.

I will tell you what will happen if we cancel: They will go ahead on their own. And those rapidly growing German and Japanese pharmaceutical and other scientific enterprises that are already seeking to get ahead of us will move ahead with their own space modules launched in their own spacecraft, and they will not share the results with us as they would if they were partners with us in this space station. And those curves that you see there showing our decline in high technology and in the number of people involved in science and engineering will continue to plunge dramatically.

So it is very important that we focus on the point the gentlewoman has made.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman from California would allow me to reclaim my time for just a moment, you know those folks who talk about the fact that better science can be done elsewhere and that we ought not invest the money this way, they have been with us for a long time. I have a quote here from a New York Times article right after the Kennedy speech was made to which I was referring before. The New York Times at that point reported, and I quote:

> Many influential scientists, including some on the President's Science Advisory Committee, have argued that the cost of a manned trip, estimated to run as high as $40 billion over ten years, could be more profitably spent in other areas of research and education on Earth.

I wonder if those same scientists, if we went back and interviewed them today, would be willing to say those things. You might find a few, but the fact is that most of them would have to acknowledge at this point that the learning curve from the manned mission more than made up for the $40 billion in expenditure. In fact, it was leveraged into hundreds of billions of dollars worth of science and new economic growth for this country. But there were skeptics at the time that we were proceeding forward just as we have skeptics today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BACCHUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of building space station Freedom. As my colleagues from both sides of the aisle have said and as my constituents in central Florida know, there is much more at stake here than merely the funding of one scientific project. At stake is the fundamental character of our Nation. Throughout our history, we Americans have been foremost among the world's pioneers, even resolved to expand the frontiers of geography and knowledge. Our decision about whether to build the space station offers us a clear choice: Do we continue pioneering or do we abdicate that role because we lack the will to confront our budget deficits and the challenges they have created? Will we push on to the next frontier or will be throw our hands up, turn away from the future, and say that we simply can't afford to be explorers anymore?

I say we must continue to pioneer. We must continue to seek the next frontier. We must continue to be explorers. We must seize the future.

Mr. Speaker, space station Freedom is the next vital stepping stone for our space program, one just as important as Explorer, Mercury, Gemini, Apollo, and the space shuttle. Without Freedom, we may no longer have a manned space program. Without Freedom, we might have to forget our dreams of building a permanent base on the Moon and landing a human being on Mars. We know of no other way to conduct the life sciences research that will tell us what long-term exposure to the harsh environment of space does to the human body.

Some question whether we need a manned space program at all. They say we can get more for our money scientifically by spending it on unmanned platforms and observational satellites. But how do you put a price on the return from the human experience of exploring space? How do you put a price on the character of a country that is willing and able to lead the world toward tomorrow. As Mr. WALKER said, "How do we explore the unknown if we rely solely on machines that know only what we know?"

I can do no better than the late writer Henry Fairlie in comparing exploration by instruments and exploration by humans. He asked:

Do we think of a machine called a telescope gazing at the stars, or do we think of Galileo gazing at them and dreaming of a brighter future? Do we think more of the three small ships that crossed the Atlantic in 1492, or do we think more of Columbus, almost driven to madness by his quest for new worlds? Do we think of the *Spirit of St. Louis*, or do we think of Lindbergh sitting in the cockpit, daring to do what no one thought possible?

It is not enough just to have the machines and the platforms and the satellites. We need the Galileos, the Columbuses, and the Lindberghs of tomorrow. We need the vision and the courage to build space station Freedom, and create a greater destiny for all mankind.

For those who demand practical economic benefits here on Earth, I am confident that space station Freedom will produce them—in abundance. Nine dollars have been returned to our gross national product for every $1 we have invested in space. This figure cannot be cited too often. Space exploration has given us weather satellites, communications satellites programmable pacemakers, programmable implants for diabetics, and other wondrous technology. Space exploration has given us better insulations and new materials for better homes, buildings, and aircraft. Space exploration has inspired countless children to study and become scientists, engineers, and doctors. More than ever, our children need that inspiration today.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving this country as a trade negotiator some years ago. I understand the components of our trade balance and, as members of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology fully understand, one of the few areas in which we continue to lead the world is space and aerospace. We have a $26 billion trade surplus in aerospace. Do we really want to throw that away?

There is at least one certainty, if we do not build a space station, someone else will. The Japanese and the Germans are willing to follow our lead and contribute to our space station, but if we do not build Freedom, they will build their own space station. They will enjoy the benefits of all that spinoff technology and international competitiveness while we might be permitted to rent some space from them from time to time. Is that the future we want for America in space? Mr. Speaker, I recognize we have many pressing needs on Earth, from cleaning up the environment to building veterans hositals to providing affordable housing. But it is simply a false choice to say we have no choice between meeting those needs any paying for the space station. What we need is the leadership and commitment to make the real choices, choices that will enable us to invest in the raw materials of our future.

□ 1510

As my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], pointed out so eloquently in the Chamber last week, the challenges we face today are no greater than years ago when President Kennedy challenged the Nation to send a man to the Moon by the end of the decade. We had a budget deficit then. We faced a budget deficit then, we faced a grave threat from the Soviet Union, we were in the initial stages of a long conflict in Vietnam. The civil rights movement challenged us to end the shameful history of discrimination. Mr. Speaker, we faced those and many other challenges then, and we went to the Moon anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see why today we cannot face our domestic challenges and build a space station as well. Do we have the courage? Do we have the will? What would Galileo do? What would Columbus do? What would Lindbergh do? What would Jack Kennedy do? Most important and most urgent, what will we do? Will we seize the future? Will we shape the future, or will we be shaped by the future in ways we may not like?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] for his statement, and it is an eloquent statement, and it is interesting. He makes the point that we have always been a Nation of pioneers, and we sometimes think back, that our forefathers did all this pioneering, and there was no real criticism of what they were doing, that they just kind of proceeded on, and we are the beneficiaries of that. The fact is that much of that pioneering and of that exploration on the frontier was criticized along he way.

The former Librarian of Congress, the eminent historian, Daniel Boorstin, wrote some years ago in a book called "The Americans: the National Experience," about the Louisiana Purchase, and it may seem rather ludicrous to us at the present time, but the Louisiana Purchase was indeed controversial. It was, and in fact some of the language used against the Louisiana Purchase at the time was language much like the people who are talking here in the Congress against the space station.

Let me just quote for my colleagues from Boorstin here at one point. He says:

When the Treaty was brought to the United States, the response was "less exuberance than fear. . . . Some eastern businessmen had already begun to fear the westward drain of their capital resources. A quarter century later their fears were still alive, when Secretary of the Treasury Richard Rush warned, 'The manner in which the remote lands of the United States are selling and settling, whilst it may tend to increase more the population of the country, . . . does not increase capital in the same proportion. . . . the creation of capital is retarded, rather than accelerated, by the diffusion of a thin population over a great surface of soil. Anything that may serve to hold back this tendency * * * can scarcely prove otherwise than salutary."

Well, in other words, I mean, as my colleagues know, hold it back, do not let people go west and so on because it is draining our capital resources. How ridiculous. What we now understand 150 years later is it did not drain the capital resources, it created new capital resources. It created new wealth, and that wealth helped the growth of this country beyond all understanding.

The fact is that space is exactly the same way. Space is even more likely to produce great wealth because it is absolutely boundless, and so we are bound to learn far more out there, and the fact is that capital is not finite. It is endlessly expanding, and our ability to do the great social work that we want to do as a nation depends upon our ability to be able to expand capital, to expand opportunity and create the wealth that will allow us to serve the poor, and that is why pioneering has always been so important to us. But it has always been controversial as well, and some people have to stand back and say, "The critics are wrong. In the case of the space station the critics are wrong. They don't recognize that this is an investment in the future, and they instead want to do it only on the dollar calculation in today's terms."

Mr. Speaker, that makes no sense.

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

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, "Thank you." You are absolutely right, and you have chosen an excellent example to add further to that reflection in the Louisiana Purchase. I think it is significant that the President who made that decision was Thomas Jefferson, and Thomas Jefferson was always someone who believed that it was likely that democracy would best be able to succeed only in a small geographical terrain, so he took a great risk in believing that in doubling the domain of democracy he could double the potential of democracy.

I just finished reading the book: "Thomas Jefferson, Scientist," about Thomas Jefferson and his scientific avocations, which were many, and I believe he was willing to take that risk in doubling the size of this country and exploring the unknown because he did have the understanding of this basic importance of science and exploring to all human endeavors. He knew that the future could be boundless if we allowed it to be so, and so he was willing to take a chance that the future of democracy could be boundless as well.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS]. He is absolutely right, and that

is what we are engaged in here, taking chances. It does take courage, but the Bible says that, and I am paraphrasing, that the nation without vision is lost. We are, in fact, in that kind of time period if we in fact do not have the vision and the courage to go forward.

Mr. BROWN. May I add briefly an additional example to the one given by the gentleman? I am sure he is familiar with it. That is the acquisition of Alaska, which in many ways people thought resembled the Moon in terms of its barrenness and its lack of resources, and in that great debate, which I well remember, it was referred to as Seward's Folly, and many people objected strongly to our expanding the United States to this barren northern terrain which has now become one of the sources of resources for this Nation and one which is indispensable to our future.

So, that typical attitude that resists exploring new frontiers could be exhibited in numerous other ways, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the point of the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is an excellent one.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly very supportive of our space station program, and I hope that my colleagues will recognize the value of our research and development investment in the space station.

Mr. Speaker, I guess I am going to approach this from a different perspective because I have been a staunch supporter of technology transfer from our Federal laboratories throughout my career in Congress so that we do see the tremendous benefit, the value, of our technology transfer which we will derive from our research and development space station, and my argument stems from a very basic rationale. The application of federally funded research and development benefits all Americans: the taxpayers who invested in the research and the American economy in terms of the marketplace and the revenues.

My crusade to support technology transfer is certainly no accident. I represent the Third District of Tennessee, which is home to the internationally renowned Oak Ridge National Laboratory. I have seen firsthand the benefits of technology transfer, even through very difficult regulatory situations.

During the 1940's, the 1950's and the 1960's, much of the research and development was conducted by or through the Department of Defense, yet, even though the original project was defense-oriented, our civilian, our peacetime and our commercial applications evolved from these research efforts. We saw breakthroughs in jet propulsion, antibiotics, synthetic rubber and microwave radar emerge from these studies to create the high-growth industries of the 1960's and 1970's, such as global jet transport, pharmaceuticals, synthetic materials, electronic computers, and many others.

Contributing to the defense contributions, starting about 1960, was the space program. The Federal space program ignited the imagination of all Americans. The space program has contributed achievements making possible today accurate weather satellites, global marine communications, a communication network that unites every continent in the world. The space program has also initiated additional fledgling industries in remote sensing, direct broadcast and navigation that appear likely to become our future growth industries, and with the heightened environmental awareness we see today, we are also fortunate to have the advantages that the space program brought us which enable us to monitor the Earth from afar to note changes in the ozone layer, deforestation, acid rain and myriad other planetary environmental concerns. These advancements stem from a variety of different projects within the space program.

The space station project is the cornerstone of our space program today.

□ 1520

We expended significant efforts, as our chairman and ranking minority member stated, to attract international participation in this major scientific project, only to say to our partners that we have changed our minds. Congress continues to encourage agencies to attract investments and technical partners for our large science projects. If we terminate the space station, we cannot possibly hope to be successful again with our international partners. Once we display our lack of commitment to a project to which we have induced others to contribute, our credibility will be lost to future partnerships.

I also caution this body to bear in mind that the space station is not the only program where this is happening and these same partners are experiencing this lack of foresight in several other program areas.

I do not believe that it is in our Nation's best interests to eliminate programs which hold so much promise for future technological advancement. The redesigned space program will stimulate many fields of science and technology, including those that will be so critical to the economic growth of the Nation in the coming new century.

Let me cite some of these examples again: Artificial intelligence, robotics, process automation, low-cost global and orbital transport, optical communication, ultra-high strength and high-temperature materials, supercomputers, and pollution-free vehicles. These are just a few of the technologies that hold great potential for commercial application. We cannot compete in the world marketplace if we simply turn off the means to new products and technologies.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology which authorizes the space program has given very careful review to this program, and as our authorization bill states, we envision a much different space program than is proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD] for her remarks. I think she makes some excellent points.

I was listening as the gentlewoman read down through the list of technological advances, and most of what she mentioned has taken place since I graduated from high school in 1960. All of those things she mentioned are things our society now benefits from and are things that did not exist when I was graduating from high school in the year 1960. Yet at that time there was no one who understood that we would be the beneficiaries of those programs.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a spinoff from the research and development that holds such a great potential. But I must again remind my colleague that if we back down on this commitment with our partners, then we can forget looking for any more international cooperation.

Mr. WALKER. Yes. One wonders what the world would be like if the people in 1961 would have listened to the advice of the critics then. I have a point to make here from an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, an editorial that I imagine they wish they could take back, if they could. This is what they said about President Kennedy's plan to go to the moon, and I quote:

> So far as we can discover, the only technically competent people who believe it is worth what it is expected to cost are those who have been dreaming of a moon shot for years. Many other scientists whose opinions are entitled to consideration think the stunt, even if it succeeds, is only a stunt and that the Nation will not be rewarded adequately for the enormous outlay * * * There are other and better ways of demonstrating that this is a great nation than by sending an expedition to the moon at staggering costs.

They could not have been more wrong. The fact is that if it had any characteristics at all of a stunt, who cares? The bottom line is that we ended up with enormous benefits out of having made the effort. The benefits are all across our society, and the gentlewoman from Tennessee has just given us a list of them, and it makes the person who wrote that editorial

look like an idiot because he obviously had no idea what would be accomplished as a result of making that outreach into space. Again, that person was certainly within the context of his times a competent person who was simply writing based upon the criticism that was then welling up from America. But thank goodness, Congress did not listen to the Chicago Daily Tribune or to critics within this body at that time. They went ahead and did the mission. That is what we have to do in the case of space station, too. We have to muster the courage to go ahead and do the mission, and the Nation will be rewarded enormously for having made the effort.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is certainly correct. These are tough times, and these are tough decisions we have to make this year, but at the same time we have an opportuntiy on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology to look ahead to the future. There are so many of these programs that we focus in on and authorize that are for development in our future, and we cannot afford to be shortsighted at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time he has given me.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mr. Speaker, let me yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the Committee on Appropriations who did not participate in the dirty deed done on that committee. Nevertheless, he is here on the floor, and we are very grateful to have his participation in this special order. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's yielding to me, and I commend him for his work in this very important field. I compliment as well my colleague from southern California, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for his leadership and for stressing the role that the United States should play and must play in the field of science.

I must say that I have come to this session late today because I have spent the last couple of hours in the full Committee on Appropriations, where they were considering the bill that came out of the subcommittee where the space station was zeroed.

The full committee did not vote directly on the station today, but discussed the issue rather thoroughly. It was indicated that we will likely have some kind of an amendment on the floor that will allow the debate to continue when the full House meets regarding the up or down vote on this bill.

I think it is very, very important that the public understand that there is broad-based support in both parties for not only a manned space station, but also for more effort in space research and technology.

Some years ago on the floor we had a vote—almost a prefunctory vote—to cut the budget of the Committee on Science and Technology by 15 percent, and Members were in the mood on that particular day to be cutting bills across the board. That had a big impact upon the space station and NASA's efforts. A few weeks after that there was a similar vote on the House floor to cut 15 percent from that program. Once it was debated clearly by Members of the House, we absolutely reversed the reflection of support for space.

There is no doubt that people across the country know that America has a responsibility and must play a role in space. What happens in this subcommittee, though, is very important. Currently the budget lids place great restrictions upon categories of spending. The bill that is coming to us contains the largest amount of discretionary spending on behalf of the appropriations process, some $60 billion-plus of discretionary spending. Nonetheless, much of that spending goes for popular social programs—veterans' medical care, and housing are examples. In this context some would argue that if you are for the station, you are really against veterans' programs. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The work of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology provides a clear demonstration of bipartisan support for America's commitment to science. Specifically, they have affirmed the role of the United States in this regard; that is, to provide leadership in space research and exploration. The authorizing committee has thus expressed the will of the House.

□ 1530

But, unfortunately, that piece of the committee's important work ended up in an extremely difficult and competitive environment.

So the committee members bringing this subcommittee report to the full committee feel very uncomfortable. What we need to establish is, first, the broad base of bipartisan support this year by way of debate on the floor. From there, we can take this issue from the House to a conference with the Senate, and thereby make sense out of this conflict of priorities.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for this contribution. No one has yet brought this up in connection with our previous hour and one-half or so of debate. I want to make it clear from my own standpoint that I would be very unhappy if any of the debate were to focus on criticism of the chairman of the subcommittee or the members of the Committee on Appropriations for bashing the space program. They are not bashers of the space program. They are supporters of the space program. They had a very, very difficult job to do, and they sought to do it in a fashion which they thought on balance would produce the maximum amount of good.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to disagree with that, but I think the gentleman has indicated what the appropriate strategy is here, and that is to try to save the space station and the space program in general, perhaps at reduced levels, and then hope that in the Senate, under slightly different rules and allocations of funding, we can come up with a sufficiently strong improvement that we can proceed with the program which I know we all support.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I might add to the point that both the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] and I are attempting to make here by saying that many of us think certain allocations to the various subcommittees reflect almost a malapportionment of available dollars. A slightly different allocation would have made enough money available, whereby a station could very well have ended up being funded in my subcommittee.

Thus, there is a need for debate on the floor that reflects not only the support of the House for our efforts in space, but also the significant contributions America has to make to science.

Just the other day we had a debate on the floor regarding the superconducting super collider. There, one more time, various elements of the scientific community were concerned about the budgetary competition.

There were those who a few short years ago were actively supporting the superconducting super collider, and now urge that we defend it in order to make money available for another scientific program.

Mr. Speaker, I think one cannot overemphasize this point, and that is that we have several very important experimental, cutting-edge, scientific programs, where America has a commitment, not only to our leadership here at home, but also to our leadership in the world and our partnership commitment to other countries.

The superconducting super collider very much involves that kind of obligation. With the space station, we have commitments to other nations who have their own desires to be involved in space. To walk away from those commitments, and not be willing to make dollar commitments this year that maintain our leadership, would cause much of the rest of the world to choose in the future to question America's commitment in almost any project.

The work that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has accomplished in connection with the manned space station, the role of

NASA, and our future in space is to be commended. Beyond that, it is very important that America know that there is bipartisan support for this effort, an effort that will play a key role in defining American leadership in research, technology, and in space.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for taking this time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] very much. He has made a great contribution here. He has pointed out that part of the problem arose within the budget process when we did not get the kind of priority for space and science that we should have.

I think the gentleman has also helped us understand that this is a matter of making appropriate adjustments in priorities to assure that those priorities that represent an investment in the future are highlighted more than they are in what the Committee on Appropriations has done thus far.

From my own point of view, I do not see how we can possibly take care of the future needs of veterans if we do not have a growing economy. I do not see how we can possibly provide for housing for all of our citizens if we do not have a growing economy. I do not see how we can possibly provide the social welfare that is necessary to help the poorest of the poor if we do not have a growing economy.

Mr. Speaker, what we do understand about the future is the only way to have a growing economy is to make an investment in that future through research and development. One of the places where we are sure if you invest in research and development that you get tremendous returns, is through the space program. There you have to push the very limits of man's knowledge. When you do that, you get all kinds of ancillary benefits no one would have ever imagined.

The fact that we do not exactly create the products as a part of the space program, but we create a theory or a kind of technology that ultimately results in new technologies that have consumer potential, that is what a growing economy is all about. That is the reason why the investment in the future really takes place.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up here, I think our concerns, from our committee and others who have been on the floor, revolve around the fact that if in fact the space station is killed as a part of the appropriations process in the House, it goes way beyond space station. We are really at that point talking about whether or not we will maintain our commitment to the manned space effort that has characterized this Nation's space program for the past 30 years.

I think the American people continue to support that manned space effort. I do not think that they understand that it is in jeopardy as a result of the action on space station.

Mr. Speaker, let me spend a moment or two and tell you why I think it is in jeopardy because of the action on space station.

The shuttle program has little to do for the future if there is no space station. The word "shuttle," the space shuttle, meant that it was to shuttle between Earth and a space station. That is the reason why it was created.

It was not called a space plane. It was called a shuttle, with a very, very important reason, to go between Earth and a space station. If the space station does not exist, one of the principal purposes for shuttle being created in the first place will cease to exist.

I can imagine the same people who are today critical of space station coming to the floor a year from now or a couple years from now telling us, look, we do not really have a lot in the way of missions for the shuttle. We ought to preserve that asset for the next century when it is really needed. It is time to begin grounding the shuttle flights, time to begin to place that asset on the ground, in hopes that we will retain it for the future. Sometime in the next century, when we have a more robust space program, in fact we can then bring the shuttle back to life and utilize them for those purposes then.

Mr. Speaker, what a tragedy that would be. Then you would not only lose your space station, you would ultimately lose all American manned participation in space. That would put us way behind the technology curve. Certainly at that point, other nations would look toward developing space programs of their own.

The Japanese are not involved in the space station purely out of an interest to participate with the Americans. In fact, the reason why they are there is a result of some negotiations, where the Japanese were going to go ahead and develop their own platforms and their own space program. We convinced them that they would be better off using our launch system and participating with us on the space station. It would get as much out of it, and the international cooperation would create the kind of atmosphere in which everyone would benefit. We talked them into doing this.

If in fact we back out of the space station, the Japanese will not back out of their commitment, long term, to do something on a space program. They will simply begin to go it on their own. The information that they obtain as a result of their own space program may or may not be shared with the United States, and we will end up once more having led the way into something, only to have our allies and our economic adversaries utilize our learning curve to their benefit.

What a tremendous difficulty that would be. We can avoid it by simply moving ahead with the space station.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS, SPACE STATION FREEDOM, AND THE QUEST FOR NEW KNOWLEDGE

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for his eloquent contribution. I was struck by both his eloquence and his erudition. I look forward to reading to the text of his contribution at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, a little more than 500 years ago, Christopher Columbus theorized that if he sailed west across the Atlantic Ocean from Europe, he could find a shorter path to the Orient. His greatest problem was not theoretical, because scientists had demonstrated that the world was round. Neither was his greatest problem technological, because he was a fine navigator, and he trusted the shipbuilders of Portugal to supply him with reliable craft.

The greatest problem that Columbus had was funding. He couldn't find a government that had the vision to support his voyage of discovery across the western horizon. In 1484, Columbus applied to the Portuguese Government for support. He was turned down, his request for funds denied by the Crown. They refused to back a project that demanded a leap into the unknown; they preferred to invest in the exploration of a safer path—to seek the Orient by hugging the coast of Africa, by never venturing far from the sight of land.

Next, Columbus went to England, and was again rebuffed. The English viewed themselves as the outermost bastion of civilization. The idea of sailing west into the savage Atlantic seemed like sheer folly.

As we all know, Columbus found his patrons in Spain, where King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella were convinced that his voyage into the unknown carried the promise of unknown reward. They accomodated the costs of his voyages in their hard-pressed budget, and the history of the world was changed.

Because of this parallel with the voyage of Columbus, space station Freedom was originally selected by NASA and the Congress as our unique commemoration of the beginning of the Age of Exploration and Discovery in 1492. It is indeed ironic that we are this week to debate the question of whether to abdicate our role of leadership in the next great age of exploration—the exploration of the universe beyond Earth.

Now we are faced with a decision of similar proportions. We routinely put human beings in space and bring them home safely, we have walked on the

Moon, we have kept astronauts in orbit for months at a time. Over the past 7 years, in the face of a budget deficit that handicaps our flexibility, we have chosen, year in and year out, to fund the space station Freedom, because it represents the next giant step for mankind in pursuit of new frontiers and new knowledge. We do not know where this step will take us, and that is part of the reason why we must take it.

Now, we have been presented with what looks, on the surface, like a logical choice. Do we continue our manned exploration of space, or do we provide important increases in funding levels for programs that address the everyday needs of many of our citizens. In fact, this choice is illogical—irrational—in the extreme. It is like giving a farmer the choice of having enough drinking water for his immediate needs, or enough irrigation water for next year's crop. The choice is unacceptable. We must satisfy basic human needs today and we must also strive to advance the frontiers of knowledge as we move into the 21st century.

In his conclusion to his great work, "The Ascent of Man", Jacob Bronowski said: "We are a scientific civilization: that means, a civilization in which knowledge and its integrity are crucial. Science is only a Latin word for knowledge." And how do we best pursue knowledge? Albert Einstein said it best, and with the greatest simplicity: "All knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it." The manned space program is the embodiment of the search for knowledge through experience. And knowledge is the true seed from which our Nation grows.

This afternoon, we will discuss both the importance of science and technology to the prosperity of our society, and the importance of our space program in general—and the space station Freedom in specific—to our system of science and technology. The arguments are clear, rooted in economics, and engineering, and history. But ultimately, the decision that we make about the future of space station Freedom will reflect our own vision of ourselves: do we want to continue our quest for knowledge—for experience—or do we want, like the King of Portugal in the days of Columbus, to hug the shore, take the safe route, and sacrifice both the promise and the dangers of the distant and unseen horizon.

□ 1540

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the Associate Administrator for Space Flight, Mr. William B. Lenoir, to me as of this date, bearing upon the subject.

The letter referred to follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1991.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BROWN: If effected, the recent recommendation by the House Appropriations Committee to terminate the Space Station Freedom would put the United States on a downhill slide out of manned space operations. Our manned spaceflight strategy for the next two decades revolves around the Space Station. Without a Space Station, our program is unbalanced and visionless. I would like to describe how the Space Station is woven into the U.S. manned space program and is, in fact, the equivalent of the manned space program.

The goals and objectives of our spaceflight program for the coming decade are:

Support Customer Space Transportation Requirements.

Develop Permanently Manned Space Station Capability.

Maintain and Enhance Shuttle Capabilities.

Increase Efficiency of Major Operational Space Flight Programs.

Develop New Heavy Lift Launch Capabilities.

Develop and Maintain World Class Resources.

How does Space Station Freedom support the achievement of these goals and objectives?

SUPPORT CUSTOMER SPACE TRANSPORTATION REQUIREMENTS

In the late 1990's the Space Station becomes the primary "customer" for the Space Shuttle, requiring about 70% of Shuttle capability. Without that demand, the Space Shuttle, the only remaining element of the manned space program, will wither and atrophy, taking with it U.S. preeminence in manned space flight.

MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE CAPABILITIES

Most of the planned Shuttle enhancements are being made specifically to provide increased capability and opportunity for the Space Station. Improvements such as the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor, Extended Duration Orbiter, and various subsystem upgrades become questionable if their driving element is removed.

INCREASE EFFICIENCY OF MAJOR OPERATIONAL SPACE FLIGHT PROGRAMS

Our two major operational spaceflight programs are the Space Shuttle and the Space Station. Plans to effect operational efficiencies are built on the synergism between the two. Removing one causes a loss of focus within the other, resulting in less efficient operations.

DEVELOP NEW HEAVY LIFT LAUNCH CAPABILITIES

The primary NASA requirement for a new heavy lift launch vehicle is for increased capability to support Space Station Freedom. Space Exploration is too far downstream to be an effective focus for a new launch vehicle in the near term. However, Freedom can benefit significantly from such a new vehicle. Following initiation of permanent manning of the Station, larger, less expensive expansions can be planned—more power, more living space, more laboratory space, new capabilities. Logistics resupply could be performed more efficiently with a new, larger vehicle. Whereas a Space Station makes sense before a New Launch System is built, it is not at all obvious that the converse is true.

DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN WORLD CLASS RESOURCES

This primarily means our work force—our highly skilled civil service work force and our contractor teams. Without the draw of a near-term, challenging new program like the Space Station, we will simply not be competitive for the highest caliber, cream-of-the-crop talent that has enabled us to pioneer the United States to the forefront in space. NASA will no longer be the NASA we know today. We must have the exciting attraction of a near-term, challenging, horizon-expanding program if we are to continue to attract our youth to careers in science and technology, and a draw a subset of these youth to NASA, thereby maintaining the quality of the work force propelling us onward.

As you can see, the spaceflight programs that would survive a Space Station termination would be terribly unbalanced. The need and desirability of the Advanced Solid Rocket Motor would require reexamination, as would the beginning steps of the New Launch System. Initial space-based investigations for future space exploration would not be appropriate, and our entire Advanced Programs thrust would be wrong. In short, the focus and implementation of the remaining aspects of our manned space program would require significant reassessment and revision.

The manned spaceflight program remaining without Space Station Freedom would be reminiscent of the post-Apollo era, when the United States essentially took a decade off. NASA's spaceflight effort shank and, with it, almost ¾ of a million jobs were lost in the U.S. economy over the decade following the peak of the Apollo program. It has been a long, slow climb back, but we have rearrived as a nation. We cannot allow ourselves to abdicate, once again, world leadership in manned spaceflight operations and technology.

Make no mistake—the issue as framed by the House Appropriations Committee is not the mere reordering of space priorities. We are talking neither about a shift of emphases within the space program, nor about a shift from one technological investment to another. We are talking about abandoning the field. We are talking about a major step backward. And we are talking about the beginning of the end of the U.S. manned space program.

We need your help and support to avoid this national tragedy.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. LENOIR,
Associate Administrator for Space Flight.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS TODAY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may be authorized to declare a recess until 4:15 p.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House will be in recess

until approximately 4:15 p.m. Bells will be rung 15 minutes prior to reconvening.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:14 p.m.

□ 1610

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS ON H.R. 2508, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, 1992 AND 1993, AND H.R. 2474, ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENTS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file reports on H.R. 2508, authorizing foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 and on H.R. 2474, the Arms Control and Disarmaments Amendments Act of 1991.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 1642, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 2042, by the yeas and nays; and S. 483, by the yeas and nays.

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

PALTO BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1642, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1642, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 323, nays 8, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—323

Abercrombie
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goss
Grandy
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—8

Coble
Crane
Dannemeyer
Duncan
Hancock
Rohrabacher
Sensenbrenner
Stump

NOT VOTING—100

Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Aspin
Baker
Ballenger
Boehlert
Boehner
Boxer
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Clay
Dickinson
Dicks
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Espy
Feighan
Fields
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gingrich
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray
Green
Hatcher
Hefley
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hutto
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Kennedy
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
Moody
Mrazek
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Orton
Owens (NY)
Oxley
Panetta
Patterson
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Quillen
Ravenel
Ray
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Savage
Scheuer
Serrano
Sikorski
Snowe
Spratt
Stenholm
Swett
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Volkmer
Washington
Waxman
Williams
Wise

□ 1643

Messrs. DANNEMEYER, STUMP, COBLE, HANCOCK, DUNCAN, and SENSENBRENNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT AUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2042.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2042, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair reminds Members this will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 326, nays 5, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—326

Abercrombie
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Durbin
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goss
Grandy
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—5

Crane
Dannemeyer
Duncan
Hancock
Stump

NOT VOTING—100

Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Aspin
Baker
Ballenger
Boehlert
Boehner
Boxer
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Clay
Dickinson
Dicks
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dwyer
Espy
Feighan
Fields
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gingrich
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray
Green
Hatcher
Hefley
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hutto
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Kennedy
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
Moody
Mrazek
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Orton
Owens (NY)
Oxley
Panetta
Patterson
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Quillen
Ravenel
Ray
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Savage
Scheuer
Serrano
Snowe
Spratt
Stenholm
Swett
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Volkmer
Washington
Waxman
Williams
Wise

□ 1651

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TACONIC MOUNTAINS PROTECTION ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 483.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 483, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 316, nays 15, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—316

Abercrombie
Allard
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Barrett
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goss
Grandy
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone

Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—15

Barton
Coble
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Rohrabacher
Sensenbrenner
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (NC)
Walker

NOT VOTING—100

Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews (TX)
Armey
Aspin
Baker
Ballenger
Boehlert
Boehner
Boxer
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Clay
Dickinson
Dicks
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dwyer
Espy
Feighan
Fields
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gingrich
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray
Green
Hatcher
Hefley
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hutto
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Kennedy
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
Moody
Mrazek
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Orton
Owens (NY)
Oxley
Panetta
Patterson
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Quillen
Ravenel
Ray
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Savage
Scheuer
Serrano
Snowe
Spratt
Stenholm
Swett
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Volkmer
Washington
Waxman
Williams
Wise

□ 1701

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, during the following rollcall votes today, June 3, 1991, I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district in Connecticut. I would submit this statement to be included in the RECORD after the votes.

On rollcall No. 122, had I been present I would have voted "yea".

On rollcall No. 123, had I been present I would have voted "yea".

On rollcall No. 124, had I been present I would have voted "yea".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to official commitments in my 12th Congressional District, I was unable to record my position on rollcall votes 122, 123, and 124, Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 122: "Yea" H.R. 1642, Palo Alto Battlefield Historic Site; rollcall No. 123: "Yea" H.R. 2042, Federal Fire Prevention and Control; and rollcall No. 124: "Yea" S. 483, Taconic Mountains Protection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I was attending meetings with North Carolina officials. Unfortunately, I missed rollcall votes 122, 123, and 124. I support each measure and would like to be recorded as voting "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I held the first meeting of my Veterans' Advisory Board back in my Pittsburgh congressinal district and was not present to cast my vote on the three bills considered under suspension of which the yeas and nays were requested. Had I been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "aye" on Rollcall 122, Rollcall 123, and Rollcall 124 and ask unanimous consent that this explanation appear in the permanent RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, due to unavoidable scheduling commitments in my district, I was unable to participate in the three recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted for H.R. 1642, the Palo Alto Battefield National Historic Site Act of 1991; H.R. 2042, the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act authorization; and S. 483, the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, because I was in the 10th district today holding town hall meetings, I was unable to return to Washington in time for the rollcall votes. I would like the RECORD to show that had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 1642—the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site Act of 1991, H.R. 2042—the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act Authorization, and S. 483—the Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991. I should also add that my vote would not have changed the outcome of this legislation.

EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY ON PORTIONS OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-94)

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 Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

(For messages, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, June 3, 1991.)

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON VETERANS AFFAIRS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, SUNDRY INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, COMMISSIONS, CORPORATIONS, AND OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes.

Mr. COUGHLIN reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when we return to the special orders, I be allowed to reclaim my 5 minutes under the special orders.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order be considered right after the 5-minute special order of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

"THANK YOU" BY BOBBY NICHOLAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a song written by one of my constitutents, Mr. Bobby Nicholas, of Morgantown, WV. The song is titled "Thank You," and it is written in honor of our troops who served during the crisis in the gulf and as a way for one American to speak for many Americans in saying "Thank you for a job well done."

Because I believe that this is a good song that speaks to our values, I have requested that Mr. Nicholas be allowed to perform the song during our "Welcome Home the Troops" celebration on June 8. For anyone at the administration who may be listening, I will add that I have not yet received a response to my request.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues will enjoy this song, especially when they consider that Mr. Nicholas' son had just entered the Army Reserves when the crisis in the gulf erupted. All of us who are parents, especially those whose children served, will appreciate the depth of emotion that this song elicits.

If Members do enjoy this song as much as I believe they will, Mr. Speaker, they may feel free to call the administration and tell them that they would like to hear Mr. Nicholas perform it, too.

Mr. Nicholas wrote the song at 5 o'clock in the morning. He could not sleep. The inspiration hit him and he wrote the song.

Mr. Speaker, there have already been several fitting tributes paid to those who served in the Persian Gulf. In West Virginia, communities large and small have sponsored parades and welcome-home celebrations. Yesterday I joined with residents of my own home town of Keyser in a welcome-home celebration. The victory parades and welcome-home ceremonies are fitting tributes for those who served. However, the true measure of the Nation's gratitude will be found in our VA hospitals and vet centers. It will be reflected in the quality of services and benefits we provide veterans and their families.

This Saturday, as we celebrate the victory, I hope that those Americans who are still serving in the Persian Gulf will not be forgotten. The West Virginians, including members of the 351st Ordnance Company out of Romney, continue to serve and their families and friends anxiously await their return. I have met with Pentagon officials and they have assured me that members of the 351st will be home by August. They are preparing a shipment for some billion dollars' worth of ammunition and materials back to the United States. The 351st will miss the parade Saturday but I am sure there will be a fitting welcome.

There were some old lessons reaffirmed with the war in the Persian Gulf. Though the victory was swift and decisive in the Persian Gulf, we know that no war is fought without the loss of human lives. Loss of lives in the Persian Gulf includes Joseph Kime III of Charlestown, WV; Joseph Bongiomi III of Morgantown, WV; and Ruben G. Kirk III of Dunlow, WV.

We know that no war is fought without sacrifice and that sacrifice includes the families and friends of those who serve in the Armed Forces. No war is fought without cost and that cost must include what has been termed the "continuing cost of war," the cost of fulfilling the promises made to those who served in the Armed Forces. Those promises include health care, educational benefits and home loans.

Parades and homecoming celebrations are fitting tributes to those who served in the Persian Gulf, but the lasting tribute will be what we do here in the Congress to honor those who served to defend America and the freedoms and liberties we cherish.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nicholas' song "Thank You" is as follows:

THANK YOU

(By Bobby Nicholas)

It's such an inspiration, to see a Nation sing
America the Beautiful, just let our freedom ring
To see little girls and little boys
waving the flag instead of toys
To see moms and dads joining hands
in celebration of common man.

Chorus:

We just want to say thank you
for all that you have done
You made us proud to be an American
We as people stand as one
and we must all remember so we don't forget
the price we pay for freedom isn't over yet.
We just want to say thank you
for now you let us see
that we can live together, in peace and harmony
From Fort Bragg to Chicago
From sea to shining sea
We did it all together, my brother, you and me.
We just want to say thank you
for the sacrifice you made
We know it wasn't easy
far away from home each day
From Spokane down to Galveston
From Boston to L.A.
You pulled it all together
to brighten up this day.
I can only wonder, what old Abe would say today
to see the north and south, fighting together
From Gettysburg to Atlanta, GA.
To see men and women, black and white
standing side by side for freedom's right
Oh, if he were here today, I'm sure this is what he'd say.
To be spoken: That this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom and that government, of the people by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth.
We just want to say thank you
for we can hold our heads up high
Yes you have brought us all together
under one big sky
We thank you Norm and Colin
You showed our Nation's pride
That we will all remember, until the day we die
So let us sing . . . God Bless America.

The song Thank You was originally to be an open letter to the men and women who served in the Persian Gulf. I thought that it would be a wonderful way to say thank you for a job well done. At the time my son had just entered the Army Reserves, and then I knew what every mother or father, brother or sister, husband or wife in any conflict, from Korea to the Persian Gulf must have felt. The sense of helplessness and worry, of just wanting to do something and not being able to, praying that they would all return home safely. There is a phrase in the song that says that we must all remember so we don't forget that the price we pay for freedom isn't over yet. Those words never were more true than now. Looking at my eight-year-old I could only wonder if some day he also would be called to serve his country. We can only hope that this will be the last time that we have to fight for what we know is right. I guess there is a lesson to be learned in all of this. That is when the time came to stand together as a nation, we did it, without reservation. Side by side, north and south, black and white. So lets all keep the spirit of unity alive to make this nation what we all know it can be. A place where all people can live in Peace and Harmony. I will take the liberty of speaking for all the people of this great country in giving you a well deserved THANK YOU.

Sincerely yours,
We the People of the U.S.A.

CELEBRATION OF ITALIAN CONSTITUTION DAY

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join Italian-Americans and Italians around the world who celebrated the 45th anniversary of Italian Constitution Day on June 2. This joyous occasion is the principal national holiday in Italy, and it commemorates the referendum of June 2, 1946, which abolished the monarch and made Italy a democratic republic under President Luigi Einaudi.

The formation of the Italian Republic is testament to the resiliency, spirit, and patriotism of the Italian people, who emerged from World War II intent upon creating a democratic nation with universal adult suffrage. Italy's search for democracy is embodied in its national anthem, "Inno di mameli"—Hymn of Mameli—which was written by the Italian patriot Goffredo Mameli and adopted on June 2, 1946. Italy's devotion to constitutional democracy is also reflected in its national flag. The green, white, and red of the Italian flag are

symbolic of independence, democracy, and unity, respectively.

Like our own constitution the Italian Constitution reflects the moral fabric of the Italian people. The Constitution expresses love of liberty, respect for human rights, religion, open expression and equality for all. It has withstood economic hard times, the superpower friction of the cold war, and internal political instability.

Following passage of a referendum on June 2, 1946, the Republic of Italy was established by a margin of 2 million votes. As a result, the monarchy was abolished, and King Umberto II was forced into exile. With the republic official, the newly elected constituent assembly was entrusted with the duty of creating a new constitution. The constituent assembly succeeded in establishing the modern Italian Constitution, which went into force in January 1948, and which has stood the test of time as a symbol of the triumph of democracy over totalitarianism, and despotism.

Today, Italy stands free, united, and proud of its 45 years of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating this landmark in the evolution of democracy not only in Italy, but around the world.

□ 1710

SUPPORT SPACE STATION FREEDOM

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like also to talk about the space station today.

I am a member of the Science and Space Committee, and I really thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], for organizing today's special orders and providing the leadership and support for space station Freedom.

I rise in support of the space station. I do not have a significant space interest economically in my district out in Oregon, and so I speak as one who cannot be accused of being tainted, if you will, or having an economic interest at heart that directly affects the employment base of my district. In fact, if anything, one could argue that I should be supporting the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee's action, and because of the needs of so many people in this country, that perhaps we should not fund the space station but, rather, I am not taking that course this week in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking this action because I believe that the space station is the right action for this Congress and this Nation to take. The history of our great Nation is the history of reaching to new frontiers.

For the past 30 years, space has been the new frontier for our country. Space has captivated and united our country and even the world. It is both the peaceful means of bringing people together and a catalyst for new ideas and the sharing of technologies with our friendly partners.

Certainly we all realize the budget dilemma that confronts this Nation and the limited dollars that we do have that was a crucial aspect to the decision by the appropriations subcommittee to terminate space station funding.

The space station is expensive. There is no doubt about it. But I believe strongly that we must push on.

Congress has cut back on space station funding in recent years, and the Congress should continue to monitor the project closely to ensure that our limited funds are spent appropriately.

President Kennedy, in a joint address to the Congress on May 25, 1961, talked about a lunar mission and the United States role in space, and he stated,

> First, I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth. I believe we should go to the Moon, but there is no sense in agreeing or desiring that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burdens to make it successful.

Who can forget the incredible first picture of Neil Armstrong taking America's first steps on the Moon? All of America was overcome with pride as Armstrong said, "That's one step for man, one giant leap for mankind." We will never forget those who have perished in the pursuit of the stars, most recently in 1987 when the shuttle *Challenger* exploded. These are but two examples of the work and the burdens we have shouldered in exploring space.

I submit that we have a responsibility to continue to do this work, to continue to shoulder the burdens of space exploration. I also believe that the American people support our leadership role in space and the space station.

Clearly we may not be able to fund it at the level that would move us to our end on the perfect timetable. We may have to cut back a little bit. We may have to accommodate the fact that we do have pressing domestic needs here at home in America.

But today space station Freedom is an example also of international cooperation, an example that sets the stage for future cooperation among nations.

If we cancel the space station, it will be an example of the United States failing to meet its commitments to other nations, and this will affect future cooperative ventures as well. These ventures may be in science with projects like the superconducting super collider, or they may be in agriculture or manufacturing, as well. The United States invited Canada, invited Japan; we invited them to participate in the space station Freedom program. Any changes in the program must be done with the knowledge that the United States is no longer the sole interested party here.

President Kennedy later in 1962 stated, "Many years ago the great British explorer George Mallory, who was to die on Mount Everest, was asked why did he want to climb it. He said, 'Because it is there.' Well, space is there, and we are going to climb it, and the Moon and the planets are there," and new hopes for knowledge come, and peace, and peace and cooperation, I believe, come with this.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must pursue these new hopes for knowledge. Who knows what discoveries await space station Freedom?

We cannot afford not to build the space station; to give up now is to disappoint all of those who have gone before, and to give up now ends America's quest for new frontiers.

I am not willing to say no to that great American tradition.

WHAT IS AT STAKE IN UNITED STATES-MEXICO TRADE NEGOTIATIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week this House had a very important debate concerning the United States-Mexico trade negotiations and on a vote of 192 to 231, this House gave the Bush administration the authority to proceed on these historic negotiations.

These particular negotiations are especially important to districts like mine which have heavy manufacturing bases. Our State of Ohio has already lost over 120,000 jobs to Mexico. When the border is completely opened, it is no secret that we will lose thousands and thousands more.

Today I would like to read a letter that I just received. I think it is important to put on the record what is really at stake and important in these negotiations, and I hope that President Bush and his staff listen to this letter, because I know I will receive others like it.

> DEAR MARCY: I work at Dura Mechanical Components Inc. in Toledo, Ohio. We have been working without a contract since February 1, 1991. We did not strike because the company would probably move out or replace us. Recently, on May 10, 1991, we had a meeting set-up with the company lawyers thinking they were going to netotiate a contract with us. When the lawyers came into the meeting all they said was that they had bad news. The company had made a decision to close Dura.
>
> I see the stress that is affecting all the people. It is hard to understand how a company is allowed under the laws to do this to employees. But the plant that they have in Mexico will receive half of our work; its Tennessee plant will receive the rest.
>
> Sunday morning, May 12, 1991, one of the tool room employees took a hunting rifle and shot himself in the head dying instantly.

The laws in this country should help protect us. The free trade agreement with Mexico will only cause more jobs to be moved. At Dura we make an average of $10.65 per hour plus fringes. The Dura Mexican plant only pays around 60 cents per hour plus fringes. How can we compete with them? Our government was formed to protect and help the people not work against us.

One of the problems we face when we are laid-off is the high cost of insurance. My wife has had three back operations and carpal tunnel. She's not able to get a job with insurance. It is hard to pay her doctor bills. How are we expected to pay with no insurance? We need national health insurance so that we don't have this to worry about.

I have worked at Dura for 47 years. My pension here would be $581.25. Most people here will receive less than half this amount. When I lose my job, insurance cost will amount to $310.00 per month. Take that from the pension I would receive and it comes to $271.25 a month for 47 years work at Dura. Most employees after paying their insurance would have nothing left. But it is better than moving to Mexico. I am 63 years old.

Sincerely,

□ 1720

Mr. President, I would hope that when your trade negotiators sit down at the table with the negotiators from Mexico, they will be thinking about people like this gentleman and hundreds of others like him in my district who have now lost their jobs to Mexican companies. What is at stake here is their lives, our community, and our standard of living.

CHALLENGING BASE CLOSURE RECOMMENDATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SKAGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to challenge the Department of Defense's recommendations for closures and realignments, in particular, to critique the Department of the Navy recommendation to realign White Oak Laboratory, Silver Spring, MD, which is in my congressional district. As you know, I testified before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission on May 22, 1991. I have felt strongly throughout the process that the proposal impacting on the defense laboratories needs to be weighed carefully and in concert with congressional intent. Today, I want to enlist the support of my colleagues in challenging this proposal as there is still time to influence the process.

The Honorable Jim Courter, a former colleague of ours, chairs the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. He has said that he will not rubber stamp the DOD proposed list. In fact, on Friday, May 31, 1991, the Courter Commission added 27 bases to the list for consideration, giving a strong sign that he is listening to alternative recommendations. In addition, during the May 21-22, 1991 hearing at which I testified, and again at the Philadelphia regional hearing on May 24, 1991, Mr. Courter, along with other members of the Commission, indicated that they would be making a decision soon about whether or not it would consider defense laboratories as part of its overall recommendations. We expect public deliberation on that decision Thursday, June 6, 1991.

In addition to wanting to reach a wider audience with my commentary, I also want to emphasize a key point regarding the Defense Department's move to include Department of Defense laboratories on the April 15, 1991 list with the hope that I can enlist support in my challenge to the laboratory recommendations. As you may already know, the list includes proposals to close or realign many research and development laboratories across the services. The Navy, in using this vehicle, proposes to alter 90 percent of the framework of its current laboratory structure. Unfortunately, the Navy plan has been hastily conceived, ill-documented, and haphazardly analyzed for cost—the GAO has confirmed this assessment of their approach. The plan contains many inconsistencies and threatens to erode a significant portion of its scientific and technical professional work force. At White Oak Laboratory alone, the move would bring about a 70 percent brain-drain.

All of this would be enough to compel the Commission to have the Navy go back to the drawing board or remove the recommendations entirely. But, what is realy at stake here is the policy process. In the 1991 DOD Authorization Act, Congress mandated that the DOD set up a separate Commission to study the conversion and consolidation of defense laboratories. This was done in recognition of the complexity and special nature of defense laboratories, as well as in recognition of their contribution to the defense technology base and the difficulty in reconstituting the laboratory structure and work force once altered or cut altogether. This was also done in recognition that the labs' successes depend largely on the body of highly skilled scientists and engineers who staff the labs and who perform missions that have long-term impact on the technical capabilities of the Armed Forces. No one can dispute that we won the Persian Gulf war on the basis of a technology investment, nor that this investment saved lives. Much of the technology deployed in the Persian Gulf war was begun in the 1970's. To be ready for the next contingency, we can ill afford to hack away at our defense laboratories without first having a Commission with special expertise examining the appropriate future of these labs, both collectively, and individually.

That is why I am encouraged by recent indicators that the Courter Commission may be persuaded by my testimony, and the testimony of at least 60 of my fellow colleagues who have all endeavored to remove laboratories from this list and have them considered by the separate commission for which they were intended. The Commission has included Navy homeports among the 27 bases it has added to the list for alternative consideration. This is extremely encouraging because the GAO said the Navy had excess berthing space and could have either closed additional bases or ceased work on new, uncompleted homeports to save money. Instead, the Navy chose to achieve its cuts through a massive overhaul of its laboratory structure, without providing any reasonable explanation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that the Navy decision regarding White Oak Laboratory is a decision in search of a rationale, one that defies explanation, and one that will result in a net loss to the Navy, the DOD, and the American taxpayer, not in a net savings as the Navy claims, but never demonstrates.

It is my hope that the Courter Commission will not rubberstamp this intolerable decision and will defer a decision to the commission Congress intended for laboratory review. Short of this goal, I have asked the Commission on Base Closures and Realignment to consider some additional recommendations, including, setting aside Navy bases and labs, in particular, until the Navy has explained and documented fairly its decision-making process.

Mr. Speaker, let me now summarize the testimony I made before the Base Closure and Realignment Commission on May 22, 1991. I also want to submit my written testimony for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, as I have already noted, the future of the White Oak Laboratory is at stake. It is an essential detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center and is replete with historical advanced technology contributions to Naval wartime and peacetime successes. White Oak Laboratory has been slated for substantial reduction and realignment in Secretary Cheney's April 15, 1991 Base Closure and Realignment Report. The Navy proposal would result in the loss of 1,250 positions, down from 1,800 civilian personnel currently employed at White Oak, leaving 550 people, including research and technology personnel, as well as personnel to operate unique facilities, but no support personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Courter Commission needs to make a thorough and objective examination of the decisions and rationale made to support this recommendation. When it does, the Commission will find, as I did, that the Navy's decisionmaking process is very difficult to track. What can be tracked is inadequately documented and riddled with inconsistencies. These findings are substan-

tiated by the GAO's May 15, 1991 report that evaluated the base closure and realignment selection process.

The Navy plan is short on explanation. Its plan for realigning certain of White Oak's critical missions is incompatible with the Navy's intended goals of mission purification, elimination of duplication, and cost savings. It ignores substantial costs that would render the plan cost ineffective. And although an official White Oak recruiting brochure states. "The single most critical determinant of the success of the Naval Surface Warfare Center is the appropriate selection, development, and retention of highly trained scientists and engineers," the plan virtually assures a massive hemmorhage of critical scientific and technical personnel.

At least 80 percent of the missions performed at White Oak are listed on DOD's and the Office of Science and Technology Policy's critical technology lists. In their 1991 reports to Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy each stressed the importance of R&D and high technology to this Nation's future national security. The Navy's criteria for laboratory restructuring, by preserving all missions currently performed at White Oak as essential leadership areas, indicate that the recommended cuts are driven primarily by a requirement to cut acquisition costs by 20 percent over 5 years and only secondarily by a desire to purify missions to achieve critical mass at four central locations. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Navy plan constitutes a shell game.

The expertise and ingenuity found at White Oak will be vital to the future of our fleet and of our technology base, which we must preserve. Critical research and development requires long lead times and is not easily reconstituted.

In the absence of hard data and a clear explanation by the Navy, I have to conclude, as I said earlier, that the cutback is a decision in search of a rationale. It is clear to me that mission requirements and technical considerations are not driving this proposal. Rather the major consideration seems to be a 20-percent reduction in acquisition force. Yet, Naval industrial funded activities, such as White Oak, are exempt from end-strength considerations. In addition, this plan will not achieve substantial savings. In fact, my cost analysis indicates a net loss to the taxpayer.

The Navy claims that the realignment will have a one-time cost of $89 million, with projected savings of $11 million, over 12 years. But, by my own conservative calculations, I arrived at a one-time cost of $146 million, a 61-percent increase. As you know, the GAO applied a sensitivity cost analysis to all of the costs provided by the services, and most of the figures were unaffected by the GAO's sensitivity analysis. But, in the case of White Oak, when a 50-percent and 100-percent increase in the one-time costs were made, a 100-year payback period was rendered in each case.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I am not persuaded that improved synergy at Dahlgren, the gaining facility, and 11 million dollars' worth of savings 5 years from now, compare favorably with the expected costs, losses in our national scientific and engineering capability, and unwarranted disruption to people, missions, and the economy. Moreover, Dahlgren is not able to receive the additional personnel and equipment without additional facilities, nor is the surrounding community able to house the influx of personnel and their families. Military construction and other costs required to accommodate this realignment are approximately $100 million. There are also environmental impact costs which add to these costs.

The Navy's anticipated loss of highly-trained scientific and technical personnel from this proposal is great. Past experience indicates a 70-percent nontransfer rate is likely, and a survey of 420 White Oak employees—or 25 percent—indicates an 80-percent nontransfer rate. This projected flight of scientific and technical personnel will have long-term, devastating repercussions to the Navy and the technology base. The direct and indirect costs will be disastrous and intolerable.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that such a major realignment in DOD R&D should not occur until the Laboratory Closure and Consolidation Commission can make its review. Moreover, such a shift should not occur until the Navy can adequately document and explain its rationale for doing so to the Commission. Should a downsizing of White Oak be found necessary, I believe that necessary personnel reductions can and should be met by attrition. If the Commission finds that the Navy R&D restructuring plan is appropriate and some realignment should take place on the basis of technical merit and cost-efficiencies, then I would recommend that, at a minimum, the missions of mine warfare and surface ship ASW, along with needed support personnel, remain at White Oak Laboratory. This is imperative in the interest of cost savings, personnel retention, existing synergies at White Oak, and the assurance of preserving these missions for the future of Navy defense needs.

Mr. Speaker, I respectively thank you for the opportunity to discuss this vital topic. I ask for support in defeating the laboratory proposal as it currently exists so that the intent of Congress and the needs of our national security may be met. And, finally, I hope for success in challenging the proposal for White Oak Laboratory, a move that is clearly not in the best interests of the Navy, the DOD, the employees of White Oak Laboratory, and the American taxpayers.

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE CONSTANCE A. MORELLA BEFORE THE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION, MAY 22, 1991

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to discuss the future of White Oak Laboratory, an essential detachment of the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC). As you know, White Oak Laboratory, which is located in my Congressional District in Silver Spring, Maryland, has been slated for substantial reduction and realignment in Secretary Cheney's April 15, 1991 Base Closure and Realignment Report.

I want to discuss in some detail my view of the merits and logic of the Navy proposal, which would reduce the number of White Oak Laboratory employees by 20 percent over five years (368 total) and realign 50 percent of the remaining positions (890) to Dahlgren, Virginia. In terms of numbers, the recommendation would result in the loss of 1250 positions, down from 1800 civilian personnel currently employed at White Oak, leaving 550 people, including research and technology personnel, as well as personnel to operate unique facilities.

However, the Navy's recommendation to realign some of White Oak's critical disciplines to Dahlgren is incompatible with the Navy's intended goals of "mission purification," elimination of duplication, and cost savings. Also, the Navy proposal would retain *no* support personnel for the reduced White Oak staff. Depending on what the Navy plans to do with the impending vacant facilities at White Oak, the shifts may or may not make sense, but most certainly the costs of the proposal would increase. However, no one in the Navy could, or would, tell me what those plans are, although several options are rumored.

The Navy plan is short on explanation. It ignores substantial costs that would render the plan cost-ineffective. And, the plan virtually assures a massive hemorrhage of critical scientific and technical personnel from the Navy, approximately 735 (1050−70 percent=735) personnel are expected to leave due to cuts or unwillingness to transfer, many with an average service length at White Oak of 19 years. In short, the Navy plan for White Oak constitutes a shell game.

I would like the Commission to know that the proposal we are discussing today is revised from a March 19, 1991 Navy document supporting its Base Closure and Realignment Report, Detailed Analysis, that would have cut 1700 positions from White Oak, retaining only 100 personnel as caretakers for White Oak's unique facilities. I am informed that in early April 1991, the Navy shifted to the current proposal after examining the costs of the first proposal, particularly those associated with unique facilities. Thus was born the numerically-driven ceiling of 550 personnel at White Oak Laboratory. Although the Navy states it has been developing the lab plan for more than a year, this plan clearly appears to have been hastily conceived. I also note that the altered plan is reflected in the DOD Base Closure and Realignment report in which Appendix G contains the earlier figures and page 81 contains the final figures.

First, my assessment of the plan's rationale looks at procedural issues, namely:

(1) Why are labs on this list when Congress clearly intended for a separate commission to consider lab closures and consolidations

and the GAO has found the Navy selection process flawed?

(2) Why is the Navy restructuring 90 percent of its R&D structure via this list, when there is excess berthing space at bases to cut according to the GAO? and,

(3) Should R&D be cut proportionate to the rest of the force structure, when most experts agree that in times of shrinking defense dollars it is important to preserve the technology base?

Second, my assessment looks at the stated criteria, namely:

(1) Where is the force structure, top-down, mission analysis that supports the proposed changes to Navy's R&D structure, in general, and for White Oak in particular?

(2) Have the military value, costs, and technical criteria been assessed reasonably? and,

(3) Have personnel, community, and environmental impacts been fairly and accurately assessed?

I offer my alternative analysis for the benefit of our national defense requirements, our defense R&D structure, the employees of White Oak Laboratory, and the greater White Oak community, which falls in my district.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I believe that, in making a thorough and objective examination of the decisions and rationale made to support this recommendation, you will find that the Navy's decision process is very difficult to track. You will also find the Navy's decision-making process to be inadequately documented and riddled with inconsistencies. These findings are substantiated by the May 15, 1991 GAO report that evaluated the base closure and realignment selection process. As you will recall, the GAO concluded:

(1) "First, due to lack of supporting documentation, we could not determine the basis for the Committee's military value ratings for Navy installations."

(2) "Second, we identified apparent inconsistencies within the Committee's internal rating process."

(3) "Lastly, although required by OSD policy guidance to develop and implement an internal control plan for its base structure reviews, the Navy did not assign responsibility for developing and implementing such a plan."

Some of my colleagues will argue that the GAO findings invalidate the entire Navy process. There are certainly a range of alternative recommendations which I will outline later.

I acknowledge that the goals of the overall Navy R&D proposal are conceptually valid; that is, the Navy's intention to create four warfare centers (of which NSWC is one) so as to eliminate duplication and to achieve critical mass is worthy. However, the criteria established to justify the plan do not withstand scrutiny, either from a technical or cost standpoint, and the implementation plan contains many flaws. I want to point out that, since 1974, the two sites, White Oak and Dahlgren have been working together as a corporate center and proximity has not been a factor in either overall center or individual laboratory accomplishments. I base my conclusion on a visit to White Oak, a staff visit to Dahlgren, numerous discussions with management at both White Oak and Dahlgren, overwhelming technical and personal input from employees and constituents, and an in-depth review of data from the DOD, the Navy, the NSWC, the GAO, concerned citizens, and various public sources.

I have a few general comments I want to make for the record as I offer my analysis of the White Oak Laboratory realignment proposal and my own corresponding recommendations. I will also be submitting supporting documentation for the record.

First, after visiting White Oak, with all of its unique facilities and talented personnel, I cannot help but think that to change this in any way or to make cuts in the vital defense work performed there would be a tragedy to our national security, the Navy, the employees of White Oak, and the Montgomery County community.

I am extremely impressed with the quality and number of high-tech and unique facilities at White Oak. Many are unmatched anywhere in either federal and commercial R&D or the free world. According to an official White Oak publication, the replacement and business base value alone for the seven unique facilities is $259 million. For four additional facilities deemed important to NSWC leadership areas, the value is $37 million. The combined total is $296 million. To its credit, the Navy recognized the value of these facilities and the necessity to retain these capabilities due to their uniqueness and substantial investment.

More importantly, I am struck by the enthusiasm, dedication, and substantive scientific and technical skills of the employees at White Oak Laboratory. An official White Oak recruiting brochure states, "The single most critical determinant of the success of the Naval Surface Warfare Center is the appropriate selection, development, and retention of highly trained scientists and engineers."

According to official White Oak briefing material, of the 1800 civilian employees, 1050 (or 58 percent) are scientists and engineers by discipline. Of these, 400 (or 38 percent) have advanced degrees, many of which were funded by White Oak. In fiscal year 1991, White Oak has budgeted about $5 million for training, most of which is pursued at eight local area higher education institutes.

It is clear that White Oak is solving problems critical to our nation's defense, as was witnessed in the Persian Gulf War. Some examples are: Mine warfare, Seal weapons and ordnance, conventional ordnance, reduced signature and electromagnetic vulnerabilities, explosives, applied materials, and inputs to the Tomahawk cruise missile. In addition, White Oak, in a joint effort with Dahlgren, was able to design, produce, and deploy to the battlefield a means of distinguishing friendly vehicles from enemy vehicles. This clearly illustrates that the two sister laboratories work well together in times of crisis as they do in times of peace. Finally, at least, eighty percent of the missions performed at White Oak are listed on DOD's and the Office of Science and Technology Policy's critical technology lists.

In their 1991 Reports to Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy each stressed the importance of R&D and high technology to this nation's future national security. The Navy's criteria for laboratory restructuring reflect this emphasis by preserving all missions currently performed at White Oak, calling them "essential leadership areas." I believe that the Commission should conclude from this that recommended cuts are driven primarily by a requirement to cut acquisition costs by 20 percent over five years and only secondarily by a desire to "purify missions" to achieve "critical mass" at four central locations.

The expertise and ingenuity found at White Oak will be vital to the future of our technology base and the fleet. If we fail to preserve our technology base, which largely depends on the talents of the people in the R&D structure, we may find ourselves even more dependent on foreign sources in the future (currently 17 major weapon systems have critical foreign dependencies) than we are now. Meanwhile, industrial R&D, which already lags behind DOD R&D, is shrinking due to defense cutbacks, making the specter of foreign dependencies more worrisome.

For all of these reasons, I am greatly dismayed and concerned by the recommendation to shift to Dahlgren 50 percent of White Oak staff and resources after making a 20 percent personnel reduction. Such a major shift in DOD R&D should not occur until such time as the Laboratory Closure and Consolidation Commission can make its review. I have co-sponsored a bill to this effect. Moreover, such a shift should not occur until the Navy can adequately document and explain its rationale for doing so to the Commission.

In sum, in the absence of hard data and a clear explanation by the Navy, I have to conclude that the cutback is a decision in search of a rationale. It is clear to me that:

(1) Mission requirements and technical considerations are not driving this proposal. Rather, the major consideration seems to be a 20 percent reduction in acquisition force. Yet, in the same DOD Authorization Act, NIF-funded activities, such as White Oak, are exempt from end-strength considerations.

(2) No savings will be achieved. In fact, my cost analysis indicates that the proposal would actually result in a net loss to the taxpayer.

Without submitting proof, the Navy claims, the White Oak realignment will have a one-time cost of $89 million, with a projected savings of $11.2 million. The stated payback period is 12 years. I have been made aware that these numbers were "crunched" many times in order that the result did not render a payback period that would exceed 20 years since a 20-year or more payback period would have rendered the proposed realignment cost-ineffective.

When I performed my own conservative calculations, which I will submit for the record, I came up with a one-time cost of $146 million (a 61 percent increase). This figure does not include relocation services costs, lost capabilities and skills, costs to recruit and train replacement hires, nor does it include the cost of a new occupant in the vacant space at White Oak, and the cost of maintaining and supporting operating White Oak with reduced personnel ($11.6 million, a recurring cost that exceeds the Navy's projected recurring savings of $11.2 million).

The GAO applied a sensitivity cost analysis to all of the costs provided by the services, because some one-time costs were found to have been miscalculated in the 1988 round of closures, thus altering the wisdom of those selections. While most of the figures were unaffected by the GAO's sensitivity analysis, in the case of White Oak, when a 50 percent and 100 percent increase in the one-time costs were made, a 100-year payback period was rendered in each case.

Whether we use my analysis or the GAO analysis, it is clear that when using the higher conservative figures, no savings would be achieved. In any case, I am not persuaded that additional "synergy" gained at Dahlgren and $11.2 million worth of savings five years from now out of a total of $1.2 billion in DOD projects to be gained from lab closings and consolidations is worth the price in terms of expected costs, national

scientific and engineering losses, and unwarranted disruption to people, missions, and the economy.

(3) Dahlgren, the gaining facility, is not able to receive the additional personnel and equipment without additional facilities, nor is the surrounding King George community able to house the influx of personnel and their families. Conservative estimates of necessary military construction space at Dahlgren to accommodate the realignment is 300,000 square feet. This would cost roughly $52 million. I am informed that the Navy reduced these space requirements so that military construction costs would stay within a 20-year payback period ceiling. In any case, trailers will need to be leased immediately in order to accommodate the first transferees, at a cost of $3 million. A new sewage treatment facility will also be needed within the next year, at a cost of $33 million. There are also environmental impact costs according to the Navy Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations, Detailed Analysis. And, most importantly, from a standpoint of morale and welfare, there is currently not enough affordable housing for enlisted Aegis personnel assigned to the base, let alone for transferees, and the nearest communities with housing and schools are 45 minutes away (i.e., Fredericksburg, VA and Waldorf, MD).

(4) The first-rate, well-funded, Navy Industrially Funded (NIF) White Oak work, where the demand for services is outpacing supply, will not be improved as a result of this proposed realignment. In addition, many customers and contractors may move their business elsewhere because of probable programmatic disruptions and the loss of 70 percent of the personnel at White Oak.

The potential disruption to fleet deliverables could be enormous. The Navy's anticipated loss of highly-trained scientific and technical personnel is great. Past experience indicates a 70 percent non-transfer rate is likely, and a survey of 420 White Oak employees (or 25 percent) indicates an 80 percent non-transfer rate. This projected flight of scientific and technical personnel to other endeavors as a result of a strong desire not to move or commute to rural Dahlgren (a 75-mile commute from White Oak), will have long-term, devastating repercussions to the Navy and the technology base. The direct and indirect costs would be disastrous and intolerable. I am in favor of a reduced defense budget and structure, but as defense dollars decline, we must be certain that a competitive technology base will be there to preserve our national security for future generations.

Critical research and development requires long lead-times and is not easily reconstituted. It takes an average of three to five years to recruit and train new scientists and engineers, not to mention the 10-plus years it takes to perform at world class levels as do so many of the personnel at White Oak. And, it takes an average of 15 to 20 years to field an advanced weapon system. In times of shrinking defense budgets, research and development dollars should go up or at least hold steady to assure the deployment of superior technology to compensate for fewer systems purchased. This strategy worked amazingly well in the Persian Gulf War and it saved lives. I need not remind this audience that the R&D for many of the "smart" weapons as well as the mainstay weapons used in that war was begun in the 1970s. Given the unique and critical nature of the technology research and development work performed at White Oak Laboratory, it is imperative that this proposed realignment be reconsidered.

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

First, I recommend that no Department of Defense laboratory be closed or realigned pursuant to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as a result of recommendations made by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission during 1991, until the report of the Commission on the Consolidation and Conversion of Defense Research and Development Laboratories has been submitted to Congress pursuant to section 246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991.

Second, in conjunction with my first recommendation, I recommend that no action be taken by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission with respect to White Oak Laboratory until such time as the Commission on the Consolidation and Conversion of Defense Research and Development Laboratories has had an opportunity to review the White Oak proposal.

Third, also in conjunction with the above, I recommend that no action be taken with respect to White Oak Laboratory until the Department of the Navy develops a plan that meets the GAO standards for nominating facilities for closure or realignment.

Fourth, should a proper and authorized decision be made that it is appropriate to make reductions at White Oak as a result of the Department of the Navy contention that a 20 percent reduction in R&D workforce is necessary pursuant to the Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 1991 to cut the acquisition workforce by 20 percent over a five year period, and hence the R&D workforce by 20 percent, then, I recommend that the cuts be made through attrition where feasible and that no realignment to Dahlgren take place.

Fifth, should a proper and authorized decision be made that the Navy R&D restructuring plan is appropriate and that some realignment should take place on the basis of technical merit and cost-efficiencies, then the missions of mine warfare and surface ship ASW should be added to those already selected to remain at White Oak along with some additional support personnel remain at White Oak Laboratory in the interest of cost savings, personnel retention, existing synergies at White Oak Laboratory, and the assurance of preserving these missions for the future of Navy defense needs.

White Oak Laboratory realignment cost analysis

	Millions
Military construction (based on 1994 funds):	
RDT&E space	$52
Sewage treatment plant	33
Total	85
Other facility costs (based on 1994 funds):	
Equipment moving expenses	12
Leased trailers to accommodate immediate realignment of personnel and equipment	3
Total	15

BASE OPERATING COSTS (FISCAL YEAR 1990 EXPENSES)

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	White Oak	Dahlgren
Maintenance	$4.9	$9.0
Support	33.6	64.5
Total	38.5	73.5

NOTE.—Base operating costs constitute recurring costs. While support costs are to be eliminated through the realignment of all support functions to Dahlgren, some support for the remaining 550 personnel and operation of unique facilities is anticipated. Though undetermined, this cost will be contracted either from the incoming host to White Oak or from the community. Because 30% of White Oak is being retained, it is assumed that both support and maintenance will cost approximately 30% of the current cost. Thus, $38.5M minus 70% equals $11.6M total cost.

PERSONNEL COSTS

Realigned Personnel (Cost: $30,000 per person).

Assume 30% will move of 890 proposed equals 267 times $30K equals $8,010,000.

Severed Personnel (Cost: $21,000 per person).

Assume 70% will be severed of 890 proposed equals 623 times $21K equals $13,083,000.

Assume 100 personnel above normal attrition in conjunction with 20% across-the-board cut (a total of 268—20% of 1800 equals 368—to be cut through either attrition or cuts) will be severed due to 20% across-the-board cut taken before any realignment occurs equals 100 times $21K equals $2,100,000.

New Hires (Cost: $20,000 per person).

Assume 623 needed to make up shortfall (890 minus 267 equals 623) equals 623 times $20K equals $12,460,000.

Total: $8,010,000 plus $13,083,000 plus $2,100,000 plus $12,460,000 equals $35,653,000.

NOTE.—Does not include relocation services costs, does not take into account lost capability and skills, nor the costs associated to recruit and train new hires.

ADDITIONAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REALIGNED ACTIVITIES

Surface Ship ASW is slated to be moved to Dahlgren. This facility was brought on line in the February-March 1991 timeframe at an overall cost of $10 million for special construction, equipment, air conditioning and power system.

TOTAL ONE-TIME COSTS

$100 million plus $36 million plus $10 million equals $146 million.

NOTE.—The Navy estimated that the total one-time costs would be $89M. The basis for this figure is not explained. Total one-time costs in this analysis exceed Navy projected one-time costs by 61%. A 61% increase in one-time would render a payback period of 100 years.

TOTAL RECURRING COSTS

$11.6 million.

NOTE.—Recurring costs exceed Navy projected recurring savings of $11.2M if the plan is implemented as proposed. The basis for this figure is not explained. According to this cost analysis, irrespective of one-time costs, because the recurring costs exceed the recurring savings, the Navy plan will never reap a savings.

WHITE OAK WORKFORCE AND REALIGNMENT PLAN

Currently 1800 civilians; 8 military.

1050 (or 58%) are scientists and engineers, 400 with advanced degrees (or 38%).

Workforce is mainly concentrated in two departments: Research and Technology and Underwater Systems. The remainder are in engineering functions, support, or operators for unique facilities.

Research and Technology consists of: explosives, materials, information sciences, directed energy, and warheads.

Underwater Systems consists of: SQQQ-89, MK 116 ASWCS, Beartrap, mines (exclusive to White Oak), warheads, and seal weapons.

Current plans are to retain the following disciplines only: explosives, underwater warheads, materials, and sensors and radiation (399−20%=319); reentry systems and operators for the wind tunnel (80−20%=64); H department which includes unique facilities (75−20%=60); warheads (140−20%=112).

Total Workforce Retained: 319+64+60+112=550.

By this plan, no support personnel are retained.

By this plan, mines are not retained (136 personnel which are exclusive to White Oak), nor is surface ship ASW (135 personnel and a new $10 million facility specially designed and recently put on line (February-March 1991). Surface ship ASW is being realigned to Dahlgren to integrate with other anti-warfare disciplines. Both mines and surface ship ASW will most assuredly lose 70% of their personnel based on past experience, informal surveys, and letters received. This would result in a loss (271−70%=81 personnel would most likely transfer to Dahlgren and 190 personnel would leave the NSWC). In addition, this would result in the lost investment cost in building space and non-transferable equipment.

What is most alarming about the loss associated with these two disciplines is that they are essential mission areas and are difficult specialties to recruit and train. In the case of mines, it was one of only two Navy deficiencies cited in the Persian Gulf war and a technology area cited as critical to future Navy defense needs. While synergy would be achieved in the case of surface ship ASW by the move to Dahlgren, at the expense of the lost costs and moving and military construction costs, there is no synergy to be gained with the movement of mines to Dahlgren. Mines is a discipline unique to White Oak and is a matrix organization in which synergy is achieved at White Oak via interaction with the research department and the underwater systems department.

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to prohibit the expansion of longer combination vehicles [LCV's] on America's highways. H.R. 2515 would ban double- and triple-combination trucks in States that do not currently allow them.

If you wonder what it's like to share the interstate with one of these giant trucks, imagine a 10-story building laid on its side and you've got a good picture of the length of some LCV's.

Statistics show that public safety is compromised by LCV's. According to the Transportation Research Board, combination trucks have twice the rate of fatal accident involvement as passengers cars. And, while larger trucks make up only 3.2 percent of traffic, they are responsible for 12 percent of highway deaths.

It's no wonder most Americans don't want these huge rigs lumbering down the same highways on which they travel with their loved ones. Riding next to a truck 120 feet long is an intimidating experience. That's why over three-quarters of the American people oppose more LCV's on our highways.

Furthermore, without a ban on the expansion of LCV's, States that do not currently permit them will be forced—out of economic necessity—to join neighboring States in allowing them on their roads.

In 1956, Congress enacted legislation limiting the size of trucks on the Interstate System. It granted exemptions to a few States which were already permitting larger trucks. But the number of exemptions has multiplied to the point where there is a legal loophole large enough to drive a truck through.

Today, 15 States permit triple 28-food trailers, 17 States permit twin 48-foot trailers, and 20 states allow "Rocky Mountain doubles," which consist of one 48-foot trailer and one 28-foot trailer.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must safeguard American motorists and their passengers as well as the public investment in our highways. Until we know more about the safety of LCV's, we should err on the side of protecting the public. H.R. 2515 will do just that. I hope you will join me in this effort.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 60 minutes I had reserved for a special order previously be reinstated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 1, THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is sad and dismaying that 27 years after the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, we are still trying to secure equal rights for all of our citizens. You would think that we would have moved beyond this now to solve other problems. Yet, instead of building on the solid foundation of the original Civil Rights Act, we have retreated from the letter and intent of that law.

We need not rehash our Nation's history of racial discrimination in employment that gave rise to Federal statutes such as section 1981, passed in 1888, over a hundred years ago, and title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is clear though, that they were passed because of the undeniable pervasiveness of job-related discrimination. Unfortunately, these laws were not able to single-handedly eliminate employment discrimination. The continued occurrence of these problems is well-known and well documented. Race, as well as gender, religion, and national origin, continue to figure into management decisionmaking regarding hiring, promotions, layoffs, firings, and day to day concerns.

It is interesting that a few weeks ago the Urban Institute released the results of an extensive study of hiring bias. The results of the study were disturbing to say the least: Blacks were three times as likely as whites to face discrimination in the hiring process. But the reaction—or lack thereof—has been even more unsettling. After a flurry of articles, that was it. That was all there was to it.

No discussion, no debate, no laments, and most unfortunate of all, the study's results provided no impetus for passage of the civil rights bill. As if the race-baiting hysteria over the bill were not enough, this is further proof that for far too many people, equal rights for minorities and women is just not an item high on the agenda.

It was certainly not on the Supreme Court's agenda when it engaged in unprecedented judicial activism and curtailed well-established rights and remedies under section 1981 and title VII. Previous Court decisions were overruled and new interpretations were artfully crafted. The net result is that the Court disregarded both the letter and the spirit of Congress' efforts, thus doing damage to the legitimate rights of millions of Americans.

Well I am here to tell you that all forms of racial and sexual discrimination are intolerable, as are the Supreme Court's decisions turning back the clock on progress and justice.

□ 1740

Just what is equality worth if it only applies in theory? What are employment protections worth if they are unenforceable? What are judicial remedies worth if the path to justice is obstructed with insurmountable barriers? Absolutely nothing, but to give hope of fairness where there really is none and to engage in a charade of democratic practices where they do not actually exist.

This weekend, the Nation's Capital will host a grand homecoming victory celebration for our troops from Operation Desert Storm. Parades, giveaways, awards, parties and special deals have taken place all across the country for the past 3 months. Let me note that a survey conducted by the Chicago Reporter found that 80 percent of all military recruits in the Chicago area are minorities. They fought for the freedom and liberation of the Kuwaiti people and achieved stunning success. Based on the results of the Urban Institute study, and what we already knew to be true, we can conclude that they may very likely not have the same success in their daily struggle for economic freedom and equal justice at home. As long as we shut out these young men and women from the very opportunities and freedoms for which they have so recently fought, we, as a nation dishonor them and their sacrifice.

The Civil Rights Act of 1991 overturns five major Supreme Court decisions: Wards Cove versus Atonio, Price

Waterhouse versus Hopkins, Martin versus Wilks, Lorance versus AT&T, and Patterson versus McLean Credit Union.

With discrimination complaints of all kinds nationwide on the rise, now is not the time to retreat. With the Supreme Court departing further and further from established principles of equality, now is not the time to be reticent. As the Congress of the United States, we must take the lead in upholding the basic, essential rights of all Americans. We must pass the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] for taking this time to point out how very basic this civil rights bill is. I think it is ludicrous for even having a debate on this in 1991. This is really a houskeeping amendment. It is just correcting from Supreme Court decisions that went way off track, and putting the law back on track the way it was in the 1970's and early 1980's.

To see all the brouhaha made about it is amazing. It says to me they do not want civil rights, they want an issue, they want a political issue.

I think polarizing this Nation at this time is unbelievable. I also think that the first bill we have is the fairest. It looks most like the one we started with, dealing with the five different cases and restoring the law, plain and simple, period.

It does not put caps on people, which I find shocking. I find it shocking that they want to put caps on people and start saying that some kind of discrimination is worse than other kinds of discrimination.

To me, that goes right to the heart of what civil rights is about. But I think basically what you are seeing is the President of the United States really almost egging on civil unrest. I would much rather have civil rights then civil unrest. All of these decisions go to jobs, jobs are where you get your dignity in America. It is a country where we do not say, "Who are you?" We say, "What do you do?" If you say, "Nothing," it means nothing.

It is also a day where the children's defense fund came out with some very important statistics, and I think those statistics show why the civil rights bill is very important to families.

They point out that the average American thinks that the average person on welfare is a young black living in the urban core with a mother who is on welfare who had him in her teens. Well, guess what; among the poor children in America, that is only 1 in 56, 1 in 56.

So the image we have does not fit poor children at all. Most of them have a parent struggling to work, struggling to get ahead.

We know that women have been discriminated against in the workplace. The gentlewoman from Illinois has worked on that forever, whether it is pay equity, sex discrimination, sexual harassment, all across the board.

Many of these women are mothers who have kids that are impoverished. We know that men have been discriminated against in the workplace. What we have done to black males in this country has been unbelievable. Many of those are fathers, and they are trying to make it.

We know there are Hispanics, we know there are many others who have been discriminated against.

I wish the President of the United States would use his position to pull us all together and then go out and fight this economy and get it back on its feet so that everybody has a job and everybody has the dignity that goes with a job.

Nobody wants to be on welfare.

As I say, I keep reminding people only 1 in 56 fits the majority stereotype of the poor child.

All the rest of the parents are struggling and trying to do something to get out of poverty and to make their lives better. But if you look at the eighties, what happened to families is that every family in America, if the head of the family was 35 years old or younger, is worse off unless they were in the top 5 percent of the income range, they are worse off than they were at the beginning of the eighties.

So this is about jobs, and this is about their ability to get into decent jobs, and this is about their ability to progress once they get into decent jobs so there are not ceilings for people of different backgrounds. It is about not allowing businesses to duck all the responsibilities by saying, "Well, we would like to promote women," or, "We would like to promote African Americans," or "Hispanics or Asian Americans," but, "business necessity."

If they can hide behind business necessity and not have to prove what they mean by it, then there will not be another civil rights case ever won in the history of this country. That is what that is all about.

So the gentlewoman from Illinois is making such a good point, and I really hope that tomorrow poeple will back the purest civil rights bill and send a real message to the White House that we have had it, we have had it with their playing political games with this. We want the country pulled together, not pulled apart, and we want this being dealt with at the high level that Abraham Lincoln would want us to.

If he is sitting down there in his chair in his monument right now, I am sure he is smiling if he hears this debate. I do not know what he is going to be doing tomorrow when he hears the other one.

To think that this many years after the Civil War and think that we are still having this kind of debate over the very basic dignity of being able to have a job and being treated fairly in the workplace is just amazing to me.

So I support totally what the gentlewoman is saying. I thank her for taking this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I will be on the floor tomorrow supporting civil rights fully, and I hope others do too, and I hope we get a wake-up call to America saying, "If you were as horrified as I was by what happened in India as you watched it all, polarizing groups, going against each other," or, "If you are as horrified as I am after seeing what is happening in some of the Eastern-bloc nations with all sorts of antieverything, raising its ugly head again, and groups starting to fight and countries starting to come unraveled, then let us not do that here."

The one thing we have right now that the world wants is we have learned how to really bring diversity out and make it a positive.

There are two areas in our economy where we have really allowed everybody to participate, and in those two areas we are second to none.

Area No. 1 is entertainment. There is no other country in the world that provides the entertainment that we do. When you look at the wide range of shows, where else could you go and have a Sylvester Stallone and a Bill Cosby and a Gloria Esteban, and you could go on, and Madonna, those are unique, and that is everybody out there, and it has made a global impact. All over the globe they turn to us for entertainment, our music, our sitcoms, our movies, Everybody is there. All you have to have there is talent.

And sports: We let everybody play in sports, and we have some doggone good teams that can take on the world.

We have also made more progress in the military than we have in the private sector. It is easier to get an advancement in the military than in the private sector. Now, that is crazy.

This bill is about finally opening up the private sector so as we move into a global economy and a globe that is clearly diverse, you would think the private sector would really want to flourish with this diversity as we have in other areas and understand the way that we broke into those markets and the way we really do things a lot of other countries have trouble doing is to use the people that came from those different places to help us make those bridges in trade, finance, and all the things that we need to get on with, instead of fighting to the bitter end to make sure that everybody in the world looks like Peter Preppie or they cannot play.

So, thank you. I will be here. We will vote. I appreciate your pointing this out, and I appreciate your very hard work in all of this.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the gentlewoman for her kind remarks because she has certainly been one who has been very interested in seeing that this legislation is passed.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

□ 1750

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] for yielding to me. I want to join with the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] in the accommodation she has given the gentlewoman in the well for taking this special order to provide each of us an opportunity to speak out in support of the Towns-Schroeder substitute to H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mr. Speaker, the Towns-Schroeder substitute is a pure, civil rights bill, without the compromises included in the Brooks-Fish substitute. In other words, the Towns-Schroeder substitute is essentially the same as H.R. 4000, last year's civil rights bill, as reported out of the Education and Labor Committee in May 1990. There are, however, two additional provisions:

First, it adds a provision to prohibit discrimination against women in the making and enforcing of contracts; and

Second, it extends the coverage of title VII of the civil rights act of 1964 to American workers employed by American-owned companies abroad.

A key feature of the Towns-Schroeder substitute is that it authorizes compensatory and punitive damages in title VII cases, without the cap on punitive damages included in the Brooks-Fish substitute. There is no legitimate reason to deny women, religious minorities, and the disabled the same, effective remedies as racial minorities are now provided. The Towns-Schroeder substitute ensures equal treatment for all victims of intentional employment discrimination. Furthermore, by strengthening the remedies available to all victims of discrimination, this provision provides more effective deterrence.

Since punitive damages are only available in cases of egregious intentional discrimination, this provision would not lead to multimillion-dollar lawsuits. Moreover, the complaining party must show either malice or callous disregard by an employer in order to obtain punitive damages. Thus, this provision would not lead to more litigation.

While the Towns-Schroeder substitute does not mandate quotas in any fashion, it does not contain explicit language prohibiting the use of quotas. Last year, to no avail, there were over 37 painstaking efforts to placate the administration by adding specific, compromise amendments addressing the quota argument. President Bush still vetoed the civil rights bill.

In view of the administration's interference in April, when the Business Roundtable was very close to agreement with civil right groups on a compromise bill, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the quota argument is still nothing but a smoke screen. In fact, there was no resort to quotas as the law existed for 18 years under Griggs and prior to the Supreme Court decisions of 1989 which changed the Griggs standard. Not one individual has offered evidence to support the assertion that quotas would result because of the technical changes in the law. To state that the civil rights bill produces quotas, when it does not, is nothing more than Willie Horton-style, racial politics, which was the bedrock for George Bush's ascendency into the Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, the Towns-Schroeder substitute simply states what ought to be obvious—under no circumstances will discrimination in the workplace be tolerated in our society. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Towns-Schroeder substitute for H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and now yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], and I will be brief because I know she has other speakers, for taking out this special order on the Towns-Schroeder substitute and on the Civil Rights Act period.

Mr. Speaker, I was very startled to hear some of the President's comments over the weekend, and frankly it may not have been malicious, but I was offended when the President used the analogy of comparing our bill to a pig compared to a horse. To me I do not think we talk in terms of the civil rights of American people in those terms. I think, when one considers the fact that some of the laws that the Supreme Court usurped go back to 1866, some of those laws that in the five decisions of 1989 that the Supreme Court made relative to discrimination and job discrimination, and that some of the laws also go back to the Civil Rights Act, title 7, 1964, we are talking about people's lives.

The majority of people in the work force frankly happen to be women, and disabled Americans, and black Americans, and other individuals of religious minorities, and they would like something very obvious: their full rights under the law protected, and that is something that the Reagan and Bush Supreme Court decided was not quite right, and that is why Congress is a separate, but equal, branch of Government and has a responsibility, I believe, to correct what, once again, the Supreme Court did. We had to do this I believe 3 or so years ago when we passed the Civil Rights Restoration Act. That was an act to restore title 9 of the Civil Rights Act, an act that had passed almost a generation ago. I think we are going backward, not forward, and we are trying, some of us are trying, to achieve the status quo, and that is to restore some of these laws that the Supreme Court decisions have, I believe, misinterpreted.

So, I want to thank my colleague from Chicago, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], for all of her wonderful work, and, hopefully, when the bills do come before the floor, we will pass the Towns-Schroeder bill which in my judgment is the fairest of the options we have to restore the civil rights of every American, irrespective of who that individual is, so that the morale, and the productivity and the access to employment can be equal for all Americans, and I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] very much, and she is certainly absolutely right. As the gentlewoman knows, we did have to go through the Civil Rights Restoration Act a decade ago. We found ourselves having to go over to pass a civil rights bill after emancipation was passed in 1863. I just wonder how long is our country going to take a step forward and four steps backward. Hopefully this act will show everybody who is interested in knowing that we really are very serious about it, our civil rights, and I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] for all of the work that she has done in this regard.

Ms. OAKAR. Would the gentlewoman from Illinois yield for just one more second?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. OAKAR. One of the reasons I support the Towns-Schroeder bill is that there is no cap on the punitive damages for women, disabled individuals, and religious minorities. Forty-five percent of the work force are apt to be female, and 37 million Americans are disabled, et cetera, and it seems to me that it sends the wrong signal to cap certain areas, if you happen to be female, or disabled, or a religious minority, and I am so delighted that so many individuals who feel that way happen to be minorities who would not be affected by that cap, and I think that shows the magnitude of all of our beliefs, that we really believe in civil rights for everyone, and that is the whole spirit of what the law is about, and let us hope that the Schroeder-Towns vote gets a very, very strong vote tomorrow.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], my dear colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in ardent support of the Towns-Schroeder substitute for the Civil Rights Act of 1991. Legislation very similar to the Towns-Schroeder substitute received the support of 273 votes last year when it was introduced as H.R. 4000, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1990. This substitute amendment codifies the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and restores what was lost by the recent Supreme Court decisions overturning substantive measures that protected the employment rights of African-Americans.

The Towns-Schroeder substitute dispels among other things, the misconception of quotas and removes the unfair practice of placing caps on damages for women, religious minorities, and disabled persons. This amendment also preserves the discriminatory impact test advised by the Wards Cove decision. It places the burden of proof on the employer to demonstrate the business necessity of the practice that has a disparate impact on the basis of race, ethic origin, religious affiliation, or gender.

The Congressional Black Caucus has brought a substitute amendment to the floor that is all about fairness, equality, and basic common sense. If the truth be told, African-Americans have not, nor have they ever been treated equally in this country. That is a sad testament for a people who have plowed America's fields, expanded the profit margin of America's industries through productivity, and broadened the focus of science, medicine, history, art, and music. Let's not also forget that African-Americans are by far, one of the largest group of consumers in the Nation.

African-Americans have earned the right to be treated as equal citizens in every venue of prosperity this country has to offer. We are not asking for preferential treatment from anyone or anything. We do however, expect and demand equal treatment under the laws of our Constitution. Equal employment and fair employment practices are an integral part of that package.

Section 5 of the Town-Schroeder substitute addresses the fairness issue for all employees by providing a provision that prohibits intentional discriminations with a provision that specifically states that an employer is liable under title II. This is effective if the employee demonstrates that race, religion, ethic origin, or gender was the motivating factor in him or her receiving unsatisfactory treatment or termination of services from his or her employer. This common-sense approach to fair employment practices that has set the Bush administration and its racially motivated rhetoric on civil rights issues on its ear.

In the battle of civil rights, President Bush has been speaking to our Nation's college graduates about civil rights laws that address the issue of "equal morality." He speaks of less Government interference and stronger responsibilities of moral values promoted in the workplace by the employer. Unfortunately, African-Americans have always known that there is no equal morality or equal opportunity when it comes to employment in the American work force.

Mr. Bush's confusion about the economic plight of African-Americans and their inability to compete fairly in the labor market is a direct result of his lack of understanding of the disparity of the American work force. If I were to make a comparison of the difference between President Bush and myself, I would surmise that President Bush and those like him lack understanding of the need to restore civil rights law because they grew up in America being equal. I and those like me, understand the need for passing this vital legislation because we grew up in America being black.

The Department of Labor's 1990 unemployment rate between African-American men and white men indicates that the unemployment rate of African-American men was 10.1 percent, over twice as high as compared to the 4.2 percent unemployment rate for white men. In the last month the April 1991 unemployment rates for African-American men stands at 12 percent compared to that of 5.5 percent of white men. Things are definitely not improving.

It is therefore understood that from the President's perspective, equality is in effect asking for a quality of life he already has. From the African-American's perspective, the Towns-Schroeder substitute is the vehicle needed to replace the steps lost in the climb to equal employment opportunity and gives us a chance at the same quality of life as white Americans.

Opponents of the civil rights legislation talk about the need to cap civil damages against the practitioners of racial and gender segregation. Caps are a red-herring issue that is both unnecessary and discriminatory to women, those of different religious affiliation, and the disabled. A 1991 study conducted by the law firm of White & Case for the National Women's Law Center concluded that over a 10-year period, from 1981 to 1991, 576 race related cases of discrimination were reported to the courts. Of the 576 cases reported, 93 cases were awarded damages. Of these, 62 cases received compensatory and punitive damages combined, of less than $50 thousand. Only four cases during the entire 10-year period received damages over $200,000.

Finally, on the question of quotas. This is not a quota bill. Plain and simple. The Towns-Schroeder substitute amendment very clearly states that it does not affect or change any law governing affirmative action. The amendment in no way mandates a quota system. So, if President Bush is successful in duping the American public by consistently repeating the blatant falsehood that the democrats are supporting quotas, he only reinforces the concept that a lie told often enough, with enough media attention, will be acknowledged as the truth. Even when the truth is obvious for all to see.

Let's face the facts. A national economic recession, increased racial tension, enhanced by recent Supreme Court decisions and a President insensitive to the needs of a hugh population of voters, have set the civil rights movement and equal opportunity for all Americans back some 20 years.

If we do not restore what was lost in those Supreme Court decisions, this Nation runs the risk of social, economic, and political deterioration. One look at the rebellion and revolutionary activities of other nations whose people suffer from economic and political oppression will tell you that ignoring the obvious injustice will be allowing history to repeat itself in our own backyard.

Congress must right the wrongs of the Supreme Court and dispel the President's myth that America has obtained equality for all of its citizens. This substitute amendment is our chance to do so. The time to address equal employment concerns is overdue and we must act now.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to consider their vote, to talk about it, to discuss it, and to act on the Towns-Schroeder substitute. It is extremely important that we do that, and I urge the Members to cast their vote for the substitute. It is extremely important that we do that, and I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] for allowing us to use this time to further provide a platform for the discussion of this most important issue.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] for her remarks because she is right on target as usual, and we are delighted that she has had the opportunity to be with us on this piece of legislation. We are delighted that she knows it so well and has been so exceedingly proficient at giving us her views on this issue because they are helpful to us all.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

□ 1810

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we should provide the same

remedies of all people who are the victims of intentional job discrimination.

It is simply un-American that women, religious minorities, disabled persons or those of different national origins, are subject to a cap on the amount of punitive and compensatory damages they may receive, while racial minorities, who are similarly situated, are not subject to a cap.

Currently, back pay is the exclusive monetary remedy available under title VII and it has not served as an effective deterrent for employers.

Making employers liable for all losses—economic and otherwise—as a result of prohibited discrimination, proven at trial, will serve a deterrent to future acts of discrimination for both those held liable for the damages, as well as the entire employer community as a whole.

Many of the opponents of the expansion of title VII's remedial scheme argue that by doing so, we would "open the floodgates" to many frivolous lawsuits, produce multimillion dollar lawsuits and discourage voluntary settlement of cases.

All of these statements are simply not true.

Filing a lawsuit against an employer is a tremendous undertaking with many personal and professional ramifications, and it is not a process that is entered into lightly.

If we use section 1981, which provides compensatory and punitive damages to victims of intentional racial discrimination, as an example, we will find some statistics that will directly speak to the question of potential frivolous lawsuits.

There have been very few cases where damages have been awarded under section 1981. In only 69 cases nationwide, over the last 10 years, were compensatory or punitive damages awarded.

In 42 of those cases where it was possible to determine the exact amount of the damages award, the combined compensatory and punitive award per case was $50,000 or less. In 4 cases, plaintiffs received less than $500.

Moreover, only in 3 cases was a plaintiff ultimately awarded more than $200,000 combined compensatory and punitive damages.

By looking at these statistics, it is clear that people have not won large lawsuits and that by providing a chance for women, the disabled, religious minorities and those of different national origins, to receive damages free from any caps, we will not produce a "lawyer's bonanza"; it will simply put them on the same footing as victims of international racial discrimination.

For too many years, the contributions that American women made to our Nation were undervalued and even ignored.

It is unfortunate that in 1991, at a time women have made dramatic advances and important contributions in all fields, we are still debating whether or not to give them their full rights as citizens.

In recent years, more and more women have laid their lives on the line for the betterment of our country. A great source of inspiration to us all was Christine McAuliffe, the young school teacher who lost her life trying to carry out a space shuttle mission to provide us with more knowledge about our universe.

When President Bush made the decision that the United States would go to war in order to end the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait, women in military service answered the call of duty. Over 30,000 women served in Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Many left husbands, children and comfortable homes behind, yet we did not hear them complain as they headed for the rigors of a desert halfway around the world.

Sadly, some of our American women—including one from my home State of New Jersey—did not return. They made the ultimate sacrifice. Another young woman was held against her will as a prisoner of war.

Are we now going to tell these women—even as we plan elaborate homecoming parades for them—that they have not earned the right to receive full protection under our American laws? Is this how we reward them for their patriotism?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think this unequal treatment for women is the right thing for us to do. It is not the direction we should be taking in 1991, when so many women are contributing so much to the betterment of our society.

Mr. Speaker, this is simply an issue of equity and fairness.

The Towns/Schroeder substitute is the only bill that will treat all victims of intentional job discrimination equally and equality is what America is all about.

I urge all Members to support the Towns/Schroeder substitute.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE] for pointing out the tremendous job that women in Desert Storm and Desert Shield did. I also thank the gentleman for the job he has done in trying to help fashion this legislation and giving it his support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the leadership that has been shown by the gentlewoman in the well in organizing this special order so that we may take time to emphasize those points that we treasure with regard to the debate that is to ensue tomorrow on the Civil Rights Act.

I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], with whom I feel privileged to serve. He has certainly pointed out all the salient reasons why any suggested tack on to any bill which would limit the rights of women is not only unfair, but is simply not a part of the concept of equal justice under the law, nor should it even be considered as part of the civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am really very sad and chagrined to know that tomorrow we will be debating two substitutes that will in fact put caps on the rights of women to go before a court of law and feel totally entitled, based upon an analysis of their own individual case, for the courts and juries to determine what their just damages ought to be.

Instead, the Congress, under these two other substitutes, will be putting limitations on as to what the courts can find. Therefore, Members of the House and people who are watching this program, there is really only one bill that to my estimation measures up to what American justice is all about, and that is H.R. 4000, which is going to be the first substitute that will come up for a vote tomorrow. It will basically be the bill that was reported out of committee last year, and, pretty much like the bill that we fashioned in the Committee on Education and Labor and in the Committee on Judiciary this year.

Mr. Speaker, this is the basic concept of trying to restore in place the decisions that came down by the Supreme Court in 1989 that reversed the traditions of the past, and, in addition, raises the question about equity in terms of title VII damages.

Up until now, and a result of provisions and limitations as have been interpreted under title VII, women, religious minorities, and, recently added to title VII, the disabled of America, would not be, except for the provisions of the civil rights law, entitled to the full range of damages that any other plaintiff coming before the courts alleging discrimination at the workplace would be, and being able then to have the courts decide what sort of damages they are entitled to receive.

Under title VII, the remedies were what they described to be equitable only, which meant back wages or reinstatement. There was no possibility of compensatory damages and no possibility of punitive damages.

Under H.R. 1, out of all of the committees, and in H.R. 4000, for the first time, we have this ability of women finally going to the courts and being able to carry their litigation on discrimination, having the courts find intentional discrimination, and being able to recover not only back wages and reinstatement, but their full justice of compensatory damages, and, in the case of egregious, overt, deliberate kinds of discrimination, to be able to have the courts decide on punitive damages.

What the other two substitutes do, which is a tremendous blow really to the concept of equity, is to put a limit on the amount of damages that these plaintiffs can receive. In the case of the Brooks-Fish substitute, it would put a limit of $150,000 on punitive damages.

A lot of people say well, that should be enough. Besides, it is not $150,000, because it could be higher if the compensatory damages should be higher.

□ 1820

That is to say that there is no trust and confidence in a court of law to make a reasonable decision after looking at individual cases. And that is what is so egregious about the notion of putting a cap because it says everybody is alike insofar as their suffering and insofar as how the employer has treated them. We know for a fact that is not true. Therefore, this whole concept of limitation I find is so difficult to accept.

On the Michel substitute, which is the one that the minority is coming forth with, it does not recognize the whole area of discrimination at the workplace because it says in their bill that only sex harassment cases can come to court for damages and then not quite damages because they do away with the jury system and they call it an extension of equitable remedy. And so their case is woefully inadequate; their bill is woefully inadequate and does not really deserve any consideration if you are truly looking at this concept of equity.

I feel so strongly that any bill that is called a civil rights act, should be within it consistent, and carry forth the notion that people in America should be treated alike. I think what has swept over us in our anxiety to correct the wrongs that were put upon the law by the Supreme Court, is to want to make sure that we have enough votes in this body to override the veto of the President. And in so doing, we have tried to make this concession, that concession, hoping that along the way we would gather enough votes in order to overcome the President.

The thing that we have to remember is that it is the President that is making this terrible mistake in going to the American people and saying this bill is not worthy of consideration or support, threatening a veto, not looking at the particular aspects of the legislation. This President is the first President to veto any civil rights bill. He did that last year. We added this cap in order to try to make it possible for him to sign it into law, and he did not.

We are now faced with that same dilemma, and I am here to ask this House, this body, to consider the basics of what we want to have fashioned into our civil rights legislation. What is it that is so elemental as to express the philosophy and the commitment of this country? I see no other legislation before us that truly conforms to that ideal. So I hope that as we debate the alternatives tomorrow, that all of the eyes of the Congress, people who are interested truly in civil rights in America, as well as the American people will look to H.R. 4000, give it full support, and the measure of support that we get for H.R. 4000 will be extremely important as the bill goes over to the Senate.

So I hope that the Members of the House will listen to the debate, understand the importance of the differences between the substitutes and come down strong for equity in America, equal opportunity for everyone, and more importantly, the concept of equal justice which is really the cornerstone of liberty and freedom in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for yielding.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

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

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] will be recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, this portion of the proceedings of the U.S. House of Representatives is what is known as special orders. I, like most Members, think that it should be rarely used for special purposes, and I have not been here long enough to know why it is called special orders, but I would like to think that at least for the time that Members and I are spending here talking about the civil rights bill this evening, it is a special time.

I do not have prepared remarks, and I would give notice at this time that I would like to share the opportunity with other Members who wish to come over, whether they are for or against the civil rights bill, or for or against one version or another, because I truly do believe that the more excellent way to get the people in this country to understand the many bright people who are here is for us to take time every once in a while to talk to each other, rather than at each other.

The people who elected us and the people out in the country are not stupid, and they know that most of the time when they see us engaged in debate, it fits the definition of debate in only the loosest sense of that word, that we never take the opportunity to engage each other intellectually to discuss the merits of matters. We give what our version is. We do not attempt to convince other people.

So if there are a few Members of the Republican persuasion, or perhaps some Democrats, who plan to vote against the civil rights bill, who have any questions in their mind about what the bill contains, who think that it is a quota bill and they are going to go back and tell their constituents they voted for it because it was a quota bill or because it did not contain this or did not contain that, we are going to take the rug off this evening. All they need to do is come over here to this floor for the next hour and they can engage at least one person and perhaps, I think, others who genuinely know what this bill is, who make no claim about its shortcomings or its benefits, but who are willing to discuss with any Member from Congressman HYDE on down, if he is watching television, I would ask him to come over. Those who intend to hide behind the use of the word "quota," if there is any intellectual honesty about the position that they take, then now is the time to come over and make their point.

For the next hour I will be here, along with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, and the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. KOPETSKI, and the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK, and the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, and others who will be coming by, because I think that the people in their districts deserve an honest answer to something as fundamental as this.

They allow us to play politics with a lot of things, but this is not a subject about which politics ought to be played. It should not matter who is President of the United States or who is going to win the next election. There are people out in this country who are suffering because we have laws that have been interpreted so negatively as to be so restrictive as to not give them the fundamental right that everybody in this country believes that people are entitled to.

Let us set the backdrop then for our discussion. I have brought along lots of material here, and I would be happy to engage anyone on the question of race norming, any other issue that they legitimately think is of a topical concern. I invite them to come out of their offices and come on over to the floor of the House of Representatives and let us engage in a little friendly debate, because I honestly do believe in the bottom of my heart of hearts that I am right about this bill. And I honestly do believe that those who claim to support a bill are wrong, but if they are right, now is the time to be man enough and woman enough to come over here in the clear light of day while the television is on, while their constituents are looking, and not make one of those cockamamie speeches where you are talking up there to the camera, but talk to a real live person who will yield some time and give them an opportunity to engage in colloquy, because the people of this country want to know what is right and

what is wrong with the civil rights bill. I hope that we will be able to spend a little time this evening discussing why we think this bill ought to pass.

Let us go back and remember who we are and where we are and how we got here. This country was founded 215 years ago by a rag-tag group of individuals, malcontent and the like, who came here from all parts of the world. They conceived of the notion that this country would be founded upon the principle that all persons are created equal and that they are endowed, not by the government, but by their Creator with certain rights that no one can take away. An inalienable right means one that cannot be alienated by many but only by God. These colonies then had the unmitigated gall to declare themselves a rebellion in fact, free and independent of the wishes and dictates of the King of England. It was a latter-day resurrection.

□ 1830

They formed a compact. They called it the Declaration of Independence. They set out in that document which amounted to an indictment of the conditions with which they had found themselves, largely due to economic circumstances, largely having to do with where they had come from, principally from Europe, but with one common idea, that is, that regardless of one's previous condition or circumstance, regardless of what one's heritage was, that all people in the eyes of God and in the eyes of the law of this country were equal.

They then formed a Constitution after they fought a war with England. They formed a Constitution that set themselves apart, the second of which is still in existence after the Articles of Confederation, and it has been amended a few times, but not that often.

I think that most people would agree that it is a rather pliable document, but there are certain fundamental things that are set out in that document. That document guarantees certain rights to the individual to be protected from the Government. They guarantee the intercourse or interaction between individuals so that all persons will be treated equal under the law. Most of us remember that as part of the debate on whether the Constitution should be adopted by these new-formed colonies that formed this Union that was called the United States of America, that there was great discussion about the interplay between the role of government having been visited upon a strong centralized form of government in the personage of England. These new colonies that formed the United States of America certainly did not want to find themselves in the same situation by creating a Presidency that was in effect a monarchy, so that there were limitations put on the Federal Government, and all rights not given to the Federal Government by the Constitution were reserved to those several States which were 13 in number at the time, or to the people.

The most important part of the equation from the founding of this country for the last 215 years has been the people, and when any part of the people in this country suffer, it is in contemplation of fact, and at least in theory, that all people in this country suffer. All people in this country suffered when citizens in this country of Asian-American extraction were rounded up and put in prison camps after the beginning of World War II. It was not just something that was visited upon them. It was visited upon the heart and the soul of this country.

All people in this country suffered from the time that the Supreme Court of the United States misinterpreted the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments in the reconstruction act passed after the end of slavery, after the war that was fought that we called the Civil War.

The Congress set out to follow the mandates of the great reconstitution, if you will, of what the Constitution actually meant. It made it clear from that point forward, it could be argued from the beginning until the Civil War, that there were two standards of conduct allowable under our Constitution, because that was, in fact, what the Supreme Court had determined, that blacks were three-fifths of a person and the like.

But the reason for visiting these points in history is not to resurrect those memories but to set the course for the discussion that we find it necessary to have here this evening. The Supreme Court, in the trilogy of cases called the slaughterhouse cases, the civil rights cases and, most notably, Plessy versus Ferguson, set back democracy as we know it from 1896 until 1945 when the Supreme Court finally decided that separate but equal was not and could not be constitutional under our Constitution.

I speak not in behalf of black people. I speak in behalf of all people, because if we are one country, then we have to be one people, and we cannot be one people when we allow either through politics or race or religion or any other circumstance to divide ourselves one from another. If we are going to be one country, and we are not, then we need to move ahead in the matter of civil rights and not behind.

Since 1989 we have been in a holding pattern with respect to civil rights, and it usually befalls us that most black Members find it necessary to come to the well and speak on behalf of civil rights. I am happy to see my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon here, because he understands that none of us are free until and unless all of us are free. This is not a black-white issue. This is not a gender issue. This is an American issue.

This is one of the few days that I decided to wear a flag on my lapel. I do not like to wear my patriotism on my lapel, but there is nothing more American under our Constitution, under the Declaration of Independence and all the laws that we profess to hold so dearly, there is nothing more American than the concept that no matter who you are, or where you come from, or what color you are, or what religion you are, or what your sexual preference or your gender, or any reason that we use to divide people into narrow little categories, no matter what those things happen to be, in America you are just like everybody else.

The poorest child in the ghetto under our law is entitled to the same accords under our law as is the President of the United States. If he is any better than anybody else, then those people 215 years ago were wrong. They did not intend to have a monarchy, and we do not have a monarchy, and we will never have a monarchy in this country.

The President of the United States has done us a disservice. He did America a disservice. He allowed someone to do him a disservice, because I know George Bush, and in his heart of hearts I know George Bush wants to do what is right. But he got bad advice from Boyden Gray and from John Sununu, and he vetoed a perfectly good, watered-down, halfway, do-nothing civil rights bill last year. It was not the bill that it ought to have been. It was not the bill it could have been. And it was not the bill that the founders of this Constitution would have been proud of.

We are talking about words that were written 215 years ago that are just as pertinent, just as viable, just as important as what is written tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We are talking about the concept of ordered liberty, and in this country, black, white, brown, everybody is the same except sometimes when you find that the business interests, or some of the business interests who are most often misguided, because most of what is in title VII in the civil rights bill does not apply to small businesses anyway, because most small businesses, at least in my neck of the woods, have fewer than 15 employees, and people with fewer than 15 employees are not covered yet under the civil rights bill. That was one of the compromises that was made back in 1964.

My legal expert is here, and if I am wrong about the year, she will correct me. The original compromise was a higher number. I think it was 50 or more employees. She is nodding yes, so that Congress in its wisdom, or for the lack of it, compromised away a lot of people, the people who do most of the discriminating, the little mom-and-pop grocery stores and the small businesses. They were not covered then, and they are not covered now.

I will not spend any more time talking about what they do not do or what they do do, but I will talk about the procedure for getting into court to begin with. I will talk about the concept of equality for our people. I will talk about what is in the civil rights bill, what ought to be in the civil rights bill, and what ought not be in the civil rights bill.

Now, the problem is that we watch television too much, and I realize that most of the people who are watching me are watching television right now, or otherwise they would not be seeing me, but we have allowed ourselves by these politicians to be—brainwashed is too strong a word; conditioned to the point that we make decisions about mayor and county commissioner and President and Congresspersons and elected officials principally based upon a 30-second sound bite. Someone can go and buy 30 seconds of television time, and they send a subliminal message with that. The people at the White House know that. Boyden Gray knew that last year. John Sununu knew that last year.

This is where the word "quotas" came from. That word was excised from a concurring opinion in Wards Cove versus Atonio. The word "quotas" first came up when the Supreme Court decided Wards Cove versus Atonio. It was a fallacious argument hypothetically made, and it was put in the middle of the concurring opinion by Justice White. That then has been extracted to become the watchword, because they want the people in the country to think that they are protecting them from these people who want to take away their rights.

The rights of all people are the same. I sure wish some of those who believe that this is a quota bill would come on over here, goodness to life, and give us an opportunity to discuss it.

□ 1840

If Members do not come today, when we stand up to talk about it tomorrow I will be here. If those Members will yield to me tomorrow, we will talk about it. I hope we will talk about it in an intelligent fashion because I believe that honesty and truth is the way that we talk about things in the Congress of the United States.

I would not stand here and call it just a quota bill unless I were able to back it up with an example. However, as everyone sees in the 30-second sound bite, Mr. Speaker, when it goes on the 6 o'clock news, they do not have to answer to that. All they have to do is call it a pig, and no matter what it looks or sounds like or purports to do, a lot of people will say, "Well, the President calls it a pig, so it must be a pig." Well, the President bought a pig in a poke this time because he cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, and he cannot dress up what is a fundamental re-creation of rights that people have.

We are talking about Patterson versus McLean Credit Union, a case in which the Supreme Court so niggardly interpreted the law as to say the same law that the Congress passed in 1866, which by the way was enacted into law over the veto of the only other President in the history who vetoed a civil rights bill, was Andrew Johnson. Now, I know that President Bush does not want to go down in history with his name in the Guinness Book of World Records next to Andrew Johnson. In fact, he will be ahead of him this time because if he vetoes this civil rights bill, he will be the only President in the history of this country that ever vetoed two civil rights bills. Whichever version we send over, I am comfortable that the Congress will do its duty and pass a civil rights bill. It is a question of whether we want to pass an oatmeal civil rights bill or a lukewarm civil rights bill, or a civil rights bill that we can be proud of.

The substitute that is offered tomorrow by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] in my judgment, is the more excellent way of the Congress forthrightly and honestly addressing the issue. Members of Congress can go home and look their constituents in the eye and say, "I was for civil rights, and I voted for civil rights." We do not have the right to go home and make a bunch of promises, and go to a bunch of chicken dinners, and smile at people, and pat them on the back and never look them in the eye like so many elected officials do. They expect something more from Members than that.

I did not come to Congress to stay forever. I came just to stay a little while.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of those who have spoken before me today.

I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for the role he has played in trying to produce a bill that would be credible, with a broad range of Members of this House.

I rise with the experience of having enforced the act under amendment at the height of its strength. It was my great privilege to enforce it at a time when it had bipartisan support, and I dare to believe it can attain that support once again.

This is an act that has literally transformed this country. At the time it was passed, both the people of color and women, literally, were confined to a narrow band of occupations. Black men could be three or four things. White women could be five or six things. They were all compartmentalized by race and sex.

I am, therefore, offended that this great act would be amended in such a way as to drain its strength. It cannot possibly continue to do the work it has done for a quarter of a century if it no longer has the force and the power that characterized it for almost a quarter of a century, until the Supreme Court saw fit to tear up the bill and rewrite it. This Court, a conservative Court, presumably committed to the proposition that courts should let legislators write legislation.

First let me say a word about capping damages, a practice that is virtually unknown in this body and that should be stopped in its tracks. The notion of capping punitive damages, in particular, is a wasteful exercise. Anyone who reads the law or studies the law knows that punitive damages are rare in the law. A person can act with great negligence and disregard and still not qualify for punitive damages. I intend to insert in the RECORD tomorrow the sparse record of punitive damages under the job discrimination laws thus far.

The Republican substitute should not be dignified with the record caps however. It crushes damages. It not only caps them, it eliminates damages for all except one cause of action, sexual harassment, and that without regard to the fact that a person may not be fully compensated by $150,000, especially since its actor presumably will live for some years, and $150,000 in our economy gets to be less and less.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the issue of quotas I had thought was put to rest in about 1978. It was raised during the time that I chaired the Equal Employment Opportunity Compensation Board and President Carter unequivocally came forward to make clear that quotas were no part of the way he understood any of the laws, and certainly not title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

We have here to undo, Mr. Speaker, three kinds of mischief: Mischief by the Supreme Court, mischief by the business community for the role it has played in this exercise, and finally, mischief by the President of the United States.

If I could ask the gentleman from Texas to let me just outline these three categories of mischief, I would be completed. First is the Supreme Court mischief, the outrage of a conservative Court rewriting a statute as the Court did in this case, taking the Griggs decision which it had originally interpreted so as to require the employer that his qualifications were job-related, to take that burden of more than 25 years and remove it from the employer, the only actor who knows the facts was nothing

more and nothing less than rewriting the statute and rewriting its own decisions, overturning, if you will, silently sub rosa the Griggs decision.

I heard my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] say that he wanted to carry Members back to the Griggs decision. He wants to carry Members back to the Griggs decision, then of course he will do as we do and use the words of that decision: Manifest, substantial, significant, making the employers' burden related to the tasks that are done on the job.

We in this House seek to undo the Supreme Court's mischief, and I must say that this body is to be commended for reaching out to those against whom the act would be enforced. While we were not all pleased with the way in which this exercise was performed, the fact is that the business community sought out of this experience to save this bill by proposing some compromises.

I condemn the business community for its temerity in backing off from the exercise apparently after threats from the highest quarters in our country, agents of the President himself. It seems to me that the very reasons that the business community proceeded upon this exercise in the first place is understanding that minorities and women were the only supply of new workers, that white males were a diminishing supply, would be about 15 percent of the work force by the year 2000. Those reasons remain in force. Some of the proposals of the business community have found their way into one of the substitutes, in any case. However, I condemn the business community for disowning its own compromises. It has said it now wants the President's bill passed, disowning its own recommendations. That is temerity. That is cowardice. They should be called to account for it, and they should know that we know what they have done.

Finally, there is the greatest mischief of all, Mr. Speaker, and that is the mischief of the President of the United States himself. This President has, over the past several weeks, used his high office to divide and separate citizens on the basis of race.

□ 1850

The irony is, Mr. Speaker, that to the extent that he is concerned that numbers track an employer's compliance, it is not those who are of color who have benefited most. The largest supply of those who have experienced discrimination, of course, is white women. They are the mothers, the aunts, the daughters of Members of this body, and they have benefited mightily from this bill. Were it not for this bill, the standard of living of the American people would have plummeted, because at about the time the bill was passed the standard of living of the United States family began to go down in no small part because our economy became less competitive. Women, therefore, flooded into the workplace. Had they not found jobs open to them through affirmative action and through this act, they would have been crowded into the five or six jobs that had always been women's jobs for the most part.

This bill then has rescued the American standard of living by opening job opportunities across the board, and yet the President has left the clear impression with the American people that this is a race bill. Whether he means to or not, the fact is that the President of the United States is being read as race baiting in this debate, and he owes the American people an apology. I invite him to cease and desist. I invite him even at this late hour to find a way to bring himself and his party to the hallmark of Lincoln, for which I would rather his party be remembered than for the President's own acts these last few days.

The bills that are before us are in some respects not greatly different, but the rhetoric behind these bills has been greatly different.

As one who enforced this bill, saw it enforced without quotas, knows that whenever there was a cause of action by one such as a white man, that that person got redress under the act equally with people of color and women, understanding that this act has been enforced in such a way as to benefit all Americans, I call upon the President of the United States and his agents to join us finally in seeking a resolution that will give not only a bill that brings us together, but a bill that is worth having, a bill that strongly protects the right against job discrimination.

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

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia providing us with these very eloquent remarks.

I hope that her dream can come true; however, the sad fact is that someone who would use the likes of a Willie Horton commercial to gain the Presidency of the United States is not likely to look with disfavor on what happened in South Carolina.

There was no mistake about it when that black hand came out and when the white hand got the pink slip, that is nothing but race. If this country is about which race votes for which person for President, we have not come very far at all. We are not that kind of people in this country.

One day the people of this country, black, white, Hispanic, Asian, Indian people, who are not divided from each other are going to wake up and rise up. They are going to straighten out Democrats and Republicans who use the worst form, the basest form of politics, to divide us one from another.

The office of the President is not worth having, it seems to me, it debases and defiles the office of the President to use the likes of turning one race against another in order to achieve that goal.

What do you accomplish? What do you win when you win the Presidency and you divide the people among themselves so that they hate each other, they fear each other, they dislike each other, they think that the reason I did not get the job is some mythical black person out there who is less qualified who did not pass a test, who is dumb, who is ignorant, who has gotten the benefit of some sort of race norm on some exam, those are the kinds of notions they put out there.

It is like throwing a skunk into a picnic. It does not matter whether it gets on anybody or not, but it sure does turn the party out.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from the great State of Oregon.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me. It is an honor to engage in this debate before the House this week. Certainly as a member of the Judiciary Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights on which I have served with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, I want the folks in the gentleman's district to know what a great teacher he has been to this new Member from Oregon. It is truly one of my honors in my first term to serve with the gentleman and to learn firsthand from such a knowledgeable individual as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman honors me very much by his remarks.

Mr. KOPETSKI. You know, Mr. Speaker, we in Oregon have a strong tradition in this century of supporting civil rights laws, both Republican and Democratic Members in the House and in the Senate. One of the great champions of civil rights was the late Senator Wayne Morse from our State who helped in 1964 to pass that Civil Rights Act.

It has been a debate that I have listened to because I was not an original cosponsor of H.R. 1. I heard all these stories that, oh, it is a quota bill, and oh, we better be very careful with this kind of legislation. So I thought that I would go slow, that I would listen to the debate in the Civil Rights Subcommittee. I would read the testimony. I would examine the witnesses from both sides and think about it and reflect. It was only until after the bill went out of our subcommittee that I finally signed on as a cosponsor, because I was convinced at that point that we had a good product that we could take to the people of the United States and say this is a good product to move us

forward as a nation and that it is not a quota bill.

I was really amazed at the public relations gimmickry that has gone on around this bill, this whole notion that if you keep saying on the barnyard wall that this is a quota bill, this is a quota bill, the average Mr. and Mrs. America are going to think well, it must be a quota bill, because all these very important people are running around saying, well, we have got a quota bill and you better watch out. It is going to take your job away.

It is not a quota bill, but we are getting down to the real issue of what the folks are afraid of in this Chamber. I think it has everything to do with the sexual harrassment provisions in title VII, that whether this Nation is going to put some teeth in enforcement language in title VII.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes.

Mr. KOPETSKI. That is the issue. They want to create this whole diversion and this whole smokescreen over here, talk about quotas, and appeal to the baser instincts of Americans to hide what is really going on, what we are really trying to achieve, and that is for a mechanism for the women of this country to finally have their day in court. I want to talk about that in a few minutes.

I want to talk first about the lawyers in our society, because I think tomorrow is going to be a field day in the sense of people coming up here and saying some not so very nice things about the legal profession, because one of the arguments Mr. and Mrs. America will hear against this is, "Oh, you're opening the courtroom door. The already flooded courts are going to be just deluged with all kinds of legislation as a result of this language."

□ 1900

Well, I thought it would be important to ask the witnesses of the subcommittee exactly what is going on out there beyond the beltway; not what we think is going on inside the beltway but what is going on inside the States.

I asked the attorneys on both sides, from a business perspective, those who practice and litigate in that area, as well as the civil rights attorneys who gave their time to come and address the congressional committee.

Well, what I found was an incredibly profesisonal group of individuals who believe in their profession, who believe that almost all lawyers in this country are honest, that they are hard working; that clients come in and when a client comes in, they get the facts as any good lawyer does and he assesses whether there is a good case. They are not afraid to tell their clients, maybe in gentle language and maybe not, that they do not have a case, that, "You are wasting your time," being in their office.

"You may feel like you are being wronged, but legally you were not wronged and there is nothing you can do about it, at least in a court of law." Or they say, "Yes, you have a legitimate case, and this is what we are going to have to do to prove it, and this is how much time it is going to take and how much it is going to cost you." Other times they will go a step further and say, "Even if we can do this, you have to ask yourself, 'Is it worth it?' Is it worth it to you, to your family to go through all of this expense, time and stress, or do you want to move on in your life?"

All the attorneys who came before us say this happens in America, not just in these cases, but generally in all cases.

We can always know of the exceptions, we can always know of the bad attorneys out there.

I should say by way of disclaimer that, yes, I do have a law degree and I am proud of it, but I am not a member of any bar in the United States; I have never practiced law, I am not a lawyer, I do not consider myself a lawyer, but I do believe that lawyering and the legal profession is a very honorable profession. Also, we are pleased, we are pleased that we have a dedicated bar in this country and each of the States because we are a government of law. We are not a government of men or women or children, we are a government of law.

Sometimes the law gets very technical. So we ask the technician, we ask the mechanics of the law, the lawyers, to come help us out.

If you are ill, if you have a malady, you do not go to your real estate agent, you go to a doctor. If you have a legal problem, you do not go to your real estate agent, you go to your lawyer. That is the way it should be in this country.

So we should recognize it as a profession. Now, I went a step further and sometimes as a new Member you never know if you are crossing the line or not, but I asked one of these lawyers who came before us, who practiced civil rights law, I asked two further questions. I said, "Are you a millionaire?" I did. I asked them that. I did not ask how much money. I just wanted to know, "Are you a millionaire?" They all said "No." I said, "Are you going to become a millionaire if we pass H.R. 1?" Every one of them laughed and said, "No, we are not going to become millionaires if you pass H.R. 1." And I also asked "How many lawyers are there out there in your State that practice this kind of law?" And I was surprised at the answer. In the State of Texas, four or five attorneys practice civil rights law. That is it, four or five in a huge State like Texas. You would think there would be hundreds, but just four or five.

In the State of Virginia, not a large State by our standards, just three or four. My own State, one or two on any kind of a regular basis practices civil rights law.

So I hope my colleagues tomorrow do not get into the lawyer-bashing, do not make statements that this is going to be a full employment act for the attorneys, because the testimony in committees, the facts, say that it is not.

Well, I think I want to spend a little time also, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to talk about the victims, the victims of sexual harassment in this country, because I also took the time to ask and to explore the witnesses as they came before the committee, and ask them who are the people? It was surprising, surprising because I had expected the answer that it is going to be the new employee, the 18-, 20-, 22-year-old ladies, young ladies just entering the work force in this country. Not the case.

Usually, the profile is 40-, 45-year-old, 30-, 35-, 40-, 45-year-old lady, usually married, is highly embarrassed to walk into a law firm and say "I am being sexually harassed in the work force, and I need to do something about it." A very stressful situation, very distraught.

So they sat down, and I was surprised about that, that it goes on so much and that it is such a stressful aspect of an individual's life and it had been going on for a number of years. It was not something that started up last week or last month or in the last few months but had been going on, and the woman was afraid to talk to her husband about it, to talk to a family member about it.

And finally it got so bad that she did, and took a giant step. Under current law, and this is the problem that I want to talk about for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, under current law what the lawyer will say is, "Well, if you are successful, guess what we are going to do. We are going to make sure that you get your job back." You see, that is the relief, that is the damage award. When you win, you get to go back to that employment situation.

Now, if you think about it, the employment situation, the contract, if you will, before the employer and employee in this situation is destroyed. I am certain this woman and her family no longer respected that working atmosphere, that working environment. So what kind of relief is that? I say that it is not—it may be equitable in the lingo of the law, but for that person, for that family, that is not equity, that is not justice. That is not justice in our society.

So we are in a capitalism—a capitalistic atmosphere, which is great. So what is the reward of capitalism? It is money, it is money in our business society.

So that is what we are talking about, moving to this kind of system of jus-

tice, of getting payment for this stress, getting payment for this intolerable and outrageous situation. And, yes, if it is so bad and we want as a society to insure that it does not happen in other communities or in that community in other places, we are going to say, "You can get punitive damages."

Mr. Speaker, I would want to just read the standard for punitive damages. It is: Punitive damages are available only where there is an egregious violation, where there is malice or with reckless or callous indifference to the federally protected rights of others.

That is the standard we are talking about, where it is so onerous and outrageous that you say we cannot tolerate this and we want the society to know that we are not going to tolerate this whatsoever in our society. And the jury, the jury, a community of peers, is going to say, "Punitive damages."

You see, it is a very fundamental concept of a democracy, the jury system, which has worked for 200 years in the United States. It is a system that brings together, whether it is 6 in some States or up to 12 individuals for civil cases, although it can be 6, a representative sampling of the community and let them decide; not the Federal Congress, not the Federal Congress decide the value of a case or the upper limit of a case.

The $150,000, that is what they are talking about tomorrow in terms of a limit, $150,000, which does not exist for anybody else. But we may impose it for women. Or we are going to give you a new privilege: "Yes, you can get some monetary damages when you are wronged in the work force, but, you know, we are afraid, we are afraid of what is out there. So we are going to cap the damages, cap your award at $150,000."

Well, I am very conservative in this respect. I believe that juries can come up with the right dollar amount for that particular situation.

As my distinguished new Member from the District of Columbia is going to enter into the RECORD, some statistics on those kinds of damages tomorrow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to talk just a moment about why you are seeing that I am one of the great supporters of Towns-Schroeder's substitute motion and although we see the bipartisan substitute that is going to be offered by Mr. BROOKS and Mr. FISH is not a bad piece of legislation, we are just saying that Towns-Schroeder is much better. It is a purer piece of legislation and clearly the Republican substitute is a step backward.

□ 1910

It is a step backward. It is going to require women to jump through some new procedural hoops just to get to the equitable relief that they already have under current law, under current law. So, there will be some new barriers imposed.

Mr. Speaker, when we open our proceedings here in the Congress, we begin with the Pledge of Allegiance, and the words say, "and to the Republic for which it stands," and what does the Republic stand for? It begs the question and then immediately answers it. It says, "one Nation," one Nation, simple, but so profound; so profound because it does not have any exceptions. It does not say, "except for women," "only up to $150,000 for damage awards." It says, "one Nation, under God." One Nation.

Mr. Speaker, my wife and I had a tremendous opportunity in our life to visit other nations in the fall of 1989. We were on our own, decided to go to Eastern Europe. We were in Budapest 2 days after Hungary became a Republic. We were in Poland after they found their freedom, fought for it, and we were in Czechoslovakia when it was still under Communist rule. Mr. Speaker, we were there when this tide of freedom was rolling through those countries and ultimately brought down the Berlin Wall itself.

We crossed into Czechoslovakia, and this border guard wanted to talk to us on his own. He was taking a risk. We probably were not so much. The worst they could probably do was throw us out of the country. But he put his job on the line probably at that time, and he picked us up in one town and took us to his home in another town, and we had a very nice evening with this gentleman. Essentially what he wanted to do was practice his English with some Americans and talk about America a little bit because, see, America still sets the standard in this world whether one is from Czechoslovakia, or from the Middle East, or from Africa, any country. When one talks about freedom, it is still the United States that sets the standard.

Mr. Speaker, we asked these countries to be free. We helped them out. There is a little bit of foreign aid. Maybe we even send in the CIA once in a while to help them out so that they can become free.

And we ask them to provide civil rights, civil rights to their own citizens, and we, we set that standard in the world.

And it gets more difficult. There is no doubt about it. As we get more and more people congested into these big cities back here, and in Los Angeles and in all these places, no doubt about it, putting all those people together, it gets more difficult. There is no frontier to which we can move.

As my colleagues know, before, if it got crowded in the East, then one moved to Iowa. Then it got clogged up in Iowa, and one would move out to Oregon or down to Los Angeles.

There are no more frontiers. We all have to live together, and we have to make it work, and we should want to improve, improve the standard by which we live today. That is what I ask.

Mr. Speaker, the purest, best way tomorrow this Congress can set that new standard is to support the Towns-Schroeder substitute language.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], for those very wonderful remarks and for engaging in the dialog. I say to the gentleman, "You really put some nice thoughts together. The people out in your neck-of-the-woods, I'm sure, benefitted much from all of the wisdom and intelligence that you bring. But I would have loved to have seen you in the courtroom. I bet you would have been all right."

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS] at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just for a moment commend my new freshman colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI]. I am also a lawyer, and I am a very proud one, after hearing such a spirited and principled defense of our profession and an impassioned plea for what we ought to do tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I also would note the ironic tragedy that the eloquence of our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], pointed out. It is about when we put our voting cards in the machine tomorrow; that our colleague from the District of Columbia can stand in this well, as we all stand in this well, as she did with such power and intensity this evening, but, when it comes time for us to decide which of these pieces of legislation, if any, will receive our support, she will not participate in that process. That is another issue for another day, but perhaps some of the underlying undercurrent that is holding us back or trying to hold us back from what we are going to achieve tomorrow speaks to that issue as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would thank and commend my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] for opening up this forum, and I would note for the record that at the onset of his participation in this forum he invited those from any point of view who would raise any question about the Civil Rights Act of 1991 to come forward. It speaks volumes about the critics of the Civil Rights Act of 1991, that they are groundless allegations, that this is a quota bill which got made in the shrillness and in the glare of political debate, but in these unfortunate rare moments, when we can gather in this Chamber, and talk to each other, and engage in colloquy, and parse the facts and analyze the law, there is a

rather deafening silence from those to whom that challenge has been made.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] from another angle for what he has done today because I believe he is laying bare the real strategy of this debate from those who would try to stop the Civil Rights Act of 1991 from becoming law. Their participation in this debate is really less about what they are saying about this question, and it is more about the questions they do not want us to get into, and I thought about that today, Mr. Speaker, and over the weekend as I was back in my district in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I came across two of my constituents who talked to me about things that at first glance would seem unrelated to this debate. On Friday morning I spoke on the phone to a constituent who is a small businessman, a contractor, who goes about the business of remodeling homes, and remodeling small commercial facilities and building small commercial facilities, and I asked him, as I do many people, "How's business," and he said, "Business is lousy. It's worse than lousy." He said, "I've never been more frightened today than I have at any time in my life. I'm more frightened today than I've ever been in my life. I haven't had any work for 3½ months. My creditors are calling me and chasing me around. I am going to make a car payment this morning so my car won't be repossessed later in the day. I'm afraid I'm going to lose my house. I'm afraid I'm going to have to explain to my children why I can't give them what I've been able to give them in the past."

Mr. Speaker, this person is not someone who managed his money imprudently.

□ 1920

This is not someone who spent recklessly or ran his business into the ground. This is a solid, honest, hard-working American small businessman who is scared to death that for reasons that are beyond his control and beyond his comprehension he is going to lose everything he has. And he said to me, "What are they doing about it, and what are they saying about my problem in Washington, DC?"

I had to answer him, Mr. Speaker, "We're not really doing anything about your problem in Washington, DC."

This morning I had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to tour an electronics assembly plant in Camden, NJ, in my district, and as we do, I walked along the line and shook hands with people and said, "Good morning" and introduced myself. There was one woman I encountered who wanted nothing to do with me or with any politician. Mr. Speaker, she said some words that I will not repeat here, acknowledging the decorum of this institution. She wanted nothing to do with any politician because, she said, "Most of the people that used to work in this place are gone now. I'm still here only because there are a few of us left and I have some seniority. You're about 5 years too late, because most of the work that used to be done in places like Camden, NJ, is now done by people in the Philippines or done by people in Mexico, and I'm probably not going to have my job in a couple of weeks. So I don't really want to shake your hand and say, 'Good morning,' because I don't think any of you are addressing the kinds of things that ought to be addressed."

And I thought, Mr. Speaker, as we often do in that situation, what can I say to this woman? How can I convince her that I am trying to solve her problems and not just simply perpetuate them? What piece of legislation, what initiative could I point to and say, "We're trying to address your situation"? But I came up empty.

We understand why the debate in the national media in the last few weeks and the last few months has been dominated by the red herring of quotas. We understand that, Mr. Speaker. We understand that when you do not want to talk about why the pie is not getting bigger, you blame somebody else for taking your piece of the pie, and you explain to that small businessman in New Jersey or that woman working on that assembly line in New Jersey that the reason things are not very good for them right now and the reason they are justifiably fearful and angry that they may not get better is because some mythical member of a minority group that my friend, the gentleman from Texas, made reference to earlier, some mythicial evil person is taking bread off your table.

So they say, "Don't blame the economic policymakers of this country who have exported our capital and given away our jobs and looked the other way as the industrial base of the country has crumbled. Don't blame the people who manage our Nation's fiscal resources with almost utter and reckless disregard to reinvesting in this country and making it grow again. Blame that person who is going to file a lawsuit and file a civil rights claim. Blame that person who is trying to force a quota down your throat. It's their fault."

Our colleague from the District of Columbia used the word apology. It was a good word to use. The deepest apology that ought to be made here is that at a time when there are fundamental economic questions that ought to be asked about where this country is going and fundamental economic questions that ought to be asked about why people have to work twice as hard just to stay in the same place, the powers that be in this country do not want to come to grips with that question. So now they have the perfect opportunity not to, the perfect diversion, the perfect little bread-and-circus scenario to take people's minds off the issue. "It's that woman's fault, it's that minority's fault that this has happened."

I am not interested in fault, Mr. Speaker. I know that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] and my distinguised colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], and all the others who participated in this colloquy are not interested in fault. We are interested in growth. We are interested in healing the wounds that have plagued this country for generations, putting them aside and saying to everyone that the door is really and truly open to them regardless of gender, regardless of race, regardless of religion or national origin. We understand the door really is open to them, and now that we are healed, let us talk about how we can grow.

The administration not only fails to have an answer to that question, it does not want to come to grips with the question because it has no idea of when we should go.

I will make a prediction, Mr. Speaker: Regardless of the outcome of this legislation—and it is my fervent hope and my commitment to those who join me in support of this that I am going to work for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and, if necessary, for the bipartisan substitute; I am going to work for that—but regardless of the outcome of that, there will be another red herring. There will be another reason to focus on some external cause of our national problems so we do not have to look within.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, is not going to let us do that any more, and for that I commend him and all those who participated in this special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] has expired.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I would at this particular time like to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON], who has so eloquently preceded me in this Chamber this evening, to talk on the subject of civil rights. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to consume a few minutes of the gentleman's time, and then I will sit and listen to him. If we run out of things to say, let us think about it and talk about it a bit. I renew my collective request for any Members who are thinking about voting against the civil rights bill, who really want a civil rights bill, to come over this evening. We have another hour. We have a gentleman from Oregon, a gentleman from Maryland, a gentleman from New Jersey, and myself, who will be happy right here in front of God and everybody to answer whatever questions Members have about civil rights.

Again, thanking the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me, I would like to discuss very briefly the remarks made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS]. I used to practice criminal law when I was out there in the other world making a living. The gentleman touched on something that is just the old shell game. It used to be called the pigeon drop.

You take three half walnut shells and put them down and take the end off your eraser and put it under one, move them around, and you get the guy who is stupid enough to go for it to guess which one it is under. You bet a dollar, and if he does not guess which one it is under, he gives you a dollar, and then he does it again. But the point is that while he is moving them around, you take these two fingers right here and you take the eraser out from under there so it is not under any of them. That is the shell game we are talking about, and I think it is despicable.

We are not talking about right versus wrong, because everybody prefaces any remarks they make by saying, "I'm for civil rights, but I want it this way," or "I want it that way," or "I want it this other way."

This is not about who is right or who is wrong. I think the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] hit the nail on the head in his remarks. Principally, we have one idea that we put out here, and that is the lightning rod that draws all the lighting; that is the notion of quotas. Both the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from New Jersey talked about that. But lurking in the background is the fact that we are dynamically undergoing changes in our work force, and in the not too distant future, hopefully in the lifetime of all of us here, in not too distant future the dynamics of our work force is going to dramatically change so that the majority of the people in the work force will be women, and they will go into the work force, as the gentleman from Oregon said, without some change in the law, and with scarce little protection, with probably less protection or actually less protection than black people had before the civil rights bill of 1964 was passed, because they had the 1966 act which provided for damages under certain circumstances.

The business community understands all of this because they pay people who are experts in demographics. They know what the work force is going to look like in 2020, in 2010, in 2009, in 2008 and all those years, and they know exactly what colleges they are going to be going to and what elementary schools they are in now and what neighborhoods they are going to come from. So it seems to me they have a vested interest in ensuring that one of two things happens: That we level the playing field, to use a trite, overworked expression, or that we fool people into thinking that what is going on is not an attempt to level the playing field.

There is a whole lot more in the civil rights bill for women than there is for blacks and Hispanics or any other people who have been victimized. But that is not a reason for us who do not happen to be women to set ourselves apart from it. That is an opportunity for people like the gentleman from Oregon and the gentleman from New Jersey, who love liberty, not just because we are lawyers but because we love liberty and we believe in the Constitution, we believe all people are equal, and we believe that women should have had the right to vote long before they passed the 16th amendment.

□ 1930

We believe in the 19th amendment. We believe in that. We know it was wrong, it was incomprehensible to think you could set up a society in which you did not allow women the right to vote and participate fully. But we have endured these things as a Nation, and it has made us stronger.

Benjamin Franklin said those who would surrender their freedom for temporary liberty deserved neither liberty nor freedom. They deserve neither liberty nor freedom.

Freedom is too precious to give away based upon whether someone is going to be President of the United States. It is too precious to give away based upon whether we like each other or not. Now is the time for the people who love this country to stand up and demand that we get our country back.

We were moving in the right direction years ago, and we hit a snag in the road. I am not talking about politics. We gave up on each other.

We got afraid because we got big cities and we see gangs of hoodlums running up and down the streets, that all of us despise. Where are their parents? Who is looking after them? Why were they not raised in the way we were raised? I am not talking about old-fashioned values, I am talking about new-fashioned values.

There is something about people that cuts across every line that is there. The people that believe in this country want to move this country in the right direction. They do not want black communities and white communities.

You remember we had some testimony before the committee, a gentleman got up there and said that there are groups of people who want to be set apart. There is not a Member of Congress who ought to agree with that, even if they want to be set apart.

The difference between being a leader and being a politican is a leader knows what is right and does it, and a politican decides what the people think that they want, and tap dances on that.

I would rather be in Congress for 1 day and stand up and do what is right than be here for a lifetime and stand up for nothing. It is time for those who really believe in civil rights to stand up and say so. Not because of me. I have gotten all the civil rights I an going to have. You have gotten all the civil rights. We have all our civil rights, because God has given us an opportunity to do some things different in life, to represent other people. So will our children, and most of the people that we know and love.

We are not here in the well fighting for us. You are not fighting for the members of your family. You are fighting for people you have never met nor seen, because if they live in this country and stand on this soil, then they are entitled to the same thing when they go down to apply for a job. When the day comes that every other person walks through the door has an equal opportunity to get a job, then we will not need any more civil rights laws.

If you think we are there, then let us test it. If you know we have fallen short of our goal, then, as long as we need to pass civil rights bills, for Asians or for white males, for whomever, I am not in favor of giving anybody an unfair advantage, I am in favor of giving everybody an equal opportunity.

It seems to me that incorporating the remarks made by my friends, both from New Jersey and Oregon, and the distinguished gentlewoman who will not be allowed to vote—you know, they fought a war about that. It was called taxation without representation. The people who threw the tea in the Boston Harbor were angry.

All that King of England had to do was give them some members in the Parliament, and this would still be a part of Great Britain, just like Canada, or just like Canada used to be.

Just think about that. These people live right here and they work for us, they work with us, they work around us, and they do not have the right to elect representatives to the Parliament. I am not suggesting that they have a Boston Tea Party. I am just thinking in passing.

But one day, the problem is, and I am going to sit down, the problem is unfortunately as human beings, some people

need to think that they are better than somebody else. Some people need that. Some people think that they need to feel that they are better than somebody else. They compare themselves. They say, I am younger than he is, I am better looking than he is, I am this race or that race.

We do not know what God looks like. God might be a black woman. If so, there are a whole lot of people that are going to be in a whole lot of trouble.

It does not matter, though. We are all God's children. As my friend from Oregon said, all these people around the world are looking at us.

We just got through fighting a war so that more people would look at us. We hold ourselves out and stand on the pedestal as exemplifying what freedom and equality really means.

I wonder how many times the Members come up here and just read the words that are etched into the base of the platform. One says "Union," one says "Justice," and one says "Tolerance." I do not know what the one over there on the Republican side says. I do not go over there too much.

But you think those words are just written there to be hollow, or do they really mean something? Is this our prayer?

Why do we have to pass a watered down civil rights bill, if civil rights is fair, if it is what this country was founded upon? How are we going to tell the people in Czechoslovakia, yes, we have freedom over here, but everybody is not free. Women are free to do certain things, but they are not free from discrimination in the workplace. People can make unwanted sexual advances toward women, regardless of their race, and we have a chance to do something about it. We knew it existed, and we had a chance to do something about it, and we did not do anything.

But we are the last of the law. This is the end of the line. I came from a State legislature where I could always put off problems on either the city council or the Congress. This is the end of the line, the buck stops here. If we do not do something about it, nobody is going to do anything about it.

The people out there want freedom. They do not want black people to have an unfair advantage, they do not want Hispanics or anybody else to have an unfair advantage. But you look at the polls. They want everybody to have the same opportunity. They need to know that right now this bill provides that a woman, in order to have a remedy, she has to quit her job or be fired, or put up with sexual harassment in America, in 1991, and that ain't right.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for yielding. If the occasion arises, I am going to sit here and listen to his eloquent statement, but, if there is enough time left, I would like to share some more thoughts with you.

Mr. MFUME. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] again for his eloquence on this very special issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to quite a bit of the debate and discussion tonight, more discussion than debate, on the subject of civil rights. I would reiterate the call of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] for those Members of Congress who have a differing opinion on this issue, to please come and join us now in this discussion, so that we might in fact have genuine and real and enlightened debate. It will not mean very much to many people tomorrow when those who seek to come and demogogue this issue run into this well for 30 seconds and quote all sorts of superlatives, and then run back to their seat and vote no on civil rights.

So for those Members of Congress who are in fact watching and listening tonight, we will be here, and we offer you the opportunity to come and debate the merits of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the real tragedies that calls our attention to this debate is the fact that there are so many people in this society who, through no fault of their own, find themselves deprived of basic civil rights.

□ 1940

I met a woman in Baltimore the other day who had just come back from the Persian Gulf. She is 21 years of age, left a daughter to go there, was there for almost 6 months, fought to defend the Government of Kuwait, watched some of her friends get wounded in the process, lost what little job she had back home that she did part time when she was not in the Reserves, lost 6 months of her daughter's life to serve her Nation and to answer the charge of the Commander in Chief to go and bear arms to defend the Government of Kuwait.

She asked in her own way, rather humble and yet defiant, she said, "Can you tell me, Congressman, how it is that I have gone and spent this time serving my country, halfway around the globe, to live on sand and to eat out of cans for 6 months, to go without any form or sense of entertainment, to work from can't see in the morning till can't see at night, to do my duty as a citizen and as a member of these Armed Forces, can you tell me why is it that I have to come back now to my daughter, who perhaps one day will have a daugther of her own, and to come back to my city of Baltimore and my country, the United States of America, and find now in 1991 that, after having gone and defended the civil rights and the civil liberties and to protect the Kuwaitis and their government, that I come back now without many civil rights of my own, with one to sound the clarion call for me, with no one prepared to bear arms to defend and to protect my rights as a citizen of this country?"

She said, "How is it that fate would be so cruel?"

I had no reply.

That is the real irony in this debate and this discussion that has gone on too long. I served with the gentleman from Texas last year on the Committee on Education and Labor and was appointed, as he was, by the Speaker to serve as a conferee on the civil rights bill of 1990. We went into that conference hoping and really believing that this was going to be unlike other political meanderings around here, that this subject was so sacred to the fundamental rights of the Nation and of the Nation's conscience that there would not be any game playing on civil rights.

But as time began to go by and the first day turned into the second and the second turned into the third, there were clear indications that the White House and all who were a part of that house had no real intentions on moving a civil rights bill. And those who were in the President's most sacred and inner circle began to suggest to him that whatever the Congress came up with, he ought to veto because it in some way was meant to construe or to suggest the implementation of quotas.

Day 3 turned into day 4, and the White House, understanding that it had no intentions of signing that bill, began to play with those of us who were part of the conference. And they would send a messenger up here to Capitol Hill and say, "The President would like to sign the bill, but we think you ought to change this provision."

And because we all wanted to be responsible and play evenhandedly with the President and the White House, after having gone through a rather hand-wrenching and heart-wrenching experience in committee and in conference, we agreed and we worked with the White House to the extent that we met them on the road with that compromise and we made it a part of the conference report.

And day 5 turned into day 6 and into day 7, and the White House called again and said, "Well, you know, the President really would like to sign a civil rights bill, but we would appreciate it if you would change this provision because he doesn't like it and we don't think it is right."

And there was more resistance building in the conference committee because we had gone out and we had met him on the road once, and we were waiting, quite frankly, for the President to meet us. But after hours of debate and discussions and all sorts of considerations, we moved again to seek to compromise to meet the President halfway. And day 8 turned into day 9.

Finally, with this talk of quotas, there came another call from the White House that said, "Well, you know, we think this is a quota bill and we cannot support it, but the President would love to sign the civil rights bill if you would just change the language."

And so the conferees got together and put in the preamble of the bill the fact that it was not to be construed as a quota bill, that there were not requirements to make it a quota bill. It was not my language. It was not the language of the gentleman from Texas. It was the language of the White House verbatim. And we put that into the bill. We met the President again on the road halfway for the third time.

And 1 week turned into 2 weeks, and we came before this body, under the leadership of GUS HAWKINS and through a rather long and interesting debate, this House finally had a chance to work its will. And there was legitimate dispute on both sides of the issue, and there were amendments to the bill. And people wanted to amend the conference report, but the House worked its will and Representatives from all over this Nation, who represent every nook and cranny, every hamlet, every town, and every city had a chance at long last to vote on a civil rights bill.

So we on the third week sent that bill down to the White House. We had compromised. We had been responsible, we thought. And we were in great anticipation that the President would, in fact, do what he said he would do when he sent compromise after compromise to Capitol Hill.

Well, what the President did was to carve himself a rather infamous place in the history of this Nation by becoming only the second President in this century to veto a civil rights bill. The President's decision was ill-conceived and the President was ill-advised. And that day of infamy is in many respects the worst day of his Presidency.

The Senate, where the bill originated, the other body convened to work its will and to seek to override. And on October 24, 1990, with David Dukes, former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan in the Gallery of the Senate, the other body failed by one vote, one vote to override the veto of this President. They voted to sustain it. And for the other body, that was the darkest day of the 101st Congress.

So we got to this point not by accident. We do not come here this evening for forum or fashion. We recognize that there is an evil and a sinister wind blowing down on Pennsylvania Avenue.

I said on the evening of October 24 that I gave President Bush the benefit of the doubt, that I believed in my heart and in the innermost parts of my being that he really wanted to do the right thing. I conceded to him the benefit of the doubt.

□ 1950

Mr. Speaker, I believed that the President, on his second chance, would, in fact, do the right thing. So the sadness in my heart this evening, for all of you around this country watching this discussion, is not because there are persons advising the President who may be sinister as it relates to civil rights, it is not because there is a body of misinformation and disinformation that is swelling all across this Nation in newspaper headlines and on the TV channels, because none of that really matters. The sadness is the fact that this President, who knows better, continues to argue, erroneously so, that this is a quota bill. Shame on you, Mr. President. You know better. And I know you know better.

I defy anyone in the White House to come to this body and to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the bill we have before us is, in fact, a quota bill. I defy you. And I know you are watching this debate, all of you who have advised the President, all of you who, in your own way, recognize not the virtue of the merits of the bill but who recognize the political capital if you can continue to confuse and divide and separate the public by having them believe that women and persons of African and Hispanic ancestry are going to somehow benefit at the detriment of others. Shame on you. You know better, I know you know better.

And so we are back in many respects to the shell game that the gentleman from Texas spoke about earlier. It is also a media game. It is the old confusion about who is on first. We have to come to this point in our time as a nation visiting this very serious issue, because we have not learned the lesson of Lincoln, who reminded us that a house divided against itself cannot stand, because we have not learned the lesson of Martin Luther King, who reminded us that we are confronted with the fierce urgency of now, and that in this unfolding conundrum of life and history that there really is such a thing as being too late, and that procrastination is still the great thief of time.

We are here because too often philosophically and ideologically we are stifled and stymied and stultified by those in our number who pontificate but do not produce, by those who confuse the issues but will not clarify, by those who seek but will not serve, and by those who harm and ruin the preservation of our rich history and culture as a nation by refusing to hang onto the basic lessons of it, yet we must be the ones, those here and all of you who are at home who close the gap between what we really say and between what we really do, we must not only lecture by example, we must set examples.

We must be prepared to reject the nonsense, the propaganda that has surrounded this issue by cutting through it in a clear and concise way with what the facts are. Civil rights.

You know, in 1848 in a speech delivered in Edwardsville, IL, Abraham Lincoln addressed these words to his countrymen, and he said, "When you have succeeded in dehumanizing the Negro, when you have put him down and made it but for him to be but as a beast of the field, when you have extinguished his soul in this world and placed him where the ray of hope is blown out as in the darkness of the damned, are you quite sure that the demons you have roused will not turn and rend you? What constitutes," he asks, "the bulwark of our freedom and of our independence? It is not our crown embattlements. It is not our bristling seacoast, or armies or our navies. They are not our reliance against tyranny," said Lincoln. "For all of those may be turned against us without having made us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance," he said, "is in the spirit of freedom which prides itself as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy that spirit," he admonished, "and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doorstep. Ignore," he said, "the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them; accustom to trample on the rights of others, and yuou have lost, my fellow countrymen, the creative genius of your own independence, and as such become the fit subjects for the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Lincoln's words, uttered over 143 years ago, have gone unheeded. Poverty, despair, hunger, homelessness, degradation, deprivation, denial and disprivilege are still a part of the American fabric in the greatest nation on Earth.

You know, someone came to me and said, "Congressman, you did not answer that woman's question. She said that she had left her daughter and her own family and her part-time job and had gone over to silently sit in the sands of Saudi Arabia and that she was there for 6 months and that in that period of time she had to real recreation, she worked from 'Can't see in the morning to can't see at night,' and she was prepared to defend and to protect the sovereignty and the civil rights and the human rights of Kuwaitis, and you did not answer her question, Congressman. She wanted to know why is it that she would come back here 6 months later in the greatest nation on Earth after having protected the civil rights of Kuwaitis, with no civil rights of her own or for her daughter or her daughter's daughter. You did not answer her question."

I do not know, quite frankly, what else African-ancestry or Hispanic-ancestry Americans must do to exhibit their faith in the American dream or in the American possibility. Our fathers and brothers have answered every call to bear arms, to defend liberties that

we never really had. The bodies of black and Hispanic men are buried around the globe in the soil of every nation as witness and testimony to preserving a democracy that they never fully enjoyed.

Our parents have begged on bended knees to be accorded the most elementary of human rights. We have peacefully assembled and petitioned for the redress of our grievances. We sat in, stood in, slept in, studied in, and prayed in. We have waged our struggle as Martin Luther King taught, nonviolently. We have appealed to the Nation's morality and to the Nation's conscience.

The result, too often, has been bloodied heads and broken limbs, bombed churches and burned homes, assassinated leaders and murdered followers, broken spirits and crippled hopes.

And so when I say we did not come here accidentally tonight to arrive at this point, understand that we did not, and when we challenge, as we do, those Members of this House who will argue that the civil rights bill is no more than a quota bill, to come here tonight and to defend that twisted position, we do not do it out of some twisted desire to have competition. We believe that a spirited debate, an intellectual debate on the real issues and substance of this bill will yield unto all of the American people who are watching the debate the understanding that the civil rights bill is as American as apple pie.

□ 2000

That the protections afforded to women and minorities are basic protections. They were not guaranteed with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. They were guaranteed when the Founding Fathers got together and wrote the Preamble to the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence and all the other pronouncements that they issued, to justify their revolution against tyranny. That is why we are here, and that is why we challenge those who will dispute the necessity of this great bill, the need of this bill, and the protection of all those women and all those minorities in this country, not to have something special.

We are not seeking an edge up. We do not want any guarantees. We do not want any person to give anything to women or to minorities. We just want an even playing field, because we believe it is the American thing to do.

Tomorrow, many citizens all across this Nation, and some citizens across this world will watch almost 8 hours of debate on the bill and on amendments to the bill. The citizens will see during that debate a number of our colleagues come and argue that this bill is now somehow bad. Remember to challenge them when they come back to your hometown. Remember to challenge them. Have those Members prove it. Dare to defy the authority that they represent. Make them understand that voting against this bill does not move this Nation forward. It moves this Nation back.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield once again to my friend and colleague from the State of Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] as we prepare to wrap up discussion on the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

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

When I was a lawyer I learned a couple of things. One of them, do not ever ask one question too many; and I think with that, do not make one statement too many. There is nothing I can probably say that could improve upon the statement that the gentleman has made on behalf of and in defense of civil rights, on this occasion. However, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy before we shut down.

Does the gentleman think that the people who care about this issue, if they are watching tonight, or if they are watching their television sets tomorrow, does the gentleman in the well think they would be interested in something like the truth?

Mr. MFUME. I think they would be very interested in the truth. The tragedy of it all is that many have been given lies dressed up as the truth in such a way that it is hard to discern which way is up and which way is down, which way is in and which way is out in this bill, and that those who have made the decision to watch this debate this evening in their homes probably thirst for the truth. That is why they are watching.

The other tragedy is that they have not had the opportunity to hear the other side of the debate. We have issued a challenge. The challenge has gone unheard. I think and I believe in my heart that people across this Nation, Americans, are held together by a common bond and a common thread. That is the understanding that we are only as good as our neighbors. We can only rise as high as our friends. We are only as trustworthy as our families, and that we who have this awesome privilege to serve in this House, that we owe them the truth, if we owe them nothing else.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Does the gentleman think that someone who would be interested in the position, say, one who would say that this a quota bill, should, then, before the American public, because I think that fundamentally probably 80 to 90 percent of the people in this country would be happy if we had a system that was completely fair. They do not want one group to have an advantage over another. We have gone through civil rights in the 1950's and the 1960's, but by 1991 I dare say if we took a referendum on it in the country, probably 85 to 90 percent of the people on the straight-up question, do you think we should have laws that guarantee an equal opportunity to every person in the workplace, would probably agree with that, and they are troubled by this notion about quotas, as the gentleman has so eloquently talked about.

If I were a citizen at home, and I were watching my Congressman or Congresswoman up tomorrow during debate, and they kept using the word "quota," there are some people who think they can brainwash people by saying something over and over again, long enough, putting it in all your speeches, and they get up and talk about the sky being pink, and suddenly it will have a certain shade of pink. It is the power of suggestion which is powerful, especially when people look to Members, because we have been elected to public office.

This podium can be used for good or evil. Sometimes people use it, in my judgment, improperly. However, suppose that they see their Members of Congress up here saying that it is a quota bill, but not saying why. Does the gentleman think of those people, because really the explanation is for them. The explanation the gentleman in the well is giving now, for why he will vote for the bill, is for his constituents. It is to explain it to the larger world what is right and what is wrong as the gentleman sees it. It seems to me that if they call area code 202, 224-3124, which is the Capitol switchboard—I cannot give out Members' offices anymore. I did that last year and I got in trouble. However, I think it is still legal under the rules to advise the people on whose behalf we are here that they have a way of addressing their thoughts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). The Chair would remind all Members that it is not in order to direct remarks in debate primarily to a television viewing audience.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I thank the Speaker. My question was a question perhaps the Speaker misunderstood.

I will ask the gentleman, if a constituent were to call area code 202, 224-3121, they would get the Capitol switchboard, would they not?

Mr. MFUME. That is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If the citizens live in Congressman WASHINGTON'S district, they could ask the switchboard to connect them with my office?

Mr. MFUME. That is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. So, if I got up here and I said that this bill did thus and so and I never attempt to prove how it did thus and so and they arrive at the conclusion I was giving a political answer, in other words, not telling them the truth, they could contact my office in that way, and perhaps persuade me if enough of them called, if they could talk to me personally, they may be able to change my vote on this bill tomorrow?

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct, and I would go a step farther to argue that in asking that of their particular Representative, it would also be good to ask them to prove that it is a quota bill.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Just giving an example, they started out saying it was a quota bill, and said it was really not a quota bill, but will lead to quotas. Any person who is elected to public office ought to be intelligent enough to make a hypothetical question to bear that out. In my judgment, any person who is intelligent enough to be elected to the United States House of Representatives, ought to be able to say here is a hypothetical situation, XYZ Employment Co., John Jones comes to apply for a job. He takes the test, he does this. The problem is, they cannot do that. It is impossible. They have not done it since they branded the bill in 1990 a "quota" bill. From that day to this John Sununu or any of the rest of them have not been able to articulate in a clear, hypothetical example, even this is how this will yield quotas. Quotas mean x number of jobs go to white people, x number of jobs go to black people. If we had to vote on whether we were going to integrate the schools, they would say that was quotas because that means instead of having all black kids in one school and all white kids in another school, they put the schools together, so that would be a quota to them, would it not?

Mr. MFUME. I believe the gentleman is correct, and interestingly enough, the three substitutes that we will have an opportunity to vote on tomorrow, H.R. 1 as substituted by Towns and Schroeder state, "That nothing in the bill shall be construed to require or to encourage an employer to adopt hiring or promotional quotas."

□ 2010

The other substitute, the Brooks-Fish substitute, explicitly prohibits the use of quotas by employers, stipulating that the use of quotas is an unlawful employment practice; but interestingly enough, this bill I have here from the White House, this same White House that makes this quota argument, has absolutely no language and no provisions relating to quotas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. What?

Mr. MFUME. The quota bill is the White House bill, and I challenge them to come here to prove me wrong. There is nothing in their bill that prohibits quotas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Surely the gentleman has misread the bill. Somewhere down in there must be a first-degree felony. I mean, if you want to prohibit quotas, make it a crime. Surely the White House version says a person who hires based upon racial quotas shall go to the penitentiary for life. It is in there somewhere. It has got to be.

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is incorrect. The White House civil rights bill makes no provisions to outlaw or make unlawful quotas.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Well, will the gentleman explain to me then if the White House bill does not prohibit quotas, if we were to pass the White House bill and the bill last year was going to result in quotas, would not the White House bill result in quotas?

Mr. MFUME. The White House bill would result in quotas even quicker.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Because there is no prohibition against quotas, so really it encourages quotas.

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Is that what you call speaking with a forked tongue?

Mr. MFUME. Either that or the old shell game.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Either one of which means that the people lose again.

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct, and that is why it is so very important for individuals across this Nation who are watching this discussion to really look at what we are dealing with and to read for themselves or to challenge their Member of Congress to make this information available.

The gentleman from Texas and I were going back in a rather friendly way to talk about the absolute omission of quota language in the White House bill.

Mr. Speaker, that is the truth. It does not exist in the bill that the White House has called its "civil rights alternative," but it does exist. Not only does it prohibit it, it makes it unlawful in the civil rights bill that this body will have a chance to vote on tomorrow.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Let me ask the gentleman from Maryland a question, if he will yield further.

In today's New York Times on page A-14 there was an objective evenhanded analysis of everything that touches every Member, and the people out there in the world will not have an opportunity to read what the gentleman from Maryland has in his hand, but they can read the newspapers. I dare say in every major newspaper there is an outline of the three major proposals that the Congress will have to vote on tomorrow. So it seems to me this is an opportunity for the people to have a chance to have their voices heard. If they think that the quota substitute is best, then call their Member of Congress and tell them so. If they think that the White House version, which will produce quotas, is the best way, then they ought to tell their Congressman and tell them that; but in the newspaper, the New York Times, page A-14, today's paper, there is an excellent side-by-side, if you will, comparison that addresses it as far as impact, it addresses quotas, it addresses discrimination and harassment, the reopening of old discrimination cases and adjustment of employment tests.

Does the gentleman think this would be good reading for the people out there before they call their Member of Congress?

Mr. MFUME. I think the gentleman makes a point that is worth repeating. It would make excellent reading, particularly given the importance historically and otherwise of this legislation.

Mr. WASHINGTON. May I ask the gentleman one final thing. Will the gentleman be here tomorrow for the purpose of guarding and protecting the people's rights with that Diogenes lamp that the gentleman so often carries around? Will the gentleman be here to ensure that the truth comes out when people get up on this side of the aisle or on that side of the aisle and use the word "quotas," will the gentleman be here to ask them to yield so that they will tell the truth for the American people one time on one day? And if they do not yield, what does that say?

If I get up here and say that I have a watermelon in my pocket and I will not yield to you to ask me any questions about it and my pockets are not fat, the people can figure that out for themselves, can they not?

Mr. MFUME. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the colloquy.

Let me just say that we have been here for several hours this evening to try to argue the merits of the Civil Rights Act of 1991. Quite frankly, I am a bit disappointed that the critics of that bill have not chosen to come and to be a part of this discussion.

Mr. WASHINGTON. They never showed up?

Mr. MFUME. They never showed. However, be that as it may, those all across this Nation who understand and feel in their hearts why this is important and perhaps those all across this Nation who wonder what in the world should I be interested in this bill about, please understand that what we are dealing with is not just a piece of legislation. We are getting ready to write for all intents and purposes the direction of our great Nation on the issue of civil rights for a very, very long time to come.

I have not given up on the American ideal or on the American possibility, and I ask all of you not to give up also.

I am convinced that this Nation still stands before the world as perhaps the last expression of a possibility of man devising a social order where justice is the supreme ruler and law is but its instrument, where freedom is the dominant creed and order, but it is principle, where equity is the common

practice and fraternity the common human condition.

It is also my conviction that we might be the last generation of Americans that has the real opportunity to help our Nation fulfill its promise and to realize its possibility.

Our generation may be the last generation to be afforded another chance, another chance to balance the scales of justice and make them equal, another chance to confront the doors of opportunity and make them open, another chance to seize the chains of bondage and set and break them free.

So if we have not done anything else tonight, we have come to you as only we know how in this humble and sincere way to say, understand the magnitude of what will occur here tomorrow.

Oh, few will remember what we say tomorrow, but all will remember what we do, and that is why it is so vital, so extremely urgent and necessary that we move for passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and that this President, who is our President, understands that to be the President of all the people you must understand that the protection of the rights of all the people is in fact paramount and that fairness ought to be the measure by which we go about dissecting and analyzing this legislation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, 215 years ago the Founding Fathers of this Nation made an initial commitment to the concept of equality in the words of the Declaration of Independence. This hallowed document affirmed that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

For almost a century following, the fulfillment of that concept of equality was restricted, with few exceptions, only to white males who were not Catholics or Jews. However, with the advent of Jacksonian democracy and new generations of immigrants, people of conscience began to question the oppression, intolerance, bigotry, and economic elitism that precluded inclusion of all America's inhabitants in the promise of American life—the right to be free citizens with equal opportunity for all—regardless of race, creed, gender, national origin, or political preference.

One hundred thirty years ago this Nation entered into one of the bloodiest civil wars in any nation's history—for the ultimate goals of ending the obscenity of slavery and expanding the frontiers of freedom for all of America's minorities. The passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 1870, and 1875 guaranteed political freedom and economic equality not only for blacks—but also for Jews, Catholics, Hispanics, Asians, Eastern Europeans—and ultimately, for all women, because these laws also made possible the subsequent passage of the 19th amendment, which guaranteed the electoral franchise for all women.

However, a century later, the minorities and women of this country were still striving to obtain their rightful place at the table of equal opportunity. Thousands had been murdered and millions deprived of their fundamental rights in the collective crusade for social and economic justice. As Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., pleaded on their behalf in his famous speech at the Lincoln Memorial on 28 August 1963:

> We have come here today to dramatize a shameful condition. In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificant words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, Black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Dr. King went on to say:

> It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check; a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds."

But Dr. King then went on to espouse our most cherished desire, saying:

> I have a dream that my four little children [including two girls] will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

The subsequent passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968 were landmark laws in the struggle for equal justice and opportunity. One can only conjecture how much grief this Nation—and this Congress—would have been spared if all the laws cited above had been fully and fairly implemented—with justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic, harsh reality is that we are here today because those laws have not been fully and fairly implemented during the past decade.

The bill before us tomorrow is a legislative effort to undo the injustices inflicted upon American justice brought on by the U.S. Supreme Court decision in 1989. It is an effort to return this Congress and the Federal courts to the integrity and intent of the legislation that was enacted in 1964—legislation that deliberately designed to ensure equality of opportunity in the workplace for women, minorities, and the physically disadvantaged throughout this land.

Mr. Speaker, it is a national shame that, in the year 1991 A.D. we even need to be here in this hall again attempting to undo this injustice.

Five months ago the leadership of this House made a priority commitment to the cause of gender and racial justice by designating this legislation as H.R. 1. I applaud the focus and efforts of the leadership. However, in the months since, I have become increasingly dismayed as I have watched the effects of the negotiations which were perceived to be necessary in order to allay the fears of those who felt that H.R. 1 is a quota bill. I am also saddened by such compromises as making the monetary compensatory damages for women and religious minorities less than for the minorities who succeed in winning discrimination suits in the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the Towns-Schroeder substitute to H.R. 1. It is not an attempt to break new ground, but rather to restore the even playing field that has been deliberately tilted against minorities and women in recent years. It is an effort to force this Congress and the country at large to live up to the professed ideals that still make America the land of promise for so many who strive for true freedom and equality of opportunity in this society.

The time to end the politicization of this issue is way overdue. Those who look to the thirty-second campaign ads as the ultimate goal of their civil rights agenda must rise above the distortions and the rhetoric to a new plane: A civil rights bill that recognizes we are all created equal—we must all be given the tools to fairly pursue life, liberty, and happiness.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SNOWE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of her accompanying members of the Base Closure Commission to a site visit at Loring Air Force Base in Maine.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 15 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. STUDDS, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mr. SKELTON, for 60 minutes, on June 11.

Mr. RUSSO, for 60 minutes each day, on June 5 and 6.

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

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, on June 6.

Mr. BORSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. MACHTLEY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. PURSELL

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

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

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mrs. LLOYD in five instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. PENNY.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 31, 1991:

H.R. 2127. A bill to amend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to extend the programs of such act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 4, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1425. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the report of expenditures of appropriations during the period October 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 162b; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1426. A letter from the Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the effects of the fiscal year 1991–97 Navy shipbuilding and repair programs on U.S. private shipyards and the supporting industrial base for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1427. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for the SD–8A and SD–8B Dragon antitank missile warheads, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1428. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed hardware license and technical assistance agreement for support of the ASTRA 1C and 1D Commercial Communications Satellite Program, which is between Hughes Communications International Inc., and the Societe Europeene des Satellites of Luxembourg (Transmittal No. 36–91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1429. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on developments since his last report of November 29, 1990, concerning the national emergency with respect to Iran, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) (H. Doc. No. 102–98); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting an invitation from the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Republic of Moldova to attend a June conference in the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1431. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a public report made to the President entitled "Public Diplomacy in a New Europe"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1432. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the annual report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1433. A letter from the Director, ACTION, transmitting the two semiannual reports covering the 6-month period ending March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1434. A letter from the Chairman, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1435. A letter from the Federal Intermediate Credit bank of Jackson, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1990, for the Production Credit Associations Retirement Plan, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1436. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report for the period October 1, 1990 to March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1437. A letter from the Acting Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1439. A letter from the Chairman, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the semiannual report for the period October 1, 1990 through March 31, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1440. A letter from the Public Printer, transmitting the semiannual report of the Inspector General, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3903 (102 Stat. 2531); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1441. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Vessel Bridge-to-Bridge Radiotelephone Act (33 U.S.C. 1203); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1442. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation to establish conditions for personnel with specialized skills to be deployed overseas without completing a 12-week training period; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1443. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting a report on the budgetary treatment of deposit insurance, pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 1003(b) (103 Stat. 509); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Government Operations.

1444. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the second of two reports on global climate change entitled "Policy Options for Stabilizing Global Climate"; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

1445. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on government-sponsored enterprises (GAO/GGO–91–90, May 1991), pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 1004(e) (103 Stat. 510); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, and Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-57, Pt. 2) Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 162. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 1, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to restore and strengthen civil rights laws that ban discrimination in employment, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-83). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 476. A bill to designate certain rivers in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 990. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for land acquisition at Monocacy National Battlefield, MD; with an amendment (Rept. 102-85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1642. A bill to establish in the State of Texas the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Site, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1323. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating certain segments of the Allegheny River in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 292. An act to expand the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument (Rept. 102-88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1514. A bill to disclaim or relinquish all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands conditionally relinquished to the United States under the Act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 11, 36), and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-89, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. S. 483. An act entitled the "Taconic Mountains Protection Act of 1991" (Rept. 102-90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1720. A bill to amend the Saint Elizabeths Hospital and District of Columbia Mental Health Services Act to permit the Secretary of Health and Human Services to enter into an agreement with the Mayor of the District of Columbia with respect to capital improvements necessary for the delivery of mental health services in the District, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2123. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to establish a predictable and equitable method for determining the amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia (Rept. 102-92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRAXLER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2519. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 2474. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Armed Services for a period ending not later than June 5, 1991, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(c), Rule X (Rept. 102-93, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X:

H.R. 2038. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than June 5, 1991.

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. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2507. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey):

H.R. 2508. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANNEMEYER:

H.R. 2509. A bill to provide for a resumption of the gold standard; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. FAWELL):

H.R. 2510. A bill to deny nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation) trade treatment to the products of India; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NUSSLE, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. SANDERS):

H.R. 2511. A bill to prohibit the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve, and other Government agencies from providing any form of direct or indirect assistance to cover foreign deposits; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 2512. A bill to encourage informed compliance, implement the National Customs Automation Program, and otherwise improve the administration of the customs laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEASE (for himself, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 2513. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a demonstration project under which Medicare beneficiaries may enter into agreements with suppliers of certain items of durable medical equipment to obtain items other than the standard version of the items for which payment may be made under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYLIE (for himself and Mr. AUCOIN):

H.R. 2514. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to extend the requirement for reciprocity in the approval of housing subdivisions; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. HORN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to gross vehicle weights on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and title 49, United States Code with respect to commercial motor vehicle combination lengths, on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and other highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 2516. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain facilities in the Wenatchee National Forest, WA; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. FIELDS):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an interagency program for trauma research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 2518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of 1994 and later model year passenger vehicles that are equipped with air bags, and to impose an excise tax on such vehicles that are not equipped with air bags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. LONG, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VOLKMER, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the American public should observe the 100th anniversary of moviemaking and recognize the contributions of the American Film Institute in advocating and preserving the art of film; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 163. Resolution condemning violence in Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

154. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to support for the Baltic Republics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the POW/MIA special investigation conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; to the Committee on Government Operations.

156. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the POW/MIA truth bill; to the Committee on Government Operations.

157. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to American service personnel missing in action; to the Committee on Government Operations.

158. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Social Security funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

159. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the low-income home energy assistance program; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

160. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the new Canadian permit regulations; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Foreign Affairs.

161. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the U.S. Armed Forces in Iraq; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 20: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 25: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Ms. HORN, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 44: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 66: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FISH, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 147: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 187: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 317: Mr. HUCKABY and Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 330: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 392: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. PEASE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. COX of Illinois, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 413: Mr. HANSEN, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 416: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 430: Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 565: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 644: Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 661: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 670: Mr. GLICKMAN and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 676: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 714: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 722: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 723: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 780: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 905: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 911: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LENT, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. PEASE.

H.R. 967: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1110: Mr. TORRES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1126: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. REED, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 1130: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1132: Mr. CLAY and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 1133: Mr. ECKART, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 1134: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 1147: Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. FISH, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1218: Mr. RAY, Mr. FISH, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1226: Mr. FISH and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1241: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PORTER and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 1242: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1245: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. FISH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 1293: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1304: Mr. VENTO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. REGULA, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 1305: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 1335: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RAY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1343: Mr. NAGLE and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1364: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1365: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MOODY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 1367: Mr. SABO and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1380: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.R. 1385: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1392: Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1411: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. ROE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. FISH, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1433: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1445: Mr. CAMP and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 1456: Mr. HYDE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 1472: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 1481: Mr. RITTER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MCCANDLESS.

H.R. 1495: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KYL, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MORRISON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 1497: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1506: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1509: Mr. PRICE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FAWELL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 1554: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1557: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1559: Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 1603: Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1696: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1703: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1711: Mrs. BRYON.

H.R. 1724: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1752: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1816: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FISH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MFUME, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 1879: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1883: Mr. LUKEN and Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 1916: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 1936: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 1967: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1992: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2001: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 2008: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 2031: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2056: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FISH, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2081: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 2089: Mr. MFUME and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2099: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FISH, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 2115: Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2123: Mr. DERRICK, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SABO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DIXON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2126: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2194: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 2235: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 2242: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. YATES, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2248: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2257: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. KYL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 2258: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2280: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WYLIE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. PAXON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2291: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 2294: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2327: Mr. PARKER, Mr. BACCHUS, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2330: Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 2336: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2389: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 2397: Mr. PETRI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 2405: Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 2406: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. ROSE, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2448: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALLON, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WILSON, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2454: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 2456: Mr. YATES and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. RHODES, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 66: Ms. SNOWE and Mr. WISE.

H.J. Res. 80: Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 91: Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. REED, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 95: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 156: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. KASICH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FISH, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.J. Res. 219: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MOODY, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WISE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. YATES, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. CALLAHAN, Ms. LONG, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. BARNARD.

H.J. Res. 233: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 262: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. ROTH.

H. Con. Res. 93: Mr. MORAN.

H. Con. Res. 103: Mr. EMERSON.

H. Con. Res. 136: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. VENTO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FISH, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 152: Mr. HORTON, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. FROST, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FISH.

H. Res. 115: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H. Res. 121: Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Res. 134: Mr. FISH.

H. Res. 141: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H. Res. 152: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. RIGGS.

H. Res. 155: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, and Mr. BONIOR.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

85. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Federal Parliament of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, relative to changes in Central and Eastern Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. Also, petition of the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization, Clearwater, FL, relative to the Federal gas tax revenue for nontransportation purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LET'S CLOSE DOWN THE WALSH INVESTIGATION

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues who were fortunate to have read Charles Dickens when they were growing up may remember a novel called "Bleak House."

It concerned a case he called Jarndyce versus Jarndyce, which went through the courts for generations, ruined lives, destroyed reputations, drove people literally insane, enriched lawyers, and after all that, never got resolved.

The modern day sequel to that case is being prosecuted by Independent Counsel Lawrence Walsh. The cases against the so-called Iran Contra defendants have now dragged on for the better part of 5 years—longer than the American Civil War, have cost the taxpayer as much as $35 million, and in the end will have done little but enrich a bunch of lawyers.

Four years ago, when the congressional investigation of the Iran Contra affair was winding down, I said that the investigation went on too long and yielded too few results. Nothing that's happened since then has changed my judgment.

Last Monday the Supreme Court made a ruling which one might have hoped would put an end to this legal farce. Yet it appears that even in the face of hopeless odds, Mr. Walsh will hunker down and drag the defendants through the mud as long as he can.

Last July 24, I wrote Attorney General Richard Thornburgh to begin actions to terminate the office of Independent Counsel in this case.

I pointed out in the letter that the "Iran Contra affair has been thoroughly investigated; we've paid for two congressional committees, a Presidential Commission, and an independent counsel; and scores of lawyers, accountants and investigators have pored over the documents, interviewed hundreds of witnesses, and issued report after report."

Last Thursday, I sent a new letter to the Attorney General urging him once again to begin actions to terminate Mr. Walsh. This time I believe the message will carry additional gravity because it is cosigned by some of the most senior Members in the House of Representatives.

The cosigners were my colleagues, Congressmen ROBERT H. MICHEL, NEWT GINGRICH, GERALD SOLOMON, JERRY LEWIS, GUY VANDER JAGT, BILL DANNEMEYER, HENRY HYDE, ROBERT DORNAN, TOM BLILEY, BILL MCCOLLUM, MIKE OXLEY, MICKEY EDWARDS, DUNCAN HUNTER, and VIN WEBER.

If ever there were a right moment to fire Mr. Walsh, this is it. In light of last Monday's Supreme Court ruling I suspect Mr. Walsh might even privately welcome such an outcome.

With his termination papers in hand, he could argue for years to come that if only he had a few more months or years to pursue the cases, if only the Supreme Court hadn't raised all those constitutional hurdles, if only * * *.

The fate of these cases was decided from the very beginning. In the wake of the Iran Contra revelations, there were two alternatives. The allegations could have been pursued through the courts and those convicted, if any, thrown in jail, thereby sending a message to other public servants that they are just as liable to be prosecuted for crimes as anyone else in America.

The second alternative was to publicize the entire affair through televised congressional hearings.

I believe that just about anyone associated with this case knew full well from the beginning that you could do either, but you could not do both.

Mr. Walsh's case was poisoned from the very outset by the congressional hearings. The fact that he has elected to pursue this case for almost 5 years, with the promise of little more in the way of results than ruined reputations and personal bankruptcies for the defendants, is I believe one of the greatest injustices ever perpetrated by the American legal system. What started as a prosecution has turned into a persecution.

There's a time for everything under the Sun, and Mr. Walsh's time has come and gone. Let's wrap this case up, send all those lawyers back into productive jobs, and get this thing behind us.

I believe it is also incumbent on the Congress to ensure that such a legal injustice not happen again. Last year I introduced legislation that would create a 2-year sunset provision for the appointment of an independent counsel, unless an extension is approved.

The bill will make sure that future special prosecutors are not able to conduct endless fishing expeditions.

Among the 19 cosponsors of the bill were all 4 Republican Members serving at that time in Congress who had also served with me on the Iran Contra Committee. They were Congressmen HENRY HYDE, BILL MCCOLLUM, JAMES COURTER, and MICHAEL DEWINE.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will become cosponsors of this important legislation. Only by enacting such a law can we be confident that future special prosecutors will be encouraged to pursue unbiased and thorough investigations of criminal activities against senior Government officials in a prompt, responsible, and cost-effective manner.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE DADE COMMUNITY FOUNDATION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Juan P. Loumiet and the Dade Community Foundation. Mr. Loumiet is the first Cuban-American to be elected chairman of the foundation since it was formed 24 years ago. Featured in Miami Today was an interview with Juan Loumiet discussing his role as the chairman of the Dade Community Foundation.

Q: What's the role of the Dade Community Foundation and how is it evolving under your chairmanship?

A: The purpose is to service the community's endowment. It permits individuals and organizations to establish trust funds for specific and general purposes and to leave a memorial for charitable and social purposes to benefit Dade County and its citizens. These can range from artistic to medical, social and educational purposes.

The great thing about a community foundation is that it's very flexible in its ability to deal with the desires of a donor and to assure that his or her or its wishes will be complied with—really in perpetuity, or as long as Dade County is here.

And it allows individuals of limited wealth to establish philanthropic funds without having to be multi-millionaires or those funds having to be that large. It also permits individuals and corporations to add to existing funds already established by other citizens or organizations for specific purposes.

We have many types of funds that are administered and out of which grants are made. the significant thing about a community foundation is its flexibility and the continuity that it provides.

You also have the ability for organizations to establish advised funds, which may permit organizations—such as our law firm—to gather charitable funds from a number of its members, pool them and then make grants with the advice of the community foundation for worthwhile endeavors. These may range from the University of Miami to the Historical Museum, or any other organization.

Q: Your law firm has such a fund?

A: We have a significant philanthropic fund at the foundation to which all of our partners contribute every year. We pool those funds and, during the following year or years, make commitments with those funds collectively.

Q: Are there any limits on where Dade Community Foundation funds would be channeled?

A: No. We have a general purpose. It's not limited to a social purpose in the sense of something like Camillus House.

The foundation is holding funds right now under the Wolfson Initiative. It held funds at one point that were used to make significant grants from a private developer in Dade

County to community development corporations. So long as the purpose is generally for the benefit of the community in its broadest sense, it complies with our charter. And because we are a public foundation, there are certain tax benefits.

Q: Is the transfer to the community foundation a result of the financial institution which was named trustee itself disappearing?

A: No. The institution we're talking about initially is not disappearing, nor is it unwilling to serve. It's just a realization that after many years perhaps in a particular trust the amount of it makes it very expensive to administer, cutting into the funds that are available for distribution to meet the charitable purposes of the person who selected that financial institution to begin with.

It's really a way to more efficiently and effectively perpetuate the wishes of the individual who created the trust or the fund.

Q: Are there other innovations or a shift in emphasis in the community foundation's activities under your chairmanship?

A: I don't know that I'd say I have a different emphasis. I think the emphasis is to be as multi-cultural and multi-ethnic as possible, because of the nature of our community.

There are certain areas that we're getting more heavily involved in, in which I'm particularly active—non-profit housing being one. That's consuming a great of our time and our effort through a collaborative effort we're engaged in with other organizations in Dade County, the county itself and the Ford Foundation in a consortium for community economic development. It's a much more active role in the non-profit housing and economic development field than the foundation had historically.

That's been prompted in part by a collaborative effort with the Ford Foundation, which has encouraged us and other community foundations around the country to take a more active role and has provided us funds to do so. That's an area in which we find ourselves becoming more and more active and we feel is extremely important in Dade County, as it is in other communities. I serve as the foundation's voting representative on that consortium.

Q: Is that a growing area because of curtailment of government funding for housing?

A: Dade County is a member of the consortium, a very valued member. Obviously there's a movement to curtail funding for these efforts. Part of it is an attempt to create a consortium that will be able to draw on other resources within the community.

There are already very strong, active players in this field—Local Initiatives Support Corp., in this field—Greater Miami Neighborhoods, Homes for South Florida and other organizations. We're trying through that consortium and in other ways to keep the effort going in Dade County, which by the way has a national reputation for effectiveness in the field of non-profit housing that sometimes we don't recognize.

Q: Why do you have a particular interest in housing?

A: I'm a real estate lawyer, but I'm not sure that it's attributable to that, as I don't do it professionally but as a community effort. I believe that you have to build neighborhoods in order to have a viable metropolitan area. I believe the process of building neighborhoods is a continuous one. Both housing and business development are equally important.

But I think that there's a particular benefit when you can afford your citizens, through private efforts or collaborative efforts between private organizations and the government, the opportunity to become homeowners or renters of decent housing. That has an impact on people who live in those neighborhoods that's impossible to measure. So I think it's a very important part of the improvement of the social fabric in this community, as it is in other communities.

Q: How do you feel about having become the first Hispanic to be elected chairman of the foundation?

A: We have some very strong Hispanic—and I use the term because it's a commonly used term, not because it's one that I'm particularly fond of—members on the board, so perhaps it just fell to me first.

I'm proud of it from the standpoint that I have a great deal of pride in the foundation and certainly in its board. To be honored by being asked by the other members to be chairman is a great honor. Considering who the other Hispanic members are, to be asked in lieu of one of them is an even greater honor.

I think it's significant because Dade County is seen in the foundation movement around the country, in which I'm involved to a certain extent, as very much a leader in the process of inclusiveness—inclusiveness not just in the receipt of grants but in the making of grants.

There's a movement across the country to bring members of different ethnic and cultural groups into decision-making in foundations. The Dade Community Foundation has been among the leaders in this. My election as chairman is just a reflection of that.

I am proud to have Mr. Juan Loumiet living in Miami. I am confident that as chairman of the Dade Community Foundation, Mr. Loumiet will be a strong influence in the fulfillment of the foundation's purpose.

HONORING THE BETH JACOB-BETH MIRIAM SCHOOL

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent changes in the Soviet Union have provided new opportunities to thousands of people on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Foremost among them are the Soviet Jewish refugees who have waited many years to enjoy the religious and political freedom for which they have yearned.

Today, I pay tribute to an organization in my district, the Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam School, which has been granted a new cause as a result of glasnost and has used the opportunity to instill new life into its educational mission. For 49 years, the Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam School has nurtured the spiritual and educational qualities of young Jewish men and women. Among its graduates are many prominent educators and community leaders who have perpetuated the values of the Torah ideals. Today, under the guidance of Rabbi Israel Greenberg, the school continues to grow and prosper in the community.

The influx of Soviet Jewish immigrants into the Bronx has challenged the school to maintain its high standards in a new and exciting way. Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam now features courses in English as a second language and vocational training. The Russian students division, under the leadership of Russian-born program director Rabbi Aharon Sirota, has instituted many successful outreach projects. The result has been a successful integration of newly arriving immigrants and a heightened awareness of the local community.

With the help of its many friends in the community, I know the Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam School will continue on its unique task of educating yet another generation of sons and daughters of Israel.

A TRIBUTE TO DEAN SCHABER

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding individual in my congressional district, Mr. Dean Schaber.

A man of tremendous intellect and influence, Dean Schaber is perhaps best known for his contributions to the McGeorge School of Law. In 1957, he became at age 29 the youngest law school dean in the country. In that capacity he has played a major role in the tremendous growth of McGeorge. He oversaw the transplanting of the campus from a two-room school in downtown Sacramento to its present 20-acre site in Oak Park as well as its merger with the University of the Pacific. He developed programs which taught law students the importance of community service, emphasizing the applicability of a legal education to solving societal problems. Under Dean Schaber's leadership, the McGeorge School of Law has risen from an unaccredited night school to an outstanding university whose students' bar examination rates are ranked near the top in California.

On July 1, Dean Schaber will step down as dean of this fine school to which he has devoted so much of his life. According to the American Bar Association, Dean Schaber is the longest serving dean of an accredited American law school. He holds the title of distinguished professor of law and intends to continue his work with both McGeorge and its Stockton-based parent school the University of the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, Dean Schaber has served as an exemplary citizen and I commend him for his many contributions to our local area and to the State of California. I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting this outstanding individual and extending to him our best wishes in all his endeavors.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN KOREA TODAY

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, today I want to call attention to a subject that seems to have slipped from our view, the subject of human rights in the Republic of Korea.

There was a great deal of hope among Members of this body when Chun Doo Hwan ended his Presidency in 1987. Roh Tae Woo was elected in the first direct election in 16 years. Our hopes were buoyed during President Roh's inaugural address when he proclaimed "The day when freedoms and human rights could be slighted in the name of economic growth and national security has ended. The day when repressive force and torture in secret chambers were tolerated is over."

There was progress through 1988, in part due to the publicity surrounding the preparation for the September 1988 Seoul Olympics. After that, things went downhill. According to Asia Watch, since 1989, thousands of people have been arrested and prosecuted for expressing views contrary to those of the government on reunification between North and South Korea or for unauthorized travel to North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD the text of a speech by Cho Seung Hyung before the Congressional Human Rights Foundation. Mr. Cho is a member of the Korean National Assembly and a member of that body's Ethics Committee, charged with investigating human rights abuses on the part of the government. Additionally, Mr. Cho chaired a special parliamentary subcommittee investigating human rights abuses committed during the regime of President Chun Doo Hwan. He is a dedicated fighter for the cause of human rights, and I commend his words to you.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND POLITICAL REALITY IN KOREA TODAY

(Speech by Cho Seung Hyung)

Honorable Representative Lantos, Honorable Representative Porter, distinguished guests, my friends, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for offering me this forum. I would first like to convey a message from my people that we deeply appreciate your continued support for democracy and human rights in Korea.

I am sad to open my remarks today with the troubling message that the human rights situation in South Korea has not improved from the days of Park Chung Hee and Chun Doo Hwan. In fact, it is steadily deteriorating.

DETERIORATING HUMAN RIGHTS CONDITION

As you may have already heard from news media, one of college students protesting the arrest of a student leader was beaten to death in the street by specially trained combat police on April 26, the day before I left Korea. Don't confuse the recent police brutality in Los Angeles with this tragic death, because the death epitomizes the repressive and dark Korean political situation.

Under the rule of President Roh Tae Woo, political oppression and physical torture persists. There are 1,400 political prisoners behind bars in South Korea today—three times the peak number during Chun Doo Hwan's repressive regime.

Neither dissidents nor government critics can speak freely about the reunification of South and North Korea, or study related issues without risking punishment under the oppressive National Security Law. Dissidents who visited North Korea without government permission have been arrested upon returning home and given heavy prison terms. And worse. Recently three dissident leaders traveled to Berlin, where they met with North Koreans and expatriate Koreans from Europe and the U.S. to talk about reunification. Upon their return to Seoul, they were arrested and put on trial although they had prior permission to travel. Labor rights are severely limited. Independent labor unions are repressed. The government prohibits more than one union to exist in one work place. Labor unions cannot receive professional or legal assistance, or cooperation from umbrellas labor organizations or sister unions. They cannot endorse political parties or nominate their own candidates for national or local elections.

Farmers' organizations are treated likewise. Movements of urban poor and street venders are, for all practical purposes, banned.

Most political prisoners currently jailed are charged with praising or defending North Korea, or with committing violent acts during anti-government demonstrations. Those accused of praising North Korea are, in fact, imprisoned for their ideas, for engaging in media of art activities critical of the government, or for supporting the labor movement.

Freedom of assembly and demonstration is guaranteed by Korean law, requiring organizers to notify authorities in advance. But the government always bans gatherings that it does not want under the excuse that they may turn violent. When such demonstrations take place anyway, police often break them up with force and arrest demonstrators for violent acts.

Although President Roh declared that North is not our enemy any longer, under the undemocratic National Security law, any government critics or dissidents may be selectively arrested and accused of anti-state activities, namely aiding and abetting North Korea. Visiting North Korea is a punishable act, and therefore there cannot be any exchange or cooperation.

An opposition National Assemblyman visited North Korea without government permission and met with North Korean leader Kim Il Sung. When he revealed his visit, he was promptly arrested, tortured, and imprisoned by the Roh government. The government didn't stop there. It tried to use the occasion to dismantle the main opposition party. And it indicted the party's president, Mr. Kim Dae Jung, on charges that he knew of the visit but failed to inform authorities. Mr. Kim's indictment is still pending, although no trial has been scheduled after two years. Yet another victim of the infamous National Security Law is Mr. Kim Keun Tae, the winner of the 1987 Robert F. Kennedy Human Rights Award, who is in prison now.

The main opposition New Democratic Union, which merged with the Party for Peace and Democracy, PPD, in April, has been working hard to repeal the National Security Law. The court has found this law partially unconstitutional. But the government and ruling party are dead set against rewriting or repealing it. Furthermore, the Agency for National Security Planning, known in the past as the KCIA, keeps abusing the law to keep the people under surveillance and rule the nation with terror.

However, unlike the days of Park Chung Hee's and Chun Doo Hwan's regimes, the worsening human rights condition is drawing little or no domestic and international attention. We are concerned.

Students and workers share at least some of the blame. When Presidnet Roh was inaugurated in early 1988 and granted a little political freedom, some students and workers abused it. Their behavior invited suspicion of radicalism and procommunism. As they continued to throw firebombs, the people turned away from them.

Today's lack of international attention on the Korean human rights situation, I believe, is the result of a misunderstanding: that Mr. Roh's regime is fully democratized. Some even have praised Mr. Roh for his democratic achievements. Some maintain there is no human rights problem in Korea today. This is false. This is wrong. The U.S. State Department, Asia Watch, and Amnesty International support that human rights abuses are growing worse.

The international and domestic indifference to the serious human rights situation in Korea is hardening the position of students, workers, and farmers, deepening their grievance. They feel abandoned. More students and workers may fall the victim to the government brutality like last Friday. The whole situation is growing ever more ominous.

There are other serious problems.

The government has generally sided with big business against labor. Worker's active resistance against the government and management invites violent reaction. Thus, workers vent their frustration and dissatisfaction by work slowdown, noncooperation and passive resistance. Productivity falls. Economic difficulty grows.

Successive military regimes have sacrificed the agricultural sector to promote industrialization. The Uruguay round and American pressure on farm markets have added more worries and woes to Korean farmers. They feel they are out on a limb.

Students and intelligentsia have lost all faith in the government's reunification policy. They believe that the regime is neither sincere nor credible about its desire for normalization with North Korea.

We are concerned that the mounting discontent among workers, farmers, students and intellectuals is destabilizing our society. Continued noncooperation by workers and despair by farmers will shake the foundation of our country and threaten our national security.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Now I would like to speak less as a lawyer and draw your attention to the political situation in Korea today.

The outcome of the April 1988 general elections was totally unexpected and truly revolutionary. The people gave the opposition the control of the National Assembly for the first time in our parliamentary history. That outcome was misinterpreted by the international community as proof that Korea had become truly democratic.

The opposition control of the National Assembly lasted for only two years. A number of democratic reforms were enacted during that time, and Koreans became hopeful of a true democracy.

But Mr. Roh could not tolerate opposition control of the National Assembly any longer. So he secretly conspired to merge his ruling party with two opposition parties headed by misters Kim Young Sam and Kim Jong Pil, and then announced it as a surprise move. This merger gave the new ruling party a two-thirds majority, which is necessary to change the constitution. The people felt betrayed, particularly by Mr. Kim Young Sam. Mr. Kim Young Sam had for years cried foul against Mr. Roh and his predecessors. One day he was denouncing them, the next day joining forces with them.

If the merger hurt the image of the ruling party, it also damaged the opposition's credibility. It made people cynical toward politicians. Many Koreans felt that if a trusted opposition leader like Mr. Kim Young Sam could turn coat like that, then no politician

could be trusted. Some media started ridiculing the ruling party as well as the opposition party. This negative campaign against the political establishment has been very effective in inviting public distrust of all politicians and indifference to political development.

Despite the political setback caused by the three-party merger, 1990 was a year of most significant political advancement.

Mr. Roh and his ruling party had plotted last year to amend the constitution in a way that would allow them to replace the direct and popular presidential election system with a parliamentary cabinet form of government. Under this new constitution, Mr. Roh could and would handpick his successor who will succeed him as the head of state.

But the opposition PPD mustered the public support and staged an all out opposition against the planned constitution change. Mr. Roh and his clique were forced to retreat. They may come back. Nevertheless, it is the first time since 1961 that the ruling elite could not attempt to change the political system by resorting to such brute force as military coup or martial law. The retreat is doubly significant, because it was not the struggle in the street but the political struggle of the opposition and public pressure that made the ruling faction withdraw from its plot.

The opposition made another important achievement. It is the establishment of autonomous local governments. Public and political pressure finally made Mr. Roh implement the long-awaited local autonomy this spring, albeit reluctantly.

These two accomplishments—the shelving of the plot to change the constitution, and the implementation of local autonomy—did not come easily. Opposition lawmakers resigned from the National Assembly last July. Opposition leader Kim Dae Jung undertook a hunger strike in October. And three million Korean citizens joined a petition organized by the opposition PPD. Mr. Roh and his ruling group finally capitulated.

The people no longer want struggle in the street nor heavy-handed arbitrary rule by the ruling elite. A new opposition New Democratic Union Party is born of the former Party for Peace and Democracy and the New Democratic Union, and is gathering opposition forces together as it broadens its support base and constituency.

Parliamentary elections will take place in about a year. The presidential election is slated for late next year. With autonomous local governments in place, massive election fraud by the ruling party, as in the past, will be difficult or impossible. Peaceful change of political power is possible and even likely.

There is an obvious contradiction in Korea today. On one hand, there is an undeniable progress in political development and maturation of the Korean public. On the other hand, human rights abuses continue unabated, and in fact are increasing. Thus Korea is at another critical crossroads. Would it backslide to the repressive and dictatorial system of the past or move forward to a true democracy?

I have an ultimate faith in my people. My people will seize control of our own future away from the hands of our political tormenters. But we need the moral support of the international community, which will force the Roh regime to abide by its promise of democratic reforms. That brings me to the issue of Korean-American relations.

KOREA-U.S. RELATIONS

Early in Mr. Roh's rule, an anti-American mood gained steam. Even the government seemed at times promoting the anti-American sentiment. It was sort of a fad. Riding this mood, many students and dissidents tried to draw the public to their side but failed. Mr. Kim Dae Jung, president of the NDU, played a critical role in arresting the spread of anti-Americanism. Amid heavy criticism, he opposed violence, procommunism, and anti-Americanism. The people ultimately agreed that anti-Americanism was detrimental to the national interest.

Korean people, however, are still critical of the U.S., mainly for two reasons. One is the general belief that the U.S. government has supported successive military regimes, and that the U.S. could have stopped the 1980 Kwangju massacre by the military led by Chun Doo Hwan. The other reason is the trade conflict. The South Korean people resent the sudden and heavy U.S. pressure to liberalize our markets, particularly farm produces. There is a strong feeling that South Korea's farmers are shouldering an unfair burden of trade pressure.

Radical anti-Americanism has now diminished in South Korea. But it has a potential to return with greater force. We must stop it from returning, rejuvenate the sagging friendship between our two nations, and develop a mature relationship.

The prerequisite is for the Roh regime to keep the promise of democratization: releasing political prisoners; guaranteeing basic democratic freedom of the press, expression, assembly, and association; and restoring respect of human rights. The government must maintain neutrality in labor disputes, and when arbitrating, it must be fair. The government must stop its monopolistic contact with North Korea and allow its citizens to freely exchange with the North. Then the potential for serious anti-Americanism will disappear.

At the same time, we ask the U.S. to show more active concern about the human rights situation in Korea. Although the 1990 human rights report of the U.S. State Department has reflected human rights problems to a fair degree, many Koreans still believe the U.S. overlooks the repressive rule of President Roh, supports, and even praises Mr. Roh. Intelligentsia in Korea are very critical of the U.S. attitude. Radicals view the U.S. as their enemy. I want to see this change.

Thus this forum today is very important. It is a sign that the U.S. Congress is listening to and taking active interest in Korean human rights problems—a step in the right direction. I am hoping to see as many human rights leaders and policy makers as possible during this visit. But I believe your role is most critical in shaping the U.S. human rights policy toward Korea.

GODOY SPEAKS OUT FOR A NEW NICARAGUA

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Vice President of the Republic of Nicaragua, Dr. Virgilio Godoy, was on Capitol Hill on a very important assignment. The Vice President's visit to Washington was sponsored by the American Security Council, and along with Congressmen CHARLES WILSON and CASS BALLENGER, I served as one of his cohosts. Also, Congressmen DANA ROHRABACHER and BILL RICHARDSON stood with the Vice President by introducing a resolution expressing concern about Nicaragua's continued poor human rights record and lack of full democracy.

Dr. Godoy's visit was particularly timely because he discussed several serious problems regarding the future of his country. He came to office with President Violeta Chamorro in an election that shocked the ruling Sandinistas and most of the world. Last week he discussed the economic situation in his country, the continuing role of the Sandinistas in the Nicaraguan government, and the need for continued aid to help resettle the former Resistance fighters who laid down their arms to give democracy a chance.

Today the Nicaraguan legal system, the Supreme Court and all but two of the judges, the National Police, the army and the secret police, as well as extralegal armed mobs, are still under the control of the Sandinistas. Because of this it is very difficult to have a real legal process. Even if a court decision were to go against the Sandinistas, it is very apparent that the police have no intention of enforcing any legal mandate against their comrades.

In a recent statement, Antonio Lacayo, Mrs. Chamorro's son-in-law and her Minister of the Presidency, claimed that dozens of agricultural growers have returned to invest in Nicaragua. I hope this is true, but it is also recognized that thousands of illegally confiscated farms and cattle ranches have not been returned to their rightful owners. In fact, 41 percent of the agriculture labor force is still unable to recover its property.

These farms were confiscated by Sandinista officials, who under the new government are untouched by the legal system, the police, or the army. The business community is experiencing almost identical difficulties in reactivating the economy. Simply put, who will open a bank or business in a country where only the Sandinistas have the right to private property?

In July 1990, the Sandinistas under the protection of the police, and with the help of government employees using official vehicles, paralyzed the nation with violent rallies. Buses were vandalized, an opposition radio station burned, and the streets were barricaded in order to inhibit the passage of vehicles.

The February 16 assassination of former Resistance leader Enrique Bermudez is still unsolved, and no one has been arrested in the murder of a young student from the American High School in Managua by General Humberto Ortega's own body guards. Although it is clear to the Nicaraguan people who committed these crimes, the government claims that both of these cases are still unsolved and mysterious. The Nicaraguan Government refuses to pursue leads which indicate Sandinista complicity, including a phony autopsy report on Bermudez issued by the Lenin Fonseca Hospital.

Additionally, U.S. aid earmarked to resettle some 20,000 former resistance fighters and their families, administered through a body of the Organization of American States [OAS], runs out in July. These brave fighters who turned in their weapons in exchange for promises to be reintegrated into society have been

betrayed by the government they helped elect. Many in desperation are heading back to the hills to fight.

Concerned about this, Vice President Godoy held a meeting with OAS Secretary General Joao Baena Soares, who said he would welcome additional U.S. funds to administer resettlement assistance to the former contras for another year. Dr. Godoy relayed this to a number of Representatives and to a bipartisan group of Senators led by BOB DOLE. He recommended that resettlement aid be appropriated for 1992 at their 1990 levels.

I believe that the current cogovernment between the democratically elected President and the Sandinistas, which is ridden with nepotism and is tolerant of systematic and flagrant financial, political and human rights abuses by General Ortega and his political loyalists, will only destroy any hope for meaningful peace in Nicaragua because its policies benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Future economic aid to Nicaragua must be conditioned on provisions that the Chamorro government implement additional democratic and free market reforms. As one of my colleagues, Mr. ROHRABACHER observed, how can there be justice in a country where ruling elites have in stolen houses? Unconditional aid will only benefit the well-established businesses in Nacaragua which are owned almost exclusively by the Sandinistas and their friends. In excess of 2,000 Nicaraguan companies are owned or operated by the Sandinista party, and the legitimate business community desperately needs a fair chance to succeed.

Meanwhile, the Nicaraguan people suffer from disease, malnutrition, and shattered hopes. American aid must be conditioned so that the workers, farmers, and small businessmen—and not General Ortega and his friends—receive relief so that Nicaragua can be reconstructed as an egalitarian society.

STATE SENATOR GWEN MARGOLIS HONORED BY MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE FOUNDATION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize Miami State Senator Gwen Margolis, who will be honored by the Miami-Dade Community College Foundation at a gala at the Omni International Hotel on June 7.

State Senator Gwen Margolis is presently serving as the first woman elected as president of the Florida Senate. Senator Margolis is a longtime resident of the North Dade area, representing the area since 1974 in both the Florida House of Representatives and the Florida State Senate. She is also one of the most accomplished alumnus of Miami-Dade Community College.

The Miami Herald recently rated Senator Margolis as the most effective lawmaker during the recently completed 1991 legislative session. The Herald reported that Senator Margolis "Provided the session's most touching moment. She sobbed on the senate floor as she read a letter from her 8-year-old grandson pleading for more money for education."

Her career in the Florida Senate began in 1980, where she tackled fiscal issues as chair of the finance, tax and claims committee; the economic, consumer and community affairs committee; and most recently, the appropriations committee. Her outstanding work in the field of education has also brought recognition from her colleagues and numerous professional educational organizations.

The Miami-Dade College Foundation gala will be a major fundraiser to help Miami-Dade Community College keep its open-door policy for all incoming students. Miami-Dade Community College is nationally recognized as the best and one of the largest community colleges in the Nation. Since its beginning in 1959, Miami-Dade has awarded over 123,000 associate degrees. Its present enrollment exceeds 120,000 students in its 5 area campuses and numerous outreach centers.

I wish to thank State Senator Gwen Margolis, Miami-Dade Community College Foundation Board Chairman Louis Wolfson III, Miami-Dade Alumni Development Vice President Hank Adorno and the many other individuals who will help make this gala a successful fundraiser for a worthwhile cause.

HONORING EMIL EISDORFER

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Emil Eisdorfer, who is being honored this week by the Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam School in the Bronx.

As a longtime friend of Emil Eisdorfer, I can attest to the fact that his commitment and dedication to the community is unsurpassed. Since emigrating to the United States from the Soviet Union 17 years ago, Emil has worked tirelessly on behalf of his neighbors, especially the local Jewish community.

It took the Eisdorfer family 9 years from when they first applied for an exit visa from the Ukraine in 1964 to finally be granted permission to come to the United States. Since reaching our shores, Emil and his wife, Elena, and their two children have been active and involved members of the Bronx community. The recent changes in the Soviet Union have allowed Emil to use his talents to assist newly arriving Soviet Jews. For instance, as a member of the Metropolitan New York Coordinating Council on Jewish Poverty, he has placed 40 Soviet refugees into jobs throughout Bronx County.

In addition, Emil serves in numerous other community positions, such as vice-chairman of Community Board No. 11, the chairman of the board of the Jewish Community Council of Pelham Parkway, and vice-president of the Pelham Parkway Citizens' Council. In all his endeavors, Emil has remained true to his religious heritage and mindful of his duty to assist his neighbors. That is why it is appropriate that he is being honored. I join the Beth Jacob-Beth Miriam School in acknowledging his outstanding accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO SACRAMENTO CHAPTER OF THE JAPANESE-AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to bring to my colleague's attention the work of a distinguished public service organization, the Sacramento Chapter of the Japanese-American Citizens League.

Over the years, the league has dedicated itself to improving the quality of life for all members of the Sacramento community. Through their commitment, the league has assisted many young students in furthering their education by offering scholarships to distinguished college-bound students.

The Japanese-American Citizens League is most deserving of our thanks and our praise for their efforts and compassion. There are few causes more worthwhile than encouraging our young people in their efforts to enhance their education and contribute in a meaningful way to society. Given the unprecedented challenges arising from the vast and significant changes which are taking place in our society, the importance of an advanced education is greater now than ever before.

I wish to commend the league on this act of public service, and extend my personal congratulations to each of these students for their academic excellence. Being honored with scholarships are: Scott Hoshida of C.K. McClatchey High School, Kenji Ogawa of C.K. McClatchey High School, Jun Okada of Mesa Verde High School. Erika Takada of Sacramento High School, Frances Hirai of J.F. Kennedy High School, Cynthia Tanaka of J.F. Kennedy High School, Jeffrey Yoshimura of J.F. Kennedy High School, Brian Honbo of Davis High School, Jill Yoshikawa of C.K. McClatchey High School, Jenny Asahara of J.F. Kennedy High School, Douglas Tanaka of El Camino High School, Alison Onga of C.K. McClatchey High School, Traci Fujita of J.F. Kennedy High School, Kimberly Ishihara of Rio Americano High School, Alison Mitsuhashi of Del Campo High School, Mark Shimomura of Woodland High School, Vanessa Kojima of J.F. Kennedy High School, Sonia Tokuyoshi of Rio Vista High School, Aric Koshiyama of Rio Americano High School and Farah Endow of J.F. Kennedy High School.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in wishing these students continued success in their academic endeavors.

AIRLIFT OF ETHIOPIAN JEWS

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, just over a week ago, nearly 15,000 Ethiopian Jews—nearly the entire Jewish population left in Ethiopia—were miraculously airlifted in just under 36 hours from the crossfire of civil war to safety in Israel. After 2,500 years in the di-

aspora, "Operation Solomon" succeeded in bringing these people home. As each one of these new immigrants walked down the ramp to begin a new life free from persecution and deprivation, Israelis welcomed the newcomers with joyous celebration and marveled at the success of this modern-day miracle.

Since the disclosure of the first major effort to evacuate the Ethiopian Jews—Operations Moses and Joshua—in 1984, flights were suspended and thousands of Ethiopian families were tragically separated. Children were without mothers, sisters without brothers and wives without husbands. Now, thousands of Ethiopian Jews will be reunited with their families in Israel after many painful years apart. The humanitarian struggle for the right of Ethiopian Jews to emigrate freely to Israel has nearly come to an end.

The thousands of Ethiopian Jews who have endured numerous hardships over the years are not the only heroes in this story. The efforts and dedication of many parties—the Israeli Government, the American Government, the American Jewish community, among others—ensured the success of this tremendous humanitarian operation.

The Israeli Government has earned the respect and admiration of the entire international community for its success in transporting so many people over 1,500 miles, in 40 flights night and day, in so little time. The Israelis had been planning the complex logistics for the airlift for weeks. Israel's ability to accomplish this great task truly deserves to be commended.

The United States also played a critical role in this operation. As a Member of the Congressional Caucus for Ethiopian Jews, I joined my colleagues in making an emergency appeal to Secretary of State Baker urging support for a massive airlift when the threat to the security of the Ethiopian Jews became urgent as the rebel groups approached the capital.

Shortly after this plea, President Bush sent a letter to Acting President Lieut. Gen. Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan stating that the United States would help mediate a peace settlement between the Ethiopian rebels and the government in exchange for the immediate evacuation of all Jews. This letter triggered the release of the Ethiopian Jews after months of intense negotiations between American, Israeli and Ethiopian officials.

Finally, the continuous efforts by the American Jewish community to assist in the release of the Ethiopian Jews cannot be forgotten. The hard work of the American Association for Ethiopian Jews over the years paved the way for this historic rescue of the remaining Jewish community in that country.

I have great confidence that the American Jewish community will demonstrate the same unity and devotion to the absorption of these new immigrants as they have so successfully done with the hundreds of thousands of new Soviet immigrants who have arrived in Israel and the United States.

These new Ethiopian immigrants have been greeted with open arms and open hearts by every Israeli citizen. The defining purpose of the Jewish State as home for imperilled Jews throughout the world has been poignantly reaffirmed. We can all be thankful for that.

ONE HUNDRED BLACK MEN OF LOS ANGELES, INC. CELEBRATE 10TH YEAR OF SERVICE

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the 100 Black Men of Los Angeles, Inc. as they celebrate 10 years of service in Los Angeles and the larger southern California community.

On June 8, the 100 Black Men organization will be holding its annual young black scholars dinner entitled "Pillars of the Future."

In 1985, the 100 Black Men of Los Angeles, through its educational wing, established the Young Black Scholars Program [YBS]. This program focuses on minority high school students in Los Angeles County who are high academic achievers. A broad-based and privately funded community effort, YBS provides mentorship and tutorial activities and college scholarships to its participants. To date, over 2,000 students have participated in this worthwhile program.

At the annual dinner, 100 Black Men will honor outstanding members of our community. Receiving this year's Founder's Awards are: Mrs. Lucille Boswell of the Coca-Cola Co.; Dr. Herb Carter, executive vice chancellor of the California State University system; Ms. Jasmine Guy, entertainer and star of "A Different World"; Mr. Earvin "Magic" Johnson, entrepreneur and professional athlete with the Los Angeles Lakers; Retired Brig. Gen. Celes King III of King Bail Bonds; the Milken Family Foundation and Mr. Norboru Watanabe, owner of the Riviera Country Club.

The recipient of the prestigious President's Award is Mr. Robert Wycoff, president and chief operating officer of ARCO.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the 100 Black Men of Los Angeles, Inc. for years of dedicated service, and I join them in saluting this year's eight awardees for their unselfish involvement in and contributions to the southern California community.

MIAMI DADE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ANNUAL AWARDS BANQUET

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize the Miami Dade Chamber of Commerce which recently held their annual awards banquet at Studio-One 83 in Miami.

The awards banquet gives recognition to those who have contributed to the development of the communities served by the Miami Dade Chamber of Commerce. The chamber's main service area has been Miami's Liberty City, but it has recently opened branch offices in West Perrine/Richmond Heights in South Dade, and Opa-Locka/Carol City in North Dade.

The chamber lists as its main objectives being a focal point of contact for black businesses, promoting minority networking and encouraging the development of business and economic enterprises. Among the activities the chamber participated in during the past year included an awards luncheon for Miami Edison High School students, two international receptions for Caribbean and Latin American delegates, a monthly radio talk show on WMBM, a television show for 3 months on WLRN and technical assistance to countless businesses and individuals.

This year over 1,000 persons turned out to participate in the annual awards banquet whose theme was "moving forward". The evening included cocktails, dinner, and entertainment from Roy Ayers and the Ensemble. A veteran of over 30 years in the music industry, Ayers performed selections from his new album "Wake Up"—of which the title track is a plea to young people to avoid the destruction of drugs.

Among those winning awards this year were: Jacque Thermilus of Urban Constructors, Inc. as Small Business of the Year; Randall Holts of Barnett Bank as Corporate Business of the Year; Ulysess Banks of Banks Amoco Mini-Mart No. 4 as Franchise of the Year; and Brenda Rivers of the Airport Ice Cream Shoppe as Board Member of the Year. Lobby Similien was awarded a $1,000 scholarship by the chamber.

I extend my sincere hope for the chamber's continued success, and special thanks to its president, Dorothy Baker. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all those individuals who contributed so much to the success of the chamber's annual awards banquet including Leifert Hobley, Dwight Stephenson, Jarvis Williams, Dr. Marnie Pinkston, and Caesar Phillips.

ROMANIA'S SECURITATE: OVERCOMING THE LEGACY OF THE PAST

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have followed events in East-central Europe with particular interest and awe. The transition from communism and centralized planning to democracy and a market economy has proven a formidable task, more so than we ever imagined.

All of the East-central European countries have made progress in these areas, and the United States is strongly supportive of such efforts. We recognize how great the challenge is. We honor the perseverance and the courage of the citizens who have endured hardship for so long.

Like my colleagues, I would like to see progress toward democracy continue. And as Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, I have a particular interest in human rights.

Romania, as we all know, is one of the countries that suffered the most under Communist rule. Former President Nicolae

Ceausescu was among the most ruthless and rash of dictators, a tyrant who sacrificed the dreams of generations for the sake of his own greedy aims. Ceausescu enforced his repressive policies with the help of his dreaded secret police, the Securitate, whose surveillance, intimidation, and persecution of even the most timid voices of opposition effectively annihilated civil society in Romania.

I believe that clarifying the present status of the Securitate will be necessary before the Romanian people can feel confidence in their new governmental institutions. I raised this point with Romanian Prime Minister Petre Roman when he visited Washington in March, and I felt he was vague in his response.

My concerns have been reinforced by the recent unearthing of what may be as much as 7 tons of Securitate files—including lists of dissidents, transcripts of Radio Free Europe broadcasts, and information on opposition figures—that had apparently been buried shortly after the miners' rampage through Bucharest last June. The excavated documents suggest that surveillance of the opposition in Romania continued even after the Securitate was officially disbanded—and indeed, many opposition figures contend to this day that their phones are tapped, their mail is opened, or they are victims of anonymous harassment and intimidation.

Over a year ago, the Romanian Minister of Defense asserted that "no citizen, political party, institution, or enterprise is the target of any kind of surveillance * * * The minister is anxious to assure public opinion that bugging will not be used either now or in the future." Clearly, this statement was premature.

Romania's new Intelligence Service, largely staffed by members of the former Securitate, has acknowledged that some of its officers were responsible for the burial. State prosecutors have begun an investigation, and the chief of the Romanian Intelligence Service has claimed that all those responsible will be immediately relieved of their posts. I would urge the Government of Romania to undergo this investigation with all due speed and sincerity, and to eliminate once and for all the shadow of suspicion still haunting Romanian society.

MEDICAL CARE IS OVERREGULATED

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, health care continues to be a major concern of mine and of many others in this country.

I happen to believe that the greatest cause of the huge increases in health care costs is due to too much Government intervention, not too little.

I wish we would move toward a free market solution to the health care crisis because I believe this is the only way we can ever bring health care costs down, or even hold the line. However, I am convinced we are going to get even more Government control over this field until the people see how bad it will be.

We need especially to listen to the physicians in private practice, the men and women actually on the firing line every day, in order to hopefully come up with a system that will work.

One of the medical doctors whom I respect most highly is Dr. Sarkis J. Chobanian. Before moving to my district, Dr. Chobanian was one of President Reagan's physicians.

Dr. Chobanian sent me a paper regarding Medicare physician reimbursement. I would like to share it with my colleagues by having it reprinted in the RECORD.

MEDICARE PHYSICIAN REIMBURSEMENT

(By Sarkis J. Chobanian)

In November, 1989, the Congress approved an entirely new program to handle the reimbursement of physicians who treat Medicare patients. When we passed this reform as part of the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, we thought we had solved a problem. We thought we were going to establish a new, fairer system that would also save the federal government money.

Already, I am beginning to think we may have contributed to the problem instead of to the solution. We gave the Department of Health and Human Services and the Health Care Financing Administration a little over two years to implement this program. We are still seven months away from the implementation date, but already troubles are appearing.

The first thing we asked HHS to do was to prepare and publish a first draft of a national fee schedule by September 1, 1990. Constituents have brought this document to my attention, and upon reviewing it, I believe that it raises more questons than it answers. For what was published bears little resemblance to a fee schedule. I would challenge any nonbureaucrat to read this document and be able to figure out how much a single office visit is going to cost the government, not alone some complex coronary procedure. It provides some information on about ⅓ of the medical services; nothing substantive on about 5,600 services.

The basic game plan was to reimburse physicians better for office visits and other "cognitive" patient encounters, with funds derived from cuts to more expensive surgical procedures. However, in its penchant for budget-cutting, within the past fifteen months, Congress has already enacted advance cuts for the procedural services, so that many informed sources, including the American Medical Association, fear that there will be no "new" cuts as of January 1, 1992, and therefore, no funds to keep our promise of higher reimbursements for office visits and direct patient encounters by primary care providers. So much for our objectives of fairness and cost savings.

One subspecialty group, the American College of Gastroenterology, has made some compelling arguments in comments it submitted to HCFA on the Model Fee Schedule proposal. These physicians note that HHS has already triggered major cuts of up to 25% to some of the new, fiberoptic technologies, such as endoscopy and colonscopy. The effect of these technologies has been to shorten or avoid hospital stays, avoid major surgeries with their related costs in time off work and medical fees, and perhaps most importantly to save lives in dramatically increasing our capacity for early detection and treatment of our #2 cancer killer, colorectal cancer. The gastroenterologists' analysis was equally persuasive in opposing HHS' effort to impose a global fee approach—previously reserved only for surgeries—to these new technologies. In this entirely separate proposed rule issued in January, HCFA appears to have inferred a Congressional mandate to standardize global surgical fees, and then in the name of cost-cutting, tried to enlarge upon that already questionable mandate so as to apply a global fee to a number of non-surgical services which have not generally been reimbursed in this manner previously.

What this global fee means is that providers will be reimbursed only for the procedure they've done and they'll not be reimbursed for any visits up to 30 days later. Well, that's fine if doctors had been under this type of reimbursement scheme all along and had set their fees accordingly. But, it's a little bit late to be coming along now and changing the rules on these fellows while we're also cutting procedural reimbursements. This whole episode is like going to the grocery store, paying for a steak, and expecting the salad fixings, baking potato, dinner rolls, and coffee to be thrown in for free—as part of the "global fee" for the steak. Your grocer wouldn't stand for it and it's not right that we expect doctors or Medicare beneficiaries to accept it either.

It's a good example of how the confusion by HHS in implementing the new law has the potential to increase, not cut, long-term Medicare spending. For there are some medical services—colonoscopy, and more recently laparoscopic cholecystectomy, i.e. the nonsurgical removal of the gallbladder—which ultimately promise to save us federal dollars. Each patient who has a precancerous polyp removed as an outpatient or a patient with a diseased gallbladder removed with a single day's hospital stay is one who will not eventually require payment for a long hospital stay for surgery and follow-up care, not to mention decreased suffering and improved prospects for the patient. If our real objective is to preserve quality patient care while cutting total government costs, we ought to be encouraging these new cost-saving technologies, not discouraging them.

As much as I hate to admit it, it doesn't look like the problem of Medicare reimbursement has been solved. I may be wrong, perhaps HHS will take some of these criticisms seriously. But I doubt it. I hope that the Congressional committees with oversight responsibility in these areas will take an early look at just how HHS is going about implementing the new Medicare forms, before we end up with more unfairness, and larger government price tags than we started with.

SOVIET VISIT ENLIGHTENING

HON. TIMOTHY J. PENNY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I traveled to the Soviet Union in January 1991 legislative exchange program. The program was sponsored by the Columbia Institute of Political Research and the International Center for Developmental Policy, both Washington-based groups, and the Institute of Social Sciences in Moscow.

I have written three columns dealing with trade, political reform, and notes from my trip.

MINNESOTA TRADE WITH THE SOVIET UNION

One of the reasons I was interested in traveling to the Soviet Union was the possibility of promoting trade and commercial contacts

between Minnesota businesses and the appropriate Soviet groups. Unfortunately, I was somewhat thwarted in that effort as my trip was cut short by the debate in the House of Representatives on the resolutions authorizing the use of force in the Persian Gulf.

For nearly a decade now the Soviet Union has been one of the top U.S. markets for wheat, corn, and soybeans, and much of Minnesota's production has been sold to the Soviets on a commercial basis.

I became closely involved with promoting agricultural trade with the Soviets in 1989 when I helped to arrange a sale of 50,000 metric tons of Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC] surplus butter to the Soviet Union. Representatives Steve Gunderson (R-WI), Charles Stenholm (D-TX) and I had seen the stockpiles of surplus salted butter grow to 335 million pounds, up from 185 million pounds the previous year. The U.S. market for salted butter is limited, but since European butter stocks were low at that time, the Soviets had expressed an interest in the U.S. stocks.

We contacted Richard Crowder, USDA's Deputy Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, as well as Agriculture Secretary Yeutter to urge the sale. We also met with Cooper Evans, a former congressman who was serving as Special Agriculture Adviser to President Bush, and with numerous Soviet trade and business representatives to discuss their needs. The Soviets are still facing shortages of both butter and vegetable oils, and this area is an excellent opportunity to expand the market for our agricultural products.

The Soviets, in spite of record or near-record harvests of numerous agricultural commodities, face daunting limitations in transportation, storage, processing, and marketing of their farm and food products. In turn, they indeed have short-term shortages of foodstuffs, much loss due to spoilage, and long lines at government markets. In contrast, there is often an abundance of foods at certain "unofficial" markets, but often at exorbitant prices. In spite of the shortages and inconveniences, my Soviet hosts assured me that nobody will starve in the Soviet Union.

There are tremendous opportunities for Minnesota's farmers, agri-businesses, and other agricultural support industries in the Soviet Union. The Soviets have an immediate need to develop food processing, storage, production, and transportation industries. The potential for business and exchange may take some time to be realized, however, because of political and financial constraints in the Soviet Union. The recent crackdown in the Baltics, and the lack of rouble convertibility may be the two biggest constraints to increasing our cooperation with the Soviets.

While in Minnesota recently I met with members of a Soviet trade delegation being hosted by the Communicating for Agriculture group. The Soviets visited many Minnesota businesses and were especially interested in the J.B. Foote tanning factory and Central Research Labs in Red Wing.

In spite of the uncertainty in the Soviet Union right now, I will continue my efforts to promote Minnesota trade with the Soviet Union. I am hopeful that Minnesota will sustain and strengthen its agricultural ties with that country as well.

POLITICAL REFORMS IN THE SOVIET UNION

During my recent trip to the Soviet Union, I had the chance to see first hand the effects of the historic political reforms initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev. These reforms were first launched by Gorbachev at the 19th Communist Party Conference in June 1988. He announced that he wanted to make the Soviet Union a "rule-of-law" state where the "soviets" (Russian word for councils) would be the supreme decision-making bodies in the country. Gorbachev probably also hoped that the new political system would break the stranglehold that the Party and the bureaucracy had on his economic reforms. The Soviets were originally ad hoc groups formed by workers, soldiers, and other opponents of Tsarist rule prior to 1917. From Lenin's time to Gorbachev's, power has been in the hands of the Communist Party and the ruling Politburo. The old Supreme Soviet (Parliament) traditionally met for two one-week sessions each year to unanimously approve all measures brought forward by the Party.

Gorbachev's reforms centered on his plan to hold national elections for a new Congress of People's Deputies (CPD). On March 26, 1989, the Soviet Union held its first competitive national elections since 1917. More than 5,000 candidates sought election to the 2,500-seat CPD. More than 80 percent of the Soviet electorate turned out to vote in the elections (turnout for the recent U.S. elections was under 35 percent). One-third of the deputies were elected by public organizations (interest groups) such as the Communist Party and scientific organizations. The other two-thirds were elected in separate elections held throughout the country. In the United States, interest groups have a lot of influence, but they are kept on the outside of our government. The provision in the Soviet Constitution which guaranteed these "special interest" seats was eliminated in October 1989.

The first session of the CPD was held in May 1989. Nearly 88 percent of the deputies were members of the Communist Party although many of these were considered reformers. The CPD has two regular sessions per year, each lasting two weeks. Its major responsibility is to elect from its membership the 542-member Supreme Soviet (Parliament) and to set basic guidelines for domestic and foreign policy. In addition, the CPD can overrule the decisions of the Supreme Soviet and can amend the Constitution.

The Supreme Soviet is divided into a Council of Nationalities (similar to U.S. Senate) and a Council of the Union (similar to the U.S. House of Representatives), and holds two four-month sessions annually. Like the U.S. Congress, legislation must pass by a majority vote in both chambers in order to become law. The President of the Soviet Union, who will be directly elected by the population starting in 1995, does have the power to veto legislation. However, a two-thirds majority may override a presidential veto. The Soviet Constitution also guarantees the Supreme Soviet the power to declare war, although the President does have certain emergency powers.

Clearly, Gorbachev's political reforms have had a major impact in the Soviet Union. The new Supreme Soviet has already passed a law which guarantees the freedom of the press and the rights of journalists. In addition, the CPD deleted Article 6, which guaranteed the Communist Party's monopoly of power, from the Soviet Constitution. This change has resulted in the birth of dozens of political parties and organizations from all sectors of society. Soviet Vice-President Gennady Yanayev stated at a conference which I attended that because the new political parties are in a period of "infancy", their "vocal cords" are well-developed, but their "limbs" are not. It may take years for a stable political system to develop, but I believe that the Soviet Union is on an irreversible path of change. I say this in spite of recent setbacks, particularly the use of force in the Baltics.

Each of the Soviet Union's fifteen republics has established new legislative bodies at the republic and local levels. Almost all of the republics, including Lithuania and Armenia, have declared their sovereignty over laws passed by the central government. Each level of government is competing for authority that the Federal government won't release. As such, there will continue to the problems of this nature until they are sorted out in negotiations between the republics and the central government.

While in Moscow, I sat in on a session of the 465-seat city Soviet (city council). Although the council, which is controlled by the reformers, was debating free enterprise, they lack the power to implement their decisions. The money for their budget and approval for their decisions come from a higher legislative body. The mayor, Gavril Popov, told my group that local governments, which currently lack authority, largely serve the function of absorbing criticism that would otherwise be directed at the Federal government.

The impact that these reforms have had on the people of the Soviet Union may seem minimal on the surface, and there is some concern that their previous gains could be taken away by hard-liners. But according to Nina Belyayeva, a Moscow lawyer, the Soviet people have "learned something about democracy and that is something they can't take away from us."

NOTES ON THE SOVIET UNION,

MOSCOW, *January 5, 1991.*

I was surprised to see a Christmas tree at the airport and another one in the lobby of the center where we're staying. Although this is the first year that Christmas can be openly celebrated, the trees are called New Year's trees.

The homes and countryside are stark and bare. Most buildings are institutional looking and are old and rundown. Soldiers are everywhere and most appear to have little to do. Citizens look listless. There are many pedestrians and the buses are crowded. Snow is not shoveled from the sidewalks.

We are staying at the Institute for Social Studies which used to be the training school for Third World Communists. With the advent of democratic reforms, they are looking for a new mission and Georgii Shahknozarov suggested the establishment of a Center for Constitutional Democracy which led to this exchange program.

Several individuals quite close to Gorbachev are main players and the new Soviet VP is giving the kick off speech for this conference. Congresswoman Nancy Johnson (R-CT) and I have also been invited to talk about the legislative process during the opening session.

JANUARY 6, 1991.

The Institute is only a few years old but the building looks like something out of the 1930s or perhaps 1950s. It is not well built or maintained and has old-fashioned elevators, ordinary woodwork, and cold stone floors.

We visited the Armory Museum (at the Kremlin) in the center of the city. The architecture was more interesting and varied in this region and major thoroughfares run like spokes to the hub of the city. Even in the

heart of the city, the buildings are drab and many look vacant although occupied.

The artifacts at the museum were more than 800 years old. Most were from the reigns of royal rulers and many artifacts were religious items (i.e. Alter Bible) and icons. Many of them showed marvelous craftsmanship with gold, silver with jewel inlays.

Our group met with U.S. Ambassador Jack Matlock at Sposa House, the American Embassy, and received an excellent update on the economic and political situation in the Soviet Union. Even though there is free press in the USSR, it is terribly difficult to get news and information.

During the reception following the conference I talked with three Soviets about the transition to a market economy. I told them of American reluctance to invest in the USSR—no buyers because there are no profits. They talked about the need for technology and suggested joint ventures, including American companies building assembly plants in the USSR as they do in Mexico.

I proposed to the conference organizers the idea of a Center for Market Economy to educate US business about Soviet opportunities and to enlighten Soviets about the need and the process of converting to free markets, free enterprise. Congresswoman Johnson and I also agreed to speak to a group of Deputies about the U.S. Congress.

A young Soviet asked me to describe myself and my personal views. In the course of conversation, I mentioned I was a Christian. He responded that he was, too. Knowing of the recent move to religious freedom, I immediately asked if he attended church. He told me no and then pointed to his heart and said, "It is in me." I told him he had it right.

JANUARY 7, 1991.

We attended a Moscow Soviet (city council) meeting where I met Sergie Stanhevich, vice-mayor and member of the city council, and a member of the Supreme Soviet. He is also an expert on governmental systems. When I told him I was from Minnesota he became excited and mentioned Walter Mondale whom he had met last year during Mondale's Moscow visit.

The Moscow Circus was fantastic. It was less glamorous and showy than the version which toured the U.S. but far more physical. The people attending were neatly dressed but not fashionably dressed. Some children bought ice cream or other snacks during intermission and others ate bag lunches from home. I gave quite a few children small candy bars and gum and wished them Marry Christmas. They were quite pleased and their parents also expressed genuine appreciation. The children were very well-behaved and a warmth within families was evident.

JANUARY 8, 1991.

We visited the Supreme Soviet of the USSR where members were debating—at this late date—the budget for 1991. Members had never before waited this long to finalize a budget but we told them they'd get used to it.

Later we attended a reception at the U.S. Embassy with several Embassy staffers and a few from our Soviet group. An interesting note: Our translator told me that the U.S. should not send food aid. She said it would not do any good because it will not reach the people because the system is bad. She said people here aren't hungry but they can't always get what they want or must pay too much. However, another Soviet told me that sending food aid would show outside support for reform and would help stabilize the situation in the USSR and allow the Gorbachev government to remain in power and continue its reforms.

JANUARY 9, 1991.

On our last day in Moscow I participated in a visit with Deputy Bourlatsky at his newspaper office. He is clearly identified with the reformers and did not close the door on the possibility of a new political party. He is also quite positive about the conference and exchange program. He expressed patience with Gorbachev and feels that Gorbachev has to placate the right wing a little in order to keep things together.

Upon our return to the Institute, we were briefed by U.S. Embassy officials on developments in the Baltic States. Gorbachev sent in troops and the situation is tense.

Congresswoman Johnson and I persuaded our hosts to take us to the Bolshoi ballet. We arrived just in time to see the close of the first act of the ballet, Swan Lake. The performance was awesome. The stage simply draws you in and the theatre is exquisite. We left at the break but heard later from our colleagues that this Swan Lake had a happy ending.

Two Soviet Deputies (Valentin Kasorov and Victor Shevkevosky) took us to the apartment building which houses Deputies during the legislative session. The apartment was quite nice but very small: just three plain rooms. I can't believe the number of box like apartment buildings in Moscow—there are clusters of them as far as the eye can see.

Our dinner was a delight. The deputies' wives—Sveta and Luda—were very pleasant. Victor and Sveta have two boys—a 16 year old we did not meet and a younger boy (about 6) who was quite cute and well behaved. Valentin and Luda had two teenage girls—again very polite. They had gifts for my children and in return I gave them candy bars and gum.

Our two hosts got into a heated discussion regarding the Persian Gulf situation and it was very interesting to listen to their debate.

A translator helped us spend an enjoyable evening. We spoke of life and family issues with much laughter and good feeling. We all proposed toasts and mine was that our children never know that our two nations were once confrontational.

Spending time with these Soviet families was one of the highlights of my trip, and we left with promises to stay in touch.

1991 BLACK WOMEN OF ACHIEVEMENT

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to bring congressional attention upon an important event which will take place in Los Angeles on June 5, 1991. On that day, the Eighth Annual NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Black Women of Achievement Awards luncheon will be held at the Biltmore Hotel.

The Black Women of Achievement Awards luncheon is a program which honors those women whose commitment to equal rights and humanitarian concerns are matched only by their success in important professional occupations. The program also serves as a major fundraiser for the Legal Defense Fund's Western Regional Office. While the LDF shares the NAACP commitment to equal rights for all, it is distinct from its founding organization and has a separate board of directors, program, staff, office and budget.

At this year's event, one of the achievement key honorees will be our own colleague, Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS. Sharing the award with MAXINE will be the dynamic recording artist Dionne Warwick. This year's AT&T Entrepreneur of the Year will be Maxine Ranson Von Phul and the 15 Black Women of Achievement for 1991 are: Charlotte Arrick, Phoebe Beasley, Margo Bouchet, Harriet Broadus Cavette, Beverly T. Davis, Ornetta Barber Dickerson, Ava A. Evegan, Lois Ford, Dr. Willye Butcher Powell, Phyllis M. Queen, Rosie M. Thompson, Pat Tobin, Patricia A. Wallace, Patricia Watts and Dr. Betty Smith Williams.

Mr. Speaker, these highly successful women represent a tremendous cross section of business, law, medicine, finance and higher education. Their selfless devotion to work and community sets a fine example for our young people. I know that the entire Congress shares my high expectations for the many important contributions these women will make to our country in the years to come. For all of these reasons I strongly urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in honoring the 1991 Black Women of Achievement.

MIAMI AIRPORT TOWER CELEBRATES 50 YEARS OF AVIATION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Miami International Air Craft Control Tower which recently celebrated 50 years of aviation history.

Fifty years ago, on May 1, 1941, the city of Miami Aviation Department established the Miami area's first control tower at the Miami Municipal Airport. The tower began operations with only three air traffic controllers, an auto-battery powered "light gun," and an altimeter loaned from Pan American Airways.

The next year, the Civil Aeronautics Administration [CAA] took over operation of the tower which was moved to a new facility on the west side of the airport, known as master field. World War II brought additional changes with the U.S. Navy assuming control of both the municipal airport and master field for transport and pilot training.

Miami's civilian air traffic moved to the 36th Street Airport. This airport had recently been expanded with Federal assistance through the War Emergency Airport Act. Pan American Airways had a control tower at the facility which came under CAA regulation in August 1942. The U.S. Corps of Engineers built a wooden control tower on the west side of the airport in 1943 to control all these runways as one airport.

The Dade County Port Authority built a new steel control tower next to the wooden tower

in 1947. Airport expansion forced the relocation of this tower in 1952, which stayed in operation until 1957 when operations were moved to the top of the new terminal building. The new tower was commissioned with radar in 1959.

The airport control tower continued to advance as Miami's airport became the gateway to Latin America, and then Europe. In 1985, operations were relocated to a new state-of-the-art tower now located at the far west side of the airport.

I would like to take this opportunity to salute the Miami Airport Tower and the many individuals who have contributed to Miami's aviation history. Among those individuals, who were present at the ceremony celebrating this important anniversary, were Miami Tower Manager Jimmy Mills; Dade County Aviation Department Director Frederick A. Elder III, A.A.E.; Miami Airport Facilities Sector Manager George Priest; Miami Airway Facilities Sector Manager Bobby R. Morris; former Miami Air Traffic Control Manager Thomas R. Jones; former Miami Air Traffic Controller Kenneth I. Schwinger and Senior Air Traffic Control Specialist Ralph N. Palmer, Jr.

TRIBUTE TO CURTIS ERICKSON

HON. PAT ROBERTS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Rural Health Care Coalition, I spend a great deal of time explaining the need to preserve adequate and afforadable health care in our Nation's rural communities. Without question, those rural communities cannot survive the next decade without doctors and hospitals and all the other facilities and professionals that today's high technology medicine requires.

Today I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding individual who has been a leader in advancing health care in the Midwest. He is Curtis Erickson of Phillipsburg, KS, outgoing president and chief executive officer of Great Plains Health Alliance. Curt dedicated his life to health care and especially to preserving rural health care for our Kansas communities. He served on many national and local boards including the Kansas Hospital Association, the American Hospital Association, the Small or Rural Hospital Governing Council, and the Federal Prospective Payment Assessment Commission.

Recently, he retired from the Great Plains Health Alliance where he served as executive director since 1959. For over 30 years he led this hospital alliance with great insight and a clear vision for the future. As one of his colleagues said, "I've been in this field for 40 years and worked in six different States and I have not known a person who knew more about rural health care or worked harder for it or did a better job than Curt Erickson."

Mr. Speaker, we are indeed fortunate to have health care professionals like Curt Erickson. I ask my colleagues to join in wishing him and his family the best in retirement. His talent and expertise will be called upon frequently in the months and years ahead as we work to forge health care policy fair to all areas of the country.

VETO THE QUOTA BILL

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to read the following editorial which appeared in the Atlanta Journal on May 30. As we consider the civil rights bill on the floor this week, my colleagues should remember that quotas are not popular in our congressional districts.

DESPITE STRUGGLE TO SAVE IT, RIGHTS BILL DESERVES A VETO

The members of Congress trying desperately to save this year's version of a flawed civil rights bill are tossing out ideas by the bushel.

They must hold the supporters of the 1990 Civil Rights Act and increase their margins this year to be able to overturn an expected veto by President Bush.

But their efforts to avoid the measure being labeled a "quota bill" ring hollow. One headline said it all: Jobs Bill Would Allow Numbers Yet Ban Quotas.

Those few words sum up two years of complicated debate and weeks of frantic maneuvering by Democrats and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. They would add language to the bill expressly banning "quotas," but they would allow numbers to be used against employers. Finding a difference requires the skills of Sherlock Holmes and Columbo.

President Bush's continued objections remain valid. A quota is a number, a measurement of people or things. Under the language proposed for the bill, employers could use percentages and raw numbers for categories of employees by race and sex, but not if the numbers meant favorable treatment for the unqualified.

Few employers, we think, are anxious to grant preferences to the unqualified.

The bill produced by House Democratic leaders is a masterpiece of confusion. It would ban the odious practice of "racenorming"—judging test scores on separate standards for separate groups—but it would cast doubt on just about any tests used for job qualifications. They must be proven to "validly and fairly" predict abilities.

Consistent with past versions of the civil rights bill, the burden of proof of a test's validity would be on the employer. In testing and in hiring practice, the employer would be guilty until proven innocent.

By limiting the damage awards available to women, the House Democrats may have collapsed their own efforts. But even if supporters of equal treatment for women decide the bill is worthwhile, President Bush has every reason for yet another veto.

Let those voting for the misnamed civil rights bill explain how a quota is not a number.

A SALUTE TO THE CLEVELAND MUSEUM OF ART

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to salute the Cleveland Museum of Art. This year marks the 75th anniversary of the founding of this institution. The anniversary celebration will commence the weekend of June 7, 1991, exactly 75 years after the doors of the museum were opened to the public. The Cleveland Museum of Art is highly revered among the museum community and has served the people of northeast Ohio since 1916 by providing a myriad of exhibitions, a broad range of innovative educational opportunities, and superlative research resources. I would like to share with my colleagues some valuable information regarding the museum.

The Cleveland Museum of Art is generally credited with owning one of the finest encyclopedic collections of art in the world. The museum also boasts a well-balanced permanent collection which includes 50,000 objects of Ancient, Asian, and Western medieval art, celebrated paintings from Europe and the United States, noted works of modern art and rare pieces from African, Islamic, pre-Columbian, Indian, Southeast Asian, and North American Indian cultures. Approximately two-thirds of this collection is on view at any given time among the museum's 72 galleries.

With such a noted collection, the Cleveland Museum of Art serves as a major international arts resources of loans to the most distinguished exhibitions throughout the world. Any major exhibition of Japanese and Chinese art must inevitably require loans from the Cleveland collection.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to its varied collections of art, the Cleveland Museum of Art has been a pioneer in providing musical attractions to the citizens of northeast Ohio. Over 40 orchestra, chamber, solo, or performing arts presentations are organized each year and presented free of charge. This free admission policy is a unique feature of the Cleveland Museum of Art. This institution is among the last private museums in America to provide such accessibility.

The Cleveland Museum of Art has also established a unique working relationship with the educational community of Greater Cleveland. The museum's teacher resource center communicates with over 4,000 teachers and provides assorted workshops, teaching aids, and advice on the presentation of art and art history to students. The annual number of students visiting the museum from Cleveland public schools is well over 50,000 and reflects the museum's commitment to educational excellence.

Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Museum of Art is directed by Dr. Evan H. Turner. Through the efforts of Dr. Turner and his dedicated staff, the museum continues to enjoy great success. I hope my colleagues will join me in saluting the Cleveland Museum of Art on the celebration of its 75th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE MORT R. LEWIS

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Mort R. Lewis—writer, health advocate, dedicated husband and friend. A resident of Marina del Rey, in the 28th District of California, Mr. Lewis passed away on May 21, 1991, at the age of 82.

With an unselfish commitment to helping others, Mr. Lewis was active in his community both as a member of the entertainment industry and as a strong advocate of cardiopulmonary resuscitation [CPR] education. In fact, he advocated and taught CPR to numerous members of the movie industry.

Mr. Lewis was a veteran writer for radio, television, and film—writing radio comedy for performers like George Burns, Jimmy Durante, and Jackie Gleason. In the area of television, Mr. Lewis contributed to series such as "Bewitched," "Truth or Consequences," and "This is Your Life." The Writers Guild of America, West describes Mr. Lewis as a producer, historian, and winner of awards for groundbreaking volunteer activity in the field of public health.

As a health advocate, Mr. Lewis was instrumental in establishing one of Los Angeles' first blood banks. He was the recipient of many honors from various organizations for his humanitarian efforts in the field of health including the American Heart Association's Award for Exceptional Services, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors' Humanitarian Award, and the Writer's Guild of America Valentine Davies Award.

He worked tirelessly to see that CPR be given the attention that it deserves. He initiated National CPR Awareness Week and Los Angeles CPR Awareness Week with the help of my colleague from southern California HENRY WAXMAN and Mayor Tom Bradley. Mr. Lewis also spearheaded a campaign to commemorate CPR on a U.S. postage stamp. It is unfortunate that he did not live to see the issuance of such a stamp.

A deep interest in the Civil War led to his involvement in organizations such as the advisory council of the United States Civil War Centennial Commission, the Civil War Round Table of Southern California and the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Association of California.

I ask my colleagues in the House to join me in expressing my sincerest condolences to his wife, the former Isabelle Bruckner, and his family, and a whole host of Mr. Lewis' friends.

CURE AIDS NOW: SOUTH FLORIDA CHARITY CONTINUES ITS SUPPORT OF AIDS VICTIMS

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, Cure AIDS Now, of south Florida is holding its first Spanish Dinner Against AIDS on June 3. The event will be a fundraiser for the important work of the Cure AIDS Now [CAN] charity. The theme for the evening, "United With Love," embodies the spirit by which CAN serves the nutrition needs of AIDS victims across the Metro-Dade area.

Cure AIDS Now is a nonprofit, community-based agency which works to directly serve the immediate physical needs of area AIDS victims. Its efforts to reduce stress and provide treatment for the malnourished AIDS patient have proven to be a feasible alternative to costly hospitalization. In the middle of the crisis of AIDS, CAN provides professional counseling assistance with Social Security benefits, housing, and Food Stamps. The centerpiece of the CAN effort is the provision of Meals-On-Wheels. Since 1987, CAN has delivered over 500,000 meals to over 1,533 people living with AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, Cure AIDS Now offers AIDS victims more than just physical support. They give hope, compassion, and love which is often the will to go on. I commend the leadership of the Cure AIDS Now executive director, Robert Kunst and its board of directors: Marlene Arribas, Rosa Bautista-Santos, Jack Campbell, Raul Cossio, Thelma Edwards, Manuel Estrada, Doug Feldman, Barbara Gottlieb, Robert Ingram, Rosa Kasse, Aleida Leal, Dominick Magarelli, Lionel Resnick, and Harry Sutton. I also offer encouragement to the staff and volunteers of CAN to continue their good work in making the day-to-day operation of this service possible.

ELIZABETH ROSENBLATT OF PLEASANT VALLEY, NY, WINS VFW SCRIPTWRITING COMPETITION

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly tell you how proud I am of a student in our 24th District who I think is typical of this patriotic generation of young Americans, like those in our Armed Forces.

Elizabeth L. Rosenblatt is a 17-year-old senior at Arlington High School in LaGrangeville, NY, and the daughter of Judge and Mrs. Albert M. Rosenblatt of Pleasant Valley. And she is the winner of the 1991 Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" Scholarship Program. She will be the recipient of the $18,000 T.C. Selman Memorial Scholarship Award. Miss Rosenblatt is planning a career in either music education or law and diplomacy. No doubt she will excel in any field she chooses to enter.

The program is now in its 44th year and requires entrants to write and record a script on a patriotic theme. This year the theme was "Democracy—The Vanguard of Freedom." As many as 14 scholarships totaling $62,500 a year are awarded, but the total monetary value of scholarships, bonds, and awards provided by the VFW, its auxiliaries, districts, councils and departments was more than $1.4 million last year.

Mr. Speaker, Miss Rosenblatt's excellence is no surprise to those who know her. She is an outstanding student, active in school publications and music activities as well as being a semifinalist in the National Merit Scholarship competition.

Her future is bright, and so is America's future with young people like her now preparing for future leadership roles.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to place in today's RECORD her winning script, and I urge all Members to read it.

DEMOCRACY—THE VANGUARD OF FREEDOM

(By Elizabeth L. Rosenblatt, New York winner, 1990/91 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program)

Webster's defines democracy as a system of government in which the people rule themselves. But for Americans, a dictionary can only begin to explain the meaning of democracy. As Americans, we are free. We can say what we want and make our own choices. The government cannot destroy our creativity because we are the government. This makes freedom and democracy inseparably connected.

On paper, democracy seems to be elementary, easy to understand. It is a technical drawing of government; a blueprint. But freedom is much more. Freedom, as I see it, is a state of mind which infuses our lives and affects everything we do. We expect to be given our liberties and to be treated equally and if we're not, we know it is our duty to fix things. We can engage in political debate and worship as we wish. And we can respect our government because it allows us our freedom. One has to see and live the American way of life to fully grasp the subtleties of American freedom.

Recently, I returned from a student exchange to the Soviet Union, where I had lived and attended Moscow Public School for a month. There are many subtle differences between our countries, but the most obvious of them lies in the way we do ordinary things . . . like walking and talking. One boy in my Moscow school told me that I must come from a free country because I "walk free, and proud, and stand straight." He saw it as different from the Soviets.

The most dramatic demonstration of the freedom we possess was granted to me some time after I returned from my visit. I had my diary published in a Moscow youth newspaper, along with my address, and received many letters, asking for a penpal. One letter was different. It was from a grown man, Alexander, who had appreciated my observations and wanted to comment on them. His English was broken, but inspiring. He wrote: "I think only one from a free country can have such view of point ... you are living in a free country and have a free way of thinking ... I'm delighted with girl which sings a national anthem of her country and in spite of her age brings the ideas of a free society. Thank you, Miss ... If you could know what means you country for people which dream to get a freedom."

For Alexander, America meant freedom. The democracy we have was his answer to the lack of freedom he saw all around him. "I know we have not an ideal society in the world and America is not paradise," he continued, "but I am sure that one can attain all in your country if one is clever and workful."

The dream of democracy and freedom led many to America, and our Founding Fathers had freedom in their minds when they created our democratic Constitution. Webster's

says that a democratic society governs itself. It follows logically that the citizens of a democratic society are free. There is nothing to hold them back, no one to tell them what they must believe or how they must behave. The ideas behind American government have served as a ray of hope for those who wish to be free and those who wish to remain free—those who know that there is more to democracy than a dictionary's definition.

Americans have died for democracy, to keep our freedom alive. And with our political system in the lead, I am sure we can maintain a system in which freedom and democracy walk hand in hand.

PROLIFERATION PROFITEERS: PART 19

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today's case study on proliferation-profiteering, the 19th in my series, highlights the problem of foreign companies which receive nuclear dual-use items from the United States and then retransfer them to other countries without our permission. Under my Nuclear Non-Proliferation Enforcement Act (H.R. 830), such a firm would be prohibited from selling its goods to the United States—a powerful deterrent indeed.

FIRM 7: DEGUSSA GMBH (GERMANY)

Degussa GmbH is a major German metal and chemical company that maintains considerable trade relations with the United States. Until July 1990, it was attempting to purchase the worldwide gold and silver businesses of the U.S. firm Engelhard Corporation. Degussa has numerous subsidiaries, several of whom, like Leybold-Heraeus GmbH have been implicated in illicit nuclear trade deals. In 1988, executives of Degussa replaced the top executives of Nukem GmbH, which was plagued by one of Germany's worst nuclear industry scandals. Degussa once held a 35 percent share in the firm, but divested most of its interest to Rheinisch-Westfaelisches Elektrizitaetwerk AG in 1990.

In January 1989, information surfaced that Degussa has shipped 95 kilograms of beryllium to India in 1984. Beryllium is used to decrease the amount of plutonium needed to manufacture a nuclear bomb. The amount sold by Degussa roughly represented enough useable material for 20 such devices. In violation of U.S. export laws and regulations, Degussa obtained the beryllium from the United States and transferred it to India without acquiring U.S. consent. In March 1990, Degussa agreed to pay $800,000 in fines to the U.S. Commerce Department for the company's illegal export activity.

Sources: DPA (Hamburg), 1/28/89; New York Times, 2/1/89, p. A2 by Stephen Engelberg; Nuclear Fuel, 4/2/90, p.1; Nuclear News, 3/88, pp. 88-92; Der Spiegel, 1/30/89, pp. 22-23; Wall Street Journal, 1/19/88, p. 24, 2/1/89, p. A11 by Thomas F. O'Boyle, 6/22/90, p. A5, 1/4/91, p. A4; Washington Post, 2/1/89, p. A19 by Don Oberdorfer.

REBALANCING THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, This past week, from May 24–27, the North Atlantic Assembly held its spring session in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. The assembly met in committee meetings all day Friday and Saturday. On Sunday, a 4-hour debate was held on the subject Rebalancing the Alliance.

Colleagues, this subject could not have come at a more opportune time. Speakers from every country in NATO presented their ideas on the future of NATO. Of special note was the participation of delegates from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. I want to say very frankly that it was one the most thoughtful and valuable debates on NATO that I have heard in a long time.

Of special interest to us in this body is the fact that one of our own colleagues, CHARLIE ROSE, gave his first address as President of the Assembly. It was a thoughtful, pointed presentation which was well received by every delegate. Mr. Speaker, I include President Rose's address and those of our East European colleagues in the RECORD at this point:

REBALANCING THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

(Address by Congressman Charlie Rose, president of the North Atlantic Assembly)

Mr. Prime Minister, distinguished colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great privilege for me to preside for the first time over a plenary session of our Assembly. And to do so in this great city and port of Rotterdam.

You, Prime Minister cogently described the agenda before us when, at the historic CSCE Summit Conference in Paris, you said that: "The last few years have witnessed immense progress in the fields of democracy, the rule of law, human rights and fundamental freedoms. The challenge now facing us is how to consolidate the progress achieved."

The North Atlantic Assembly certainly intends to play an active part in that consolidation. The flags displayed in this hall leave no doubt as to where we stand. We meet here as 22 partners determined to work together in the construction of a new Europe.

As I announced during the recent meeting of our Standing Committee in Key West, during my time as President I intend to encourage this Assembly to focus its resources on helping our colleagues in Eastern Europe during this difficult period of transition. Those of my colleagues who have had the opportunity to visit these countries can have no illusions as to the magnitude of the problems they face.

That is why, together with Senator Bill Roth, I have prepared an initiative which will allow the Assembly to play an active role in the development of parliamentary democracy in the countries of Eastern Europe.

Let me dwell for one moment on this question.

The principle of democratic government, with all the rights and freedoms that it implies, is at the heart of everything we do. We know from bitter experience that without it there can be no lasting peace, no real stability or security. We frequently overlook this crucial element of our security. Any contribution we can make towards strengthening the democratic process in Eastern Europe must be a constructive use of our resources and a matter of priority.

We must of course be realistic about what we, as an Assembly, can offer. We cannot, for example, play a direct role in improving economic conditions. Rather we must focus our efforts. We must concentrate on areas where this Assembly as a multilateral framework is uniquely placed to make a contribution. Clearly, with the range of political views and the depth of political experience represented here we have much to share with our colleagues in Eastern Europe.

In the larger picture of what needs to be done, our efforts will be relatively small steps. But no one should be in any doubt that they will be worthwhile. We should never underestimate the political and psycological importance of creating a Community of interest and involvement at the parliamentary level.

I was particularly gratified to see that the activities of this Assembly were recognized in the declaration made recently by Secretary of State Baker and Foreign Minister Genscher which recognized the contribution made by "greater contacts between Soviet and East European parliaments and the NAA."

Colleagues, we will shortly begin the plenary debate on the theme of "Rebalancing the Atlantic Alliance." It is a debate that is increasingly urgent because by the end of this year it is foreseen that our governments will produce some answers, both in the Alliance and the European Council frameworks, to questions as old as this Alliance itself.

What, then, are the responsibilities that we will need to address collectively in the new environment.

There are, in my view, three important security functions that we will need to provide.

First, the classic function of maintaining sufficient capabilities for the defence of our territory. Despite the dramatic changes in Europe, this basic function will remain an imperative for us all. It will continue to provide the main reason for our collective defense planning.

But defence capabilities and expenditure will occupy a lower order of priority and a lower visibility. There will be fewer forces and they will be organized and configured differently—hopefully in a way that will contribute to the motion of cooperation and partnership.

The second function will be the increasingly urgent requirement to maintain security and stability in the whole of Europe. The key sources in security in Europe are no longer military in nature, even though they may have military consequences. There are new range of possible risks and dangers to which our Alliance must respond.

The third function was highlighted by the Gulf War—the question of threats to our common security that emanate from outside the traditional boundaries. To what degree and within which institutional framework can we plan for such contingencies?

These three functions enbrace a broad range of diverse risks. By their very nature many are difficult to define. Many are simply unpredictable.

The question for us today is how and where should they be handled.

Does the new security environment allow a re-allocation of existing roles and tasks, a new division of labour. To quote our own theme, can we achieve a "rebalancing" of Alliance responsibilities? This question must be addressed in reference not only to the tra-

ditional transatlantic relationship between Europe and North America, but also to the balance of responsibility between the various institutional frameworks at our disposal.

The short answer, of course, is yes. The new security environment will not just allow, it will necessitate a redefinition and a rebalancing of responsibilities.

The central issue in this process and the current debate is the emergence of what is known as the European Defence Identity.

It is clear to us all that as the United States presence in Europe, but not I stress the American commitment to Europe, diminishes, Europeans will as a natural consequence take a greater share of the collective defence.

It is also clear that this situation, and the effect of the Gulf War, has stimulated a real dynamic towards the development of a more visible European role in defence.

The main question is not whether a European defence identity should be developed. Rather it is how it will be developed and with what final objective? These are the central preoccupations of the day.

Put simply, there are two alternative courses of action. The first sees a more coordinated European approach to defence developed within the strengthening the Atlantic Alliance. The other approach sees a European defence role developed within the European Community, parallel to and perhaps even surpassing NATO. In both options, and for reasons that are well-known, the Western European Union has emerged as the appropriate basis on which to construct, at least initially, this European defence identity.

I will not dwell in any greater detail on the complex issues surrounding these institutional questions. I would simply like to point to some of the questions that they inevitably raise, and which I hope my colleagues will refer to during our debate this afternoon.

In what way will European security interests be different from those of the United States?

Are separate and distinct "Euro-capabilities" realistic or desirable?

Would the development of a separate European Defence identity help or hinder the gradual integration of the countries of Eastern Europe into the Western community?

Would its development within NATO weaken rather than strengthen the Alliance?

I will not myself attempt to answer these questions. Let me rather make two comments which are relevant to any solution:

First, we must assess the implications and weigh carefully the advantages and disadvantages of each course of action.

Second, we must avoid unnecessary and wasteful duplication of our efforts and our assets.

And finally, we must be clear about our final objective. A European defence identity must not be an end in itself—it must be a means to an end and to achieving a better situation—in other words it must be an instrument for achieving stability and security in Europe.

Properly handled, the emergence of a more coherent Europe defence identity could allow a balancing of responsibilities and a more effective division of labour.

Given our current security requirements and priorities, a very simple division of labour suggests itself. The primary responsibility for security—as this applies to collective defense arrangements—should rest, as now, with NATO, with its well established and will proven institutional planning arrangements.

That would permit the European Community to concentrate on the more urgent priority, and one which it is naturally suited to fulfill, of providing much needed economic help to the countries of Eastern Europe.

Where, on the security side, the Europeans are able, and feel it necessary, to make a separate effort in defence, within or outside Europe and through the WEU, this would be welcome. But we must not create additional structures and capabilities that lead to an unnecessary and wasteful duplication of time, money and effort.

It goes without saying that at a time of rapid change, we must not rule out any options or foreclose any course of action.

Our institutions must work together, each has a role to play. The challenge is to ensure that each is making its most effective and appropriate contribution.

As we look at these contributions, I would emphasize the following:

NATO must remain the principal venue for consultation and the forum for agreement on all policies bearing on security and defense commitments of its members;

That NATO must maintain an effective, integrated military structure to provide for collective defense; and

That we should support the European allies in their efforts to improve Europe's ability to protect vital interests and uphold the rule of law beyond Europe itself.

Thus far I have neglected to mention the institution in which so such optimism has been placed—the CSCE. Rebalancing the Alliance must also take into account the potential and limits of the CSCE. I hope that in Berlin the 34 foreign ministers can advance the discussion about peaceful settlement of disputes, looking toward a mandatory third-party role in conciliation and arbitration on security and political issues.

I hope the ministers can also agree on establishing a mechanism for emergency meetings, perhaps invoked on the basis of a majority of the participating states, and examing whether the Conflict Prevention Center is really, as it now stands, worthy of its name.

But the issue is not, as some would have us believe, a choice between NATO and CSCE. Again, it is a question of how the two can reinforce and complement each other. NATO will serve to underpin the security of the new democracies, whom I would also caution against placing undue hopes in the capability of the CSCE to act as an effective guarantee of their security. That day has not yet arrived.

Colleagues, I would hope that today all of the 22 parliaments represented here will have a reasonable opportunity to be heard on these difficult but nevertheless pressing issues. And in so doing, let us get on with real debate and concise argumentation, in the best traditions of this Assembly.

SPEECH BY MR. MIKLOS VASARHELYI, NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF HUNGARY

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished colleagues. Let me please speak briefly of our position concerning stability and security on the continent.

We are a small country, so it is evident that our security depends on the stability of the new European order which granted us the possibility to establish a free, independent, and democratic Hungary. So it is understandable that we try to use every means to reinforce our new status in Europe. We are striving for a working and creative partnership in the EC, the Council of Europe, the European Parliament, in the Conference on Security and Cooperation, in the WEU, and last but not least in the Assembly of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

We hope that the cooperation and the harmonization between these very important international organizations will develop in the future for the benefit of Europe and the world. However, we Hungarians will never forget that NATO and its main pillar, the United States, played a major role in preserving peace on the continent in these last decades, and made a contribution to the historical changes of 1989. The Atlantic dimension of any European collaboration is for us of basic importance. We definitely consider the presence of the United States and Canada in Europe as a guarantee for peace and stability of the continent, and consequently as a factor of the vital interest of Hungary and other Central and East European countries.

The lessons of the Gulf war have reiterated our conviction, according to which the very existence of NATO is of crucial importance from the point of view of stability. As it was stated on many occasions here in this conference, in the Soviet Union a gigantic struggle is going on between the supporters of perestroika, the promoters of democratic changes, and the old guard, the conservatives. We hope and we heartily wish that this struggle will result in the final victory of the progressive forces. But we know that the outcome of such a battle cannot be foreseen and the result taken for granted. That is why we think that in any case, NATO remains a determining factor in the balance of Europe. Therefore, we very much welcome NATO's endeavor to adapt to the requirements and circumstances of the new European constellation which also includes the reassessment of NATO's role in enhancing the security in Europe.

Since the democratic renewal taking place in Central and Eastern Europe provides the national parliaments with an increasing role also in shaping foreign and security policy, the role of the parliamentary bodies of European and Western integration are also witnessing an increase in the role they have to play. Therefore, in our endeavors to join Europe and European integration, we attribute an ever increasing importance to our relations with bodies such as the North Atlantic Assembly, the European Parliament, and others. Among all these bodies, it is with the North Atlantic Assembly maybe the most dynamic development of relations already prior to the status of associate delegation, which we are very happy to enjoy now. We will make efforts to perform in this Assembly a working and creative role.

Finally, please, let me express our satisfaction for the future assistance the chairman emphasized in his inaugural address before this Assembly. Thank you.

SPEECH BY MR. BOGDAM ATANASSEV, GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY, REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

Mr. Chairman, dear colleagues. I will repeat a very old joke that the speaker in trying to exhaust the subject indeed exhausted his audience. Unfortunately, the president will be here to cut me short, so I will get down to what I want to tell you.

In 1945, by the courtesy of certain countries, the East European nations were allowed the privilege of participating in what I call the GHMEEE, a beautiful acronym which you haven't heard, and which stands for the Great Historical Marxist Experiment Extended into Eastern Europe. It yielded nothing. It produced only suffering, hardship, tyranny, strife, inefficiency and a self perpetuating one party bureaucracy. One of

its children was the so-called Cold War, a misnomer really because it was red-hot, and flames were bursting out all over the world, out of its coldness, obviously.

The Warsaw Pact countries built a Berlin Wall with barbed wire extensions, but they were cut away by the Hungarians not long ago, and the wall was knocked down by the people of the so-called GDR. We know another very well known wall, the Great Wall of China, and there is an anecdote I'll relate of an American journalist being taken down to see that great structure and, admiring it, he turned to his Chinese hosts and asked, "did it work?". They looked at each other inquisitively and said, "Well, no, it didn't because the attack came from another quarter." We can draw an analogy here. The collapse of the Eastern economies behind the borders bristling with military technology also came from a different and unexpected direction. From the middle, from the economy.

Walls don't really work very well for those who wall themselves in. Those who are outside have the whole world to live in and to work in, in freedom, and they are not a very good idea. Indeed, I see three types of postwar devastation. Unfortunately, Rotterdam is one of those cities which has memories of that; so does Dresden, so do many cities in the Soviet Union and some in our own country. The first type I would say is the atom bomb attack, where you have total devastation, you can't see where the streets were, and where the built-up area was. Then you have the neutron bomb, which keeps the buildings standing but there is no living creature about. But the worst is the MARX bomb, that's the marxist economic bomb, that leaves the people walking about, but the economy is in a shambles.

We have no quarrel, I wish to note, with the peoples of the Soviet Union, none at all. We wish them well, and we want to have very good relations with every one of them and the Soviet Union as it stands today and as it will stand in the future, whatever the changes those peoples decide to make. Indeed, we wish to have links with the democratic forces in the Soviet Union, and we would like to collaborate with them too. Their ideas are our ideas; we share them. We wish to do business also with all nations in the world that wish to do business with us. However, there is one thing that I would like to mention. Goethe, on government, in his letters to Eckermann. "I hate bungling like sin", he says, "but most of all bungling in the affairs of State, which produce nothing but misery for thousands and millions." This is exactly what we have been doing, and we want to put a stop to such bungling. Now, in building the new defensive identity in the alliance, this should come as a result of creating a Pax Atlantica, as I see it. May I suggest that the best way of rebalancing your alliance is by the addition of a third pillar. Three is a very nice number; "alle gute dinge sind drei", say the Germans. By which I mean of course the inclusion of the East European countries, for the simple reason that political and military vacuums are dangerous. Implosion is just as dangerous as explosion. Indeed, the East Europeans must be allowed, more and more, to join the European and Atlantic structures in the short term, rather than the long term. And so, I would like to end with "Fiat Pax Atlantica". Thank you.

SPEECH BY MR. ION RATIU, ASSEMBLY OF DEPUTIES, ROMANIA

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the collapse of Moscow, the will there to rule over our part of the world permitted the countries of Eastern Europe to free themselves. They aspire to Western values, profess belief in democracy and, above all, want prosperity. The West recognizes this, wants to help, and does so. We all have heard of gradualism and of the "critical mass" reform approaches. But the results so far have been far worse than the most pessimistic estimates. Production is down, production capacity remains unused, unemployment is rising, inflation the same, standards of living have plunged, and people vote with their feet. We are witnessing what can easily become a massive exodus from East to West. In Romania itself, since the revolution, over one and a half million people have left up to the end of February this year, and we don't know exactly how many since.

Clearly, what is being done is inadequate. When thinking about rebalancing the Atlantic alliance, what we must aim at in my view is to make these people stay there; to make it interesting and exciting for them to stay there; make it interesting for the over 10 million exiles from these countries who now live in the West to go back there, use their acquired skills and resources. At the end of the last war, the West had the power to set the whole of Europe free. Alas, that power was misunderstood, misused or rather not used, and left us with a legacy of the trials and tribulations of the suffering of the last 45 years. In the aftermath of the Gulf war, the West again has the power to do what is necessary. Will it misuse it or will it not use it again? Must we go through an inevitably long period of yet unfathomed difficulties here in the West, as Germany—the richest of Western countries—is now coping with in Eastern Germany?

And, in the East, must a whole generation again be sacrificed? Some of you may have noticed that a year ago I tried to run for the Presidency of Romania. I advocated then and I do now a bold, radical reform surgically removing all the cancerous growth of Communism. In industry, plant, equipment unfit to compete freely in the open world market. I urge, then, the development of these lines that can produce wealth, and can be adequate for the people there. What we lack in Eastern Europe is an initial push conceived on a grand scale. What I suggest is no visionary leap in the dark. Today, most everybody agrees that the Marshall Plan, that most generous, unprecedented action, saved Western Europe, and it also brought great prosperity and helped the United States as well.

Today, Eastern Europe is in the most fertile ground for democracy and for potential prosperity. It is the critical area of what is now known as rebalancing the Atlantic alliance. We must not forget that Communism, like fascism and nazism, was a revolt within the body politic of Western civilization. Our civilization is well and healthy, with its twin roots firmly planted on the two sides of the Atlantic, it is at the dawn of stupendous, undreamt of achievement for the benefit of mankind. But for this, it should bring within its fold the lands abandoned half a century ago. A bold, massive approach will remove the risk of recession, and bring near full employment in the West. It will prime the pump in Eastern Europe. It will build the infrastructure, the roads and railways and the benefit of the electronic revolution. It will develop the tertiary industries virtually absent there. This is not a pipe dream, ladies and gentlemen, it is sound economic sense. The new effective demand thus created by these bold measures, coupled with wholesale training here in the West of the young East Europeans would create the instruments through which this new bold plan would be made a reality. The West has today the means, all the necessary means, to achieve this. The West has the historical opportunity to do it. In my humble view, there is nothing, but absolutely nothing that stands in the way. If there is a will, this will be done. Thank you very much

SPEECH BY MR. JACEK SZYMANDERSKI, SEJM, REPUBLIC OF POLAND

I think that now we Europeans have got to come to an understanding that the only way out of the circumstances which have plunged Europe into two wars is the denationalization of defense and security. We will have order of the peace as long as powers of cohesion in Europe are stronger than powers of disintegration. Any European country left out of this internationalized security system might be a potential danger against peaceful Europe. Poland and the rest of the East European countries strive to get to this internationalized security because we don't want to be exposed to the danger of becoming the stabilizing element in Europe.

To allow Poland into Europe should not be viewed as a privilege. Poland in Europe would visibly contribute to common European security and would help strengthen European integration. If Poland is integrated into Europe, then none of Poland's side countries would try to run their own politics toward Poland which might be dangerous to European integration, and might wake up the specter of the Cold War. We understand that any quick steps would bring us and Europe into political risk. But from the other side, we Europeans have to be aware that now initiatives have to be taken by the West. We cannot any longer comfort ourselves with not provoking the Soviet Union; we have to support actively democratic forces in the East. We have to support them both economically and politically.

We Poles expect that soon NATO would issue the declaration that sovereign democratic Poland is vital for the peaceful development of Europe. Thank you.

GOOD ADVICE

HON. DAVE McCURDY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Speaker, even though John Silber appeared to be afflicted with "foot in the mouth" disease during his unsuccessful campaign for Governor of Massachusetts, nonetheless he recently offered some very thoughtful and reasonable advice to Democrats in the following article. I submit that is worth the reading and suggest it to my colleagues.

A NEW TRADITIONALISM FOR DEMOCRATS

(By John Silber)

The Democrats can win the White House in 1992. But to do so, we must assess our party's situation with painful honesty.

Having lost five of the past six presidential elections, the Democrats can count on only the District of Columbia, claiming at best that as the District goes, so goes either Mas-

sachusetts or Minnesota. The Democratic hold on Congress is little consolation, for the direction of the nation is charted in the White House.

Nineteen months from now a Democrat can win—but only if, first, the party recalls and reaffirms its guiding principle that government can make a positive difference for the working men and women of America. Republican presidents are fond of invoking the name of John F. Kennedy, but nearly 11 years of Reagan-Bush have revealed this as a ploy. Republicans do not share President Kennedy's central conviction that government cannot sit on the sidelines but can and must confront the domestic problems of this nation.

Second, our party must recognize the failures in its nominating process that have distanced it from its constituents. Democrats must once again become the party of inclusion—not just in caucuses and conventions, but at the polls as well.

Once the party of farmers, working men and women (union and nonunion alike), teachers and other professionals, racial and ethnic minorities, Protestants, Catholics and Jews, Democrats appealed—victoriously—to Americans as Americans. But in 1972 the party abandoned FDR's grand alliance and began to appeal to voters as members of special interest groups. As these groups became increasingly important in the nominating process, the party became increasingly ideological and hostile to compromise.

Now traditional Democrats have come to feel abandoned or ignored, and they have wondered what has happened to their party. In great numbers they voted for Ronald Reagan and George Bush—not because they had become Republicans but because they saw traditional Democratic values best represented in these candidates.

THE REPUBLICAN EXAMPLE

Third, Democrats must re-establish bipartisanship on national security and foreign policy. In 1947, Sen. Arthur S. Vandenberg of Michigan, who with many Republican leaders had been a firm isolationist before the war, reversed his position to support Harry Truman on the Marshall Plan and NATO. By turning his party away from its discredited isolationist past, he gave it new life. We should profit by the Republican example. It is folly to disagree with the opposing party when it is right. If Republicans say two plus two is four. Democrats are not obligated to argue that it is five.

Democrats need to reassert their belief in a positive role for government. They do not believe that the best government is almost no government at all, nor that deregulation is the remedy for all problems. Americans have seen the havoc wrought by hands-off government: ineffective regulation of the S&Ls, deterioration of the banking system, conversion of the stock market into a computer-driven casino, the loss of competitiveness in American business with the consequent loss of jobs, the failure of the war on drugs, increased crime and violence, the decline in personal security, in our basic infrastructure, and in the quality of our schools.

Democrats need to develop the knowledge, common sense, vision and courage to address our greatest responsibility—our children. The Department of Education should serve as a National Bureau of Educational Standards to provide tests to measure student competence and the competence of teachers; persuade states to deny certification to high schools in which less than 80% of the graduating class passes the 12th grade test, and colleges to deny academic credit to students until they pass that exam; encourage choice by urging school boards to contract with private companies to achieve schools of higher quality; and offer day-care programs for all children from three to six years of age every working day of the year so that working and single teen-age mothers who need to work or go to school can escape permanent entrapment in welfare.

In this way we can ensure for the first time in our nation's history that all children have the ability to enter the first grade prepared to succeed, to experience school as a place of fulfillment and delight, prepare to stay in school and to avoid the use of drugs, alcohol, and practice of irresponsible sex. And if we succeed in this, we can begin to reduce the destruction and loss wrought by random crime and violence, drug and alcohol addiction, and adolescent pregnancy.

If we do not give all children a vision of themselves as competent, responsible individuals able to support themselves and their families, and a vision of the consequences of moral irresponsibility, we will never restore civil order or reduce the need for jails, welfare and increased police protection. Unless young people can earn an honest living and look ahead to a good life without crime or drugs, they will make a dishonest living and take their pleasures, however short-lived and destructive, where they find them.

Democrats should acknowledge that the War on Poverty, despite good intentions and some successes, has increased poverty and dependency. Incentives are needed to help those on welfare regain control of their lives and liberate themselves from entrapment in an underclass. Americans are disgusted with filthy cities and decaying infrastructure, while able-bodied, mentally sound people are unemployed. They are ready for a revival of the WPA and programs that require work for remuneration: programs that rebuild our infrastructure, provide thousands of jobs, and rehabilitate those addicted to drugs or alcohol.

Americans want an end to welfare fraud by the rich who use Medicaid trusts to defraud taxpayers. They want common sense used in the allocation of health dollars where major savings can be made through preventive medicine, including inoculations for children. It has been estimated that 40% of our children lack one or more essential inoculations. The lack of these ounces of prevention will inflict great human suffering and millions of dollars in expenses for avoidable cures. They want an end to mandated heroic treatment of patients for whom it is futile, cruel and expensive. They want an end to the ambulance-chasing that has driven malpractice insurance costs so high that many communities are without obstetricians or adequate medical care.

As crime and violence increasingly dominate our streets Democrats can offer more than the "hands off" Republican prescription. They can stand up to the gun lobby on automatic weapons. They can state the plain truth that these guns have one purpose, to kill people, and that they are no more sporting weapons than the Patriot missile. They can convince Americans that in the long run the use of abandoned military bases as sites for prison-schools to transfer ill-educated young offenders into responsible citizens will be far less costly than endlessly building more prison warehouses, or putting hardened criminals back on the streets.

THE MOST IMPORTANT RESOURCE

Democrats, while supporting free trade, should, unlike the Republicans, act to protect sound companies from corporate raiders and encourage basic research and its translation into products made by American workers to be sold competitively on world markets. Under the Republicans we lost immense parts of the microchip industry and run the risk of losing high-definition television to Japan. The Democrats can ensure that American industry will have the level playing field that will prevent more such disasters.

America is still a young, powerful nation rich in natural resources, including the most important—the intelligence and imagination of its people. When we develop our human capital and restore the banks and stock markets to provide financial capital, we will again have an America where life is good, where families and children flourish, where all are safe not only in their homes but on the streets, an America in which working men and women can enjoy in peace and security the fruits of their labor and anticipate a future unclouded by random violence.

The great years of America lie not behind us but before us. We are too young and strong to step back or step down. We are ready for leadership that will use government positively to harness the strengths, the talents and the virtues of our people. If the Democrats offer new hope and hard work, they can win.

TRIBUTE TO BRUCE FRIEDMAN, RECIPIENT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE VOICE FOR CHILDREN AWARD

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate this year's recipient of the New Hampshire Voice for Children Award, attorney Bruce E. Friedman of Contoocook. This award was presented last week as part of the 141st Annual Meeting of Child and Family Services of New Hampshire. Child and Family Services is a nonprofit organization whose mission is advocacy and protection for the interests of troubled and at-risk youth throughout the Granite State. It is the leading agency in New Hampshire serving the needs of low-income families through counseling and crisis intervention.

It is fitting that Child and Family Services has decided to honor Bruce Friedman. He is well-known to many in my State as a champion of the disadvantaged. For over a decade he has been professor of law and legal director of the Civil Practice Clinic at Franklin Pierce Law Center in Concord. He has been a leader in the movement to make legal services available to low-income persons. His work at the civil practice clinic has always been directed to the needs of the most vulnerable in our society; victims of abuse, foster children and troubled youth. This award demonstrates the respect that he has among his peers.

Bruce Friedman's work on behalf of disadvantaged children extends beyond the courtroom, into the halls of the New Hampshire Legislature. He has fought for years to make State government accountable in its responsibility to protect the interests of at-risk children. As a member of the board of directors of the New Hampshire Alliance for Children and Youth, he has worked with service

provider and advocates to force those of us in government to recognize the barriers which impede healthy development and growth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Bruce Friedman on a record of accomplishment serving New Hampshire. Mr. Friedman's success and commitment to the most vulnerable in our society is an example to all of us.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TRAUMA RESEARCH ACT OF 1991

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleague JACK FIELDS and I are introducing legislation which would create a comprehensive trauma care research program within the National Institutes of Health [NIH].

Traumatic injury is the leading cause of death during the first four decades of life and trauma is never lower than fourth as a cause of all deaths. An estimated 140,000 Americans die from trauma each year or about 400 people a day. This comprises a greater economic toll than heart disease and cancer combined and the economic losses amount to over $1 billion annually. In spite of this epidemic, according to a preliminary position paper presented to the Third National Injury Control Conference held in Denver in April 1991, the annual Federal research expenditures related to trauma care are approximately only 5 percent of those for cancer, heart disease, or AIDS. Increased focus in the area of trauma research is desperately needed.

The Trauma Research Act of 1991 would create an Interagency Trauma Care Research Program under the Director's office at NIH. This program would coordinate current piecemeal trauma research done at all of the institutes within NIH into a comprehensive program that will fill in the gaps that currently exist in trauma research. Specific institutes and agencies would be responsible for crucial issues such as the effectiveness of particular treatments conducted under particular time constraints, the biomechanics of trauma, infection control, wound healing, nutritional support and care, surgical interventions, neurotrauma, pediatric trauma, and geriatric trauma. An inter-institute advisory committee would be established to advise the Director on program initiatives and necessary budgets for this program. Within this program, the appropriate institutes would collaboratively focus on trauma issues in a comprehensive way, while addressing the need for specific attention to pediatric, geriatric, and neurotrauma. The bill would also allow NIH to give grants to trauma research centers to conduct additional biomedical research.

The Centers for Disease Control [CDC] is currently doing exemplary applied research in the area of injury control. CDC focuses on prevention and public education and is groundbreaking in these areas. Applied research is crucial and must be complimented by additional biomedical research specifically focused on acute and rehabilitation trauma care. The Trauma Research Act of 1991 creates a program for this critical component of trauma research.

Traumatic injury is currently at epidemic proportions. For every person in a serious car crash, every victim of gun shot wounds, and every child who is critically injured, the doctors and nurses knowledge of, and access to, the most effective treatment is a matter of life and death. The research that comes out of the legislation will enable health care providers to utilize the most effective trauma care procedures and limit the cost in terms of human life, human suffering, and health care dollars.

This legislation has been endorsed by the American College of Surgeons, American Trauma Society, American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Emergency Physicians, American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, American Congress of Rehabilitation and Medicine, and American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons.

Mr. Speaker, the Trauma Research Act of 1991 will promote a cohesive strategy for state-of-the-art trauma care. I urge the support of my colleagues.

AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS,
Chicago, IL, June 3, 1991.

Hon. ED MARKEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MARKEY: The American College of Surgeons commends you for the commitment you have demonstrated toward increasing access to quality trauma care services. In particular, we are pleased to support your most recent effort to improve and coordinate government-sponsored basic and clinical research into the treatment of severe injury.

While trauma is the leading cause of death for Americans under age 44, the National Academy of Sciences has estimated that severe injury receives less than two cents of every health research dollar spent by the federal government. In addition, most of these scarce resources are directed toward the epidemiology of this devastating disease. Better planning and coordination of the government's inquiry into the care of trauma patients, as intended by your draft legislation, would be a significant step toward addressing this serious deficiency in our nation's trauma research agenda.

Once again, the College wishes to express its deep appreciation for your continued commitment to reducing unnecessary death and disability due to trauma.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. EBERT, MD, FACS.

H.R. —

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 "Trauma Research Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERAGENCY PROGRAM FOR TRAUMA RESEARCH.

Part B of title IV of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 284 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"INTERAGENCY PROGRAM FOR TRAUMA RESEARCH

"SEC. 409. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH shall establish a comprehensive program of conducting basic and clinical research on trauma (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Program'). The Program shall include research regarding the diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, and general management of trauma.

"(b) PLAN FOR PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH, in consultation with the Trauma Research Interagency Coordinating Committee established under subsection (g), shall establish and implement a plan for carrying out the activities of the Program. All such activities shall be carried out in accordance with the plan. The plan shall be periodically reviewed, and revised as appropriate.

"(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Director of NIH shall submit to the Congress the plan required in paragraph (1) not later than April 1, 1992, together with an estimate of the funds needed for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 1995 to implement the plan.

"(c) PARTICIPATING AGENCIES; COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of NIH—

"(A) shall provide for the conduct of activities under the Program by the heads of each of the agencies specified in paragraph (2);

"(B) shall ensure that the activities of the Program are coordinated among such agencies; and

"(C) shall, as appropriate, provide for collaboration among such agencies in carrying out such activities.

"(2) RELEVANT AGENCIES.—The agencies referred to in paragraph (1) are—

"(A) the National Institute on Aging;

"(B) the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases;

"(C) the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development;

"(D) the National Institute of General Medical Sciences;

"(E) the National Institute on Heart, Lung and Blood Disease;

"(F) the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke;

"(G) the National Center for Medical Rehabilitation Research; and

"(H) such other agencies as the Director of NIH determines to be appropriate.

"(d) CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF PROGRAM.—The Program shall include—

"(1) studies with respect to all phases of trauma care, including prehospital, resuscitation, surgical intervention, critical care, infection control, wound healing, nutritional care and support, and medical rehabilitation care;

"(2) basic and clinical research regarding the response of the body to trauma and the acute treatment and medical rehabilitation of individuals who are the victims of trauma; and

"(3) basic and clinical research regarding trauma care for pediatric and geriatric patients.

"(e) MECHANISMS OF SUPPORT.—In carrying out the Program, the Director of NIH may make grants to public and nonprofit private entities, including designated trauma centers.

"(f) RESOURCES.—The Director of NIH shall assure the availability of appropriate resources to carry out the Program.

"(g) COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be established a Trauma Research Interagency Coordinating Committee (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Coordinating Committee').

"(2) DUTIES.—The Coordinating Committee shall make recommendations regarding—

"(A) the activities of the Program to be carried out by each of the agencies rep-

resented on the Committee and the amount of funds needed by each of the agencies for such activities; and

"(B) effective collaboration among the agencies in carrying out the activities.

"(3) COMPOSITION.—The Coordinating Committee shall be composed of—

"(A) the heads of each of the agencies that, under subsection (c), have responsibilities under the Program; and

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

"(1) The term 'designated trauma center' has the meaning given such term in section 1231(1).

"(2) The term 'trauma' means any serious injury that could result in loss of life or in significant disability and that would meet pre-hospital triage criteria for transport to a designated trauma center.".

TRIBUTE TO LONG ISLAND'S GOD SQUAD

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend and pay tribute to two outstanding Long Islanders who have formed a partnership to raise the spiritual awareness of people in my district and across America. These men, Msgr. Thomas Hartman and Rabbi Marc Gellman, are known as the God Squad.

While of different faiths, Monsignor Hartman and Rabbi Gellman have found considerable common ground between Judaism and Catholicism. Their double teaming approach to religion is a recognition of the importance of God and the need that all people have for Him everyday. As cohosts of a cable television show, carried on Long Island by TELICARE—Channel 25—and LI News 12, they are bringing a wonderful message of brotherhood, understanding, and love into living rooms from coast to coast.

Monsignor Hartman and Rabbi Gellman have worked tirelessly to raise both the quality and depth of interreligious dialog. In doing so, they have inspired a renewed interest in God and a deeper appreciation of the belief of others.

The latest collaborative effort of the God Squad is a book entitled, "Where Does God Live? It is a basic guide for parents to teach their children about religion and introduce them to God. It presents 17 questions frequently asked about God by young people of all faiths. The answers are in story form and draw from the bedrock values that are common to all religions.

Mr. Speaker, because our Nation's greatness will be measured less by our wealth than by our willingness to help others, I am pleased that we have men like Msgr. Tom Hartman and Rabbi Marc Gellman. These two bright, articulate, and innovate men have made the world a friendlier, more enriched, and more understanding place for those in search of God. I commend them both for their truly inspired work.

DISAPPROVING THE EXTENSION OF FAST-TRACK PROCEDURES TO BILLS TO IMPLEMENT TRADE AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO AFTER MAY 31, 1991

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, two letters should have followed my remarks in the May 23 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in support of House Resolution 101, disapproval of the fast-track procedure. Unfortunately, these letters were not included, and I request that they appear in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and be made part of the permanent May 23 RECORD. The first is a letter I sent with Representatives GEPHARDT, WYDEN, SIKORSKI, and MATSUI to U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills requesting assurance that the sovereignty of U.S. health and environmental laws would be protected in GATT and NAFTA trade talks. The second is the Trade Representative's response to us.

JUNE IS NATIONAL FRESH FRUIT AND VEGETABLE MONTH

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, a recent cover story in Newsweek magazine pointed out that when it comes to Americans' dietary habits what's missing from our plates is just as important as what's on them.

The disturbing news is that nutritionists have found nearly half of all Americans eat no fruit on a given day, and nearly a quarter eat no vegetables. Worse still is the fact that 11 percent eat neither.

Our eating habits stand in bold and unhealthful contrast to the Federal Government's dietary guidelines which recommend that a person consume five or more servings of fruits and vegetables each day.

The United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, a national trade association representing the U.S. produce industry, is trying to change these Americans' attitudes about fruits and vegetables. To help do so, it has declared June—National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month.

During the month of June, the association will conduct a nationwide media and educational campaign to encourage Americans to eat more fruits and vegetables. The association's goal is to re-introduce these Americans to the healthful, delicious-tasting bounty of fresh fruits and vegetables available here in the United States.

Both children and adults are being targeted. For children, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association hopes to increase their awareness of the healthy virtues of eating fresh produce. The message for them is simple: Eating fresh fruits and vegetables is good for your body.

For adults, the produce industry wants to get across the message that it's never too late to change your eating habits. Just because you disliked broccoli as a child, as did President Bush, does not mean it will not appeal to you as an adult.

Hundreds of people—from produce growers to retail operators—are working with the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association to get the word out about National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month and the importance of these foods in our diet.

Nutritionists point out that if Americans consume more produce and couple this dietary change with exercise, we decrease the risk of contracting various forms of cancer. New evidence suggests that a diet with plenty of fruits and vegetables may also protect against heart disease.

Mr. Speaker, fresh fruits and vegetables are not only an important part of a healthy diet, they also make a significant contribution to a healthy U.S. economy.

A recent Congressional Research Service report noted that fruits and vegetables earned U.S. farmers about $19 billion in 1990, more than 10 percent of all farm cash receipts. When imports are included, fruits and vegetables and their end products generate annual sales of as much as $125 billion, representing 20 to 25 percent of all U.S. food spending.

I commend the members of the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association for taking the initiative to declare June as National Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Month. More importantly, I urge all Americans to explore the delightful tastes of the hundreds of varieties of healthful and wholesome fruits and vegetables we have available in our country.

SALUTING DR. ROBERT L. HESS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 25th anniversary of the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute [UMTRI] and the contributions of the institute's founding director, Dr. Robert L. Hess.

Established as the Highway Safety Research Institute in 1966, the institute undertook the challenge of bringing together researchers to address the issue of safety on the Nation's highways.

Dr. Hess, who joined the university faculty in 1953, was asked to chair a university program advisory committee to analyze the complex system of people, automotive vehicles, and the roadway to develop practical and effective solutions to the urgent problem of highway safety.

Professor Hess assembled a research staff to conduct rigorous research study and program evaluation aimed at reducing vehicle crashes and the resulting injury and death—and thus was born the institute.

The institute has been recognized over the years for its contributions to the improvement of the Nation's highways. The institute has made major contributions in the areas of occupant protection, vehicle size, weight and handling, optimum roadway signing and vehicle

lighting, and the analysis of public policy as it relates to the driving environment.

Dr. Hess' own research involved the study of impact tolerance of the head and thorax, and the creation of computer applications to reconstruct vehicle crashes.

Mr. Speaker, in June of this year Dr. Hess will become professor emeritus. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Hess on his outstanding work at the University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute.

THE RETIREMENT OF ANN MONDELLO

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the impending retirement of one of the stalwarts of the Armed Services Committee staff, Ann Mondello. Ann has just completed her 25th markup with the Armed Services Committee, which certainly has to be some kind of record.

Ann joined the committee staff in 1967. Since that time she's worked for four different chairmen and five different staff directors. In fact, only two members of the committee—CHARLIE BENNETT and BILL DICKINSON—can claim the longevity with the committee that Ann has enjoyed.

Needless to say, the past 25 years have brought major changes to our Nation and the military, and the committee has been fortunate to have had Ann helping us adapt to those changes. She began working here with the Research and Development Subcommittee, but soon shifted her sights to the Personnel Subcommittee. There she played a key role in legislation bringing about the All Volunteer Force, the total force policy, the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act, Selective Service, and the list goes on and on.

In early 1984 she became the executive assistant to the staff director, a position she has held with distinction to this day.

It's difficult to summarize in a few words the importance of Ann's quarter of a century of dedicated service to the committee and the Congress. But let me try to put it this way: Ann has always put the interests of the committee and its members first; she's always been willing to go the extra distance to make sure things got done right and got done on time; she's been a mentor to new staff members, giving freely of her time and knowledge; and she's been a good friend to all of us.

Kim Wincup, our former staff director and now Assistant Army Secretary, said that Ann was his "good right arm" during his entire tenure here. To all of us, Ann has been a pillar of dedication and determination.

Mr. Speaker, all of us on the Armed Services Committee wish Ann every blessing in her new life and the best of everything for she and her husband Tony. We hope she'll come back to visit; she will truly be missed.

IN HONOR OF ANN MONDELLO ON THE OCCASION OF HER RETIREMENT

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Ann Mondello, who is retiring after serving with the House Armed Services Committee since her appointment by Chairman Mendel Rivers in 1967. As I think back on the long list of members and staff who have worked on this committee during the past 24 years, Ann's tenure is matched only by my own and Charlie Bennett's.

Over this time, Ann has lent her talents to the HASC and has played a variety of critical roles. She retires as the executive assistant to the staff director, a position she has held since 1984, outlasting one staff director and in the process of "breaking-in" another. Ann has brought a wealth of experience to this post, experience that she accumulated during her years as a full committee staff member, as well as a member of the Research and Development and Personnel Subcommittees. Her contribution to our committee is impossible to measure and will be with us all long after she has left.

Ann's list of accomplishments is lengthy and the amount of time she has spent with the committee, remarkable. However, it will not be the number of years of service for which I will remember Ann so fondly, but instead for her high standards of professionalism, her political instincts, her personal touch, her kind, gentle manner, and above all, her friendship.

Ann retires today in order to spend more time with her husband Tony and her family, including two grandchildren and to perfect a tennis game that I hear is already in pretty good shape. Ann takes with her, my friendship, best wishes, and highest esteem. I will miss her.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MOVIEMAKING AND AMERICAN FILM

HON. TED WEISS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, in 1993 moviemaking will celebrate its 100th anniversary. To mark this occasion, I have introduced a resolution today to honor this treasured American art form and distinctively American innovation.

The art and science of moving pictures was developed through the work of numerous creators in the United States—including Thomas Edison—and was perfected through many American inventions. But while America has contributed to the technology involved in moviemaking, it has left its indelible mark on the moving picture art and has indeed transformed this art form.

Films have reached every one of us—each of us has favorite pictures and beloved stars. America is home to unforgettable icons, from Charlie Chaplin and the Marx Brothers to Bogie and Bacall, John Wayne, and the thousands of larger-than-life men and women both of past years and in the present who command the silver screen both home and abroad.

Movies are more than an entertaining art form; they are also a successful creative enterprise. Moreover, they are America's ambassador to the world, conveying American values and beliefs, styles and attitudes. Their images and messages help convey the goals and aspirations of not only Americans but of people in every corner of the globe.

This resolution recognizes this wonderful American art form and calls for a nationwide celebration of the motion picture centennial through exhibitions, festivals, educational programs, and other activities. The resolution recognizes the American Film Institute [AFI]—whose founding legislative mandate is to help preserve the heritage of American film—and its role in helping to coordinate these activities. It also calls upon the AFI to join with regional entities and other interested groups throughout the country in related activities.

Hopefully, this resolution will assist in helping all Americans to celebrate an art form which has touched generations of Americans, which continues not only to entertain but also to inspire, and which has written a living history of our Nation's cultural heritage.

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL E. COURTNEY

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a special tribute to a man that many consider as a Washington institution. For decades, Samuel E. Courtney, affectionately known as "Courtney," was a fixture at events all over the Washington area with his ever-present cameras and a true sense of concern.

Samuel E. Courtney was born on March 20, 1919, in Washington, DC. He was introduced to photography by Lee Dunlap in the early thirties. Mr. Dunlap showed Courtney and his friends how to make a pin hole camera as well as crystal radios. From 1938 to 1945 Courtney served in the U.S. Army in the 19th Cavalry Machine Gun Troop which was stationed at Fort Myer, VA. After his discharge from the Army, he held a number of jobs including service as a waiter on Capitol Hill. In 1958, Courtney began his career as a freelance photographer for Jet magazine, a past he still holds. Courtney currently serves as the Washington bureau chief of the Daytona Times. Among the outlets that use his photographys are: The Washington Afro-American, National Chronicle, Washington Informer, Capitol Spotlight, Washington Observer, and the National Newspaper Publisher's Association.

In the African-American community, it is an established fact that if Courtney was at an event, the photographs taken would be seen in a number of publications.

Mr. Speaker, Courtney is a true long distance runner in the race for social equality and justice.

Courtney was on the frontline when African-American journalists had difficulty gaining access to press conferences and other news events. When we look at the growing number of African-American journalists, we owe a special debt of gratitude to Courtney and others who blazed the trail.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes great contributors aren't recognized until after their work is done. In the case of Courtney, I want to register my unequivocal commendation right here and now.

Courtney, you are a pillar of strength. I appreciate your efforts. I honor your work and I am glad you are there to keep politicians and others in line.

Thanks Courtney and keep on recording our history.

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADM. DANIEL W. McKINNON

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that Rear Adm. Daniel W. McKinnon, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, is retiring on July 1, 1991, after completing 35 years of faithful service to the Navy and his country. I take this opportunity to recognize and commend him. Culminating a distinguished naval career, Dan is currently serving as the commander, Naval Supply Systems Command and chief of Supply Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline his career accomplishments, however, I must make note of the fact that he and I attended Missouri University together in the 1950's. Hailing from St. Joseph, MO, Dan received his bachelor of science degree in business administration in June of 1956 from the University of Missouri through a NROTC scholarship. Following his graduation, he was commissioned an ensign in the Supply Corps, U.S. Navy. Additional educational accomplishments include receiving his master's degree in business administration with distinction from the University of Michigan and graduating with distinction from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. In addition, he was a 1986 Capstone Fellow of the National Defense University.

His tours at sea include assistant supply officer on the U.S.S. *Boxer* [CVS 21] and Supply Officer on the U.S.S. *Princeton* [LPH 5] where he saw service with Marine Corps units in Vietnam. Shore duty tours include stock control officer, U.S. Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, NJ; contracting officer of the naval support activity, Naples, Italy; United States Navy liaison officer to the U.N. Forces in the Middle East; contracting officer at the Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, PA; purchasing superintendent, Charleston Naval Shipyard, and director, contracts department, Naval Supply Center, Charleston SC. From 1970 to 1974, he was assigned to the Naval Supply Systems Command where he first served as director of the Sea and Overseas Assignment Branch in the office of the director of supply corps personnel and subsequently as the executive assistant to the commander, Naval Supply Systems Command/Chief of Supply Corps.

He was promoted to Captain in 1977 while serving on the staff of Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet, where he was responsible for Pacific area supply management policy ashore and afloat. In 1978, he joined the Naval Sea Systems Command in Washington, DC as director of the Shipbuilding Contracts Division where he led a Navy effort to change its methods of contracting for ship overhauls, as well as director of the Contract Administration and Claims Settlement Division. In May 1980, Dan assumed command of the United States Naval Supply Depot, Subic Bay, Republic of Philippines, responsible for logistic support of both U.S. Marine Corps and Seventh Fleet units during the crises in Iran and Afghanistan. In July 1982, he was assigned as director of supply corps personnel and was selected for promotion to flag rank the following year. At that time, he was assigned as assistant commander for inventory and systems integrity, Naval Supply Systems Command, where he was responsible for ADP acquisition and modernization programs. In March 1984, he assumed duties as vice commander of the Naval Supply System Command. In August 1986, he became deputy director, Acquisition Management of the Defense Logistics Agency. His responsibilities included contract administration of over $270 billion in Department of Defense contracts as well as management of a multibillion dollar purchasing system that included everything from spare parts to food and fuel used by ships and aircraft around the world. In July 1988, he became commander, Naval Supply Systems Command and the 36th Chief of Supply Corps.

In his current assignment, through superb leadership, Dan established a vision of and definition for the Navy integrated supply system and supply corps for the year 2000 and beyond. By employing comprehensive strategic and business planning methods, his command and the supply system performed brilliantly in its fleet support mission, culminating in the exceptional Navy logistics success achieved during Operation Desert Storm. His pursuit of logistics integration brought supply and maintenance activities together as a synergistic team. Inventory control points and supply centers, embracing total quality leadership, work in tandem with their industrial partners in shipyards and aircraft rework facilities. This process allowed him to leverage resources and maximize effectiveness through system automation and process improvement. His leadership toward a best value contracting philosophy and his comprehensive plan for a streamlined, highly service-oriented Navy resale system are further examples of his superior service. By his inspirational leadership, unrelenting perseverance, and tenacious dedication to duty, he rendered valuable and distinguished service and contributed greatly to the success of supply and logistics operations worldwide.

His career decorations include the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with goal star in lieu of second award, the Meritorious Service Medal with two gold stars and the Navy Achievement Medal [Combat v] with one gold star.

In 1987, President Reagan appointed him as a member of the President's Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severly Handicapped. In private life, he is on the boards of the Navy Federal Credit Union, Navy Mutual Aid Association and the Navy Relief Society; and is a member of the board of advisors of the National Contract Management Association.

In the last several years, Dan has shared his unique knowledge and great expertise concerning defense acquisition by personally participating in numerous congressionally sponsored procurement seminars. In this capacity he has been of great assistance to me, many of my colleagues and thousands of our constitutents.

A man of Rear Adm. Dan McKinnon's talent and integrity is rare indeed. Although his honorable service will be genuinely missed, it gives me great pleasure today to recognize him before this body and to wish him fair winds and following seas as he brings to a close his long and distinguished career in the U.S. Naval Service.

TRIBUTE TO MISS ILLINOIS FOR 1991 JULIE KEMMERLING

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Julie Kemmerling, who has been named Miss Illinois for 1991. She graduated from Hinsdale Central High School, attended Drake University in Des Moines, IA, for 2 years, and is now attending Columbia College, in Chicago, IL, where she is pursuing a B.S. degree in broadcast journalism. She is an honor roll student and a member of Delta Gamma Sorority. Julie is also a former Miss Iowa for the 1988 Miss USA Pageant.

Julie participates in many charitable organizations and activities. She visits weekly at the Hinsdale Hospital pediatrics ward and at the Wellness Community of Hinsdale. She was also involved in the Multiple Sclerosis Walk-a-Thon, and was one of the many Chicago celebrities who took part in the nationally televised 20th Annual Easter Seal Telethon on Sunday, March 3, 1991.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize and to pay tribute to such a talented and giving young lady. It makes me proud to have Julie Kemmerling as a member of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, and I encourage her to continue to use her talents so that others may benefit. I wish the best of luck to Miss Illinois of 1991 in all of her pursuits; she certainly deserves it.

A TRIBUTE TO SHELDON S. SOLLOSY

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sheldon S. Sollosy, this year's

recipient of the Providence Rotary Club's Rhode Island Distinguished Citizen Award. Every year this award is presented to the person who best represents the Rhode Island business community professionally, civically, and charitably.

Sheldon S. Sollosy certainly meets this criteria. He has been president of Manpower, Inc., of Providence since 1954, and serves as vice chairman for government relations for the Greater Providence Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Sollosy holds numerous other positions in the community. He is the vice president of the Providence Public Library, and president of Vaad Hakashruth of Rhode Island. In addition, he is director of the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, Leadership Rhode Island, Turks Head Club, Jewish Home for the Aged, and the Genesis School. Sheldon Sollosy is a member of the Workers Compensation Advisory Council, Board of Public Education Fund, Small Business Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Governor's Small Business Council, and the Private Industry Council for the city of Providence as well.

Sheldon S. Sollosy has proven himself to be a key element of the Rhode Island community. It is with great pleasure that I congratulate Sheldon S. Sollosy on his many achievements. I wish him equal success in all his future endeavors.

HONORING MONSIGNOR SCLAFANI: A HALF CENTURY OF SERVICE

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride and humbleness to pay tribute to a man who has served his city, his country, and his church for as many years as I am old, 50 years.

Msgr. Dominic A. Sclafani will celebrate his golden anniversary of ordination on Sunday, June 9, with a concelebrated Mass of thanksgiving at Our Lady of Grace Church in Brooklyn where he served as pastor for 12 of those distinguished years.

I would like to point out to my colleagues, that Monsignor Sclafani has been a priest through the terms of 10 American Presidents, from Franklin Roosevelt to George Bush. He has counseled and consoled adults and young people through a half-century of American history.

Monsignor Sclafani, who I am proud to count as a personal friend, was born in the Little Italy section of Manhattan. He attended PS–21, DeWitt Clinton High School, and Cathedral College, all in Manhattan, and Our Lady of Angels Seminary in Niagara.

He served as an assistant at St. Rosalia-Regina Pacis in Bensonhurst from 1941–1944; Our Lady of Mt. Carmel in Patchogue, Long Island from 1944–1945; was chaplin at Camp Upton in Westhampton, Long Island from 1945–1946; and was assistant at St. Michael-St. Edwards in Fort Greene in Brooklyn from 1946–1950.

In 1950, Monsignor Sclafani was assigned to St. John Evangelist in Brooklyn and became pastor there in 1966. He was named pastor of Our Lady of Grace Church in the Gravesend section of Brooklyn in 1970 and served in that capacity until retirement in 1982. He was named monsignor in 1981.

I have been blessed with the good fortune to honor many distinguished Brooklynites over my years in Congress. None has been more dedicated, more loyal, more tireless in his work than this remarkable man, Msgr. Dominic Sclafani.

TRIBUTE TO DR. EDWARD RHODE

HON. VIC FAZIO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Edward Rhode who will be leaving his position as Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine at the University of California, Davis, to return to teaching. Dr. Rhode has served as Dean for almost a decade and is now stepping down to devote his time to instructing our Nation's future veterinarians.

Dr. Rhode was born and raised in Amsterdam, NY. In 1943, he graduated from high school with honors. After attending Union College in Schenectady, NY for 1 year, he entered the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine program at Cornell University.

Upon completing his education, Dr. Rhode entered private practice for a year. He then received a position as instructor in the Department of Medical Surgery and Clinics, School of Veterinary Medicine, Kansas State College.

In 1951, Dr. Rhode became an assistant professor of Veterinary Medicine at U.C.D. Since then, he has received several promotions and much critical acclaim. In 1967, he became the head of the Division of Medicine, Department of Clinical Sciences. The following year, he was promoted to chairman of the Department of Clinical Science, School of Veterinary Medicine, at Davis. Dr. Rhode was again promoted, in 1971, to Associate Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine, and he became the Dean in 1982. For almost a decade, he oversaw one of the most respected veterinary schools in the country.

Dr. Rhode is not only an exceptional administrator, he is also an accomplished researcher and distinguished teacher. In 1959 and 1966, he received several research fellowships, and, since coming to Davis, he has written an impressive number of scientific articles. In addition, he was past president of the American Association of Veterinary Medicine Colleges and has been involved in a great number of prestigious committees, including participation in various university committees covering almost every aspect of campus life. To his credit as a teacher, Dr. Rhode was listed among the 1972 Outstanding Educators of America.

In today's world, when we frequently hear about teachers leaving the field of education for lucrative jobs in the private sector, it is heartwarming to know that someone as experienced and respected as Dr. Rhode will return to teaching. Such dedication to education is a fine example not only to his students but to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues today will join me in saluting Dr. Edward Rhode, a distinguished administrator, researcher, scholar, and teacher. I would like to send my personal best wishes to Dr. Rhode in his current endeavors and in the years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO FLINT JOURNAL EDITOR ED BACKUS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate this opportunity to honor Ed Backus, a veteran Michigan journalist who formally retired last week, at the end of May, after more than 40 years in the media.

Politicians and journalists sometimes have adversarial roles, even if they personally get along together. So it's not too often that you see a tribute from one to the other in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

But Ed Backus has been a contributing factor in journalism in my hometown of Flint, MI, for about as long as I've been in public service, and his clear eye and quick wit will be both missed and long appreciated.

As a journalist, Ed had his hand in almost all elements of journalism in at least two States that I know of—Illinois and Michigan. In Flint, he was involved with television before joining the Flint Journal newspaper in 1968. Ten years later, he joined the staff of the newspaper's opinion page, where he has served as associate editor.

Ed's colleague on the editorial pages, Editor David Fenech, recently quipped that Ed had finally decided to trade in the pencil for the golf course, where he undoubtedly would be as expansive in his opinions as ever.

If that's true, I sincerely hope that other golfers listen when Ed speaks, because his opining on the editorial pages of the Flint Journal has been well worth the reading.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that Ed Backus enjoys a grand and rewarding retirement, for he certainly deserves it. But I would like it known for this RECORD that I personally am a better person for Ed's wisdom, and all of us in the Flint community will be the poorer for his journalistic absence.

FARMINGTON REALTOR HONORED

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to advise my colleagues that a constituent of mine has been honored for her real estate sales expertise.

Claudine Riddle of Claudine's Real Estate in Farmington, NM, has been selected as an honored member in Steven's Who's Who in Real Estate.

Ms. Riddle has been helping New Mexicans find their perfect homes for 20 years. Selling

homes is a tough, highly competitive business with a high turnover rate among realtors. Having been in business for two decades, it is obvious Ms. Riddle has what it takes to do the job and do it right.

Ms. Riddle is also the education director for the San Juan County Board of Realtors and past president of the Women's Council of Realtors. She has served as legislative chairman of the San Juan County Board of Realtors. She was appointed by Governor Bruce King to the New Mexico State Housing Authority Commission and was reappointed by Governor Toney Anaya.

In addition to her distinguished real estate career, Ms. Riddle has been an outstanding member of the community and a great asset to our State. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Ms. Riddle for a job well done.

BUSINESS LOBBY TARGETS DEMOCRATS IN UNFAIR, RACE-BAITING ADS ON ALLEGED "QUOTAS" IN CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, opponents of H.R. 1, the Civil Rights Act of 1991, notably the so-called fair employment coalition, have sunk to new lows in their spurious campaign to label this a "quota" bill. The latest tactic used by this group is to run race-baiting advertisements and radio commercials in targeted districts of democratic Members of Congress. See attached article in the New York Times.

This group's conduct is to be contrasted with the admirable effort of the Business Round-Table—a high-powered business lobby led by the head of ATT—which was able to reach agreement with civil rights groups on a bill they were satisfied did not force employers to adopt hiring quotas. As Members know, this agreement was scuttled by the White House but the negotiations revealed that responsible business groups and the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights were able to craft a civil rights bill that put to rest the bogeyman of "quotas."

You may ask, "Which group represents the business viewpoint?" I believe that the so-called fair employment coalition represents the views of conservative ideologues in the Republican Party and White House, not the views of legitimate businesses who have demonstrated they do not fear H.R. 1 will force them to adopt quotas.

This latest tactic of using race-baiting ads against democratic Members who support civil rights should be roundly condemned. In particular, the businesses in whose name the fair employment coalition speaks should be made aware that the FEC is engaging in scurrilous ads that foster racial divisions. The following list of the FEC's members was distributed to Members of Congress last year. The FEC did not respond to a request from my staff to identify the businesses who do not support its ad campaign.

EXAMPLE OF ADVERTISEMENTS IN SELECTED DISTRICTS

(Federal Election Committee "Say no to employment quotas," 60 Radio, May 10, 1991)

Female voice: Have you heard what Congress is doing?

Male voice: What now?

Female voice: They're at it again, trying to pass a bill that would force employers to hire and promote by quotas.

Male voice: Quotas? Again? You've got to be kidding.

Female voice: I wish I was. But under H.R. 1, main street businesses across the country would have to hire and promote by quotas.

Male voice: But I thought the law was supposed to guarantee equal opportunity, not special preferences.

Female voice: Me, Too. But now some Congressmen want to throw skill, ability, and experience out the window. They want to force businesses to hire by quota or face big ticket law suits.

Male voice: You mean a business could be sued just because they didn't hire by some quota formula?

Female voice: They sure could. They could be sued and lose big bucks.

Male voice: What can I do?

Female voice: Pick up the phone and contact Representative ——. Call at 202-225-3121 today, and ask him to oppose H.R. 1. Tell him you want equal treatment for everyone, not special preferences for a few.

Male voice tag: This advertisement paid for by the Fair Employment coalition. Not authorized by any candidate or candidate's committee.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT COALITION

Aerospace Industries Association.
Aluminum Company of America.
American Bus Association.
American Crystal Sugar Company.
American Cyanamid Company.
American Electronics Association.
American Furniture Manufacturers Association.
American Hotel and Motel Association.
American Iron and Steel Institute.
The American Mining Congress.
American Paper Institute.
American Telephone & Telegraph, Inc.
American Road 7 Transportation Builder's Assoc.
American Standard, Inc.
American Subcontractors Association.
American Textile Manufacturers Institute.
Ameritech.
Ashland Oil, Inc.
Associated Builders and Contractors.
Associated Employers of Illinois.
Associated General Contractors of America.
Associated Specialty Contractors Association.
Association of American Railroads.
Autoclave Engineers, Inc.
Ball Corporation.
Bank of America NT&SA.
Bell Atlantic.
BellSouth.
Bethlehem Steel Corporation.
The Boeing Company.
Boise Cascade Corporation.
Bommer Industries Incorporated.
Brown 7 Root, Inc.
Building Owners & Managers Assoc, International.
The Business Roundtable.
Carter Hawley Hale Stores, Inc.
Caterpillar, Inc.
CBI Industries, Inc.
Central States Can Company.
Central Illinois Employers Association.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
Chevron Corporation.
CIBA-GEIGY Corporation.
Construction Industry Manufacturers Association.
Detroit Tooling Association.
Diebold, Inc.
R.R. Donnelley & Sons.
The Dow Chemical Company.
Eastman Kodak Company.
Electronic Industries Association.
Emerson Electric Company.
Ethyl Corporation.
Exxon Company, U.S.A.
FHP, Inc.
FMC Corporation.
Food Marketing Institute.
Food Service and Lodging Institute.
General Dynamics Corporation.
OLENFED, Inc.
GenRed, Inc.
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company.
Halliburton Company.
Hallmark Cards, Inc.
Harahey Foods Corporation.
Honeywell, Inc.
Household International.
IMA Management Association, Clifton, NJ.
International Paper.
Jessup Steel Company.
The K-Mart Corporation.
Kiva Container Corporation.
Libbey-Owens-Ford Company.
3 M Company.
The Management Association of Illinois.
The Manufacturers Association, Warren, OH.
Mechanical Contractors Association of America, Inc.
The Mead Corporation.
Monsanto Company.
Motorola, Inc.
National Aggregates Association.
National Asphalt Pavement Association.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors.
National Association of Stevedore.
National Association of Theater Owners.
National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors.
National Electrical Contractors Association.
National Federation of Independent Business.
National Ready-Mixed Concrete Association.
National Restaurant Association.
National Retail Federation.
National Roofing Contractors Association.
National Stone Association.
Pacific Telesis Group.
Painting and Decorating Contractors of America.
NYNEX Corporation.
Pakhoed Corporation.
Pfzar, Inc.
Plumley Corporation, Inc.
Portland Cement Association.
Power Tool Institute, Inc.
Ralston Purina Company.
Rockwell International.
Sandmeyer Steel Company.
Scott Paper Company.
Sears, Roebuck & Co.
Sheet Metal & Air Conditioning Contractors National Association.
Snap-On Tools.
Society for Human Resource Management.
Southwestern Bell Corporation.
Standard Register Company.
Sundstrand Corporation.

Superior Technical Ceramics Corporation.
Texaco, Inc.
Textile Rental Service Association of America.
TRW, Inc.
The Western Connecticut Industrial Council.
The Will-Burt Company.
Union Camp Corporation.
United Technologies.
UNOCAL Corporation.
USG Corporation.
USX Corporation.
Volvo North America Corporation.
Wells Fargo Bank.
Weyerhauser Company.
York International Corporation.

[From the New York Times, May 25, 1991]

CORPORATIONS ARE DESERTING GROUP BATTLING RIGHTS BILL

(By Steven A. Holmes)

WASHINGTON, May 24—Concerned about the economic impact of publicly opposing a civil rights measure, at least 21 major companies and an organization representing 200 big corporations have pulled away from a group formed last year to lobby against a broad civil rights bill.

Some of these companies, many of them large retailers, have declined to renew their membership in the group, the Fair Employment Coalition. Others have kept their membership, but are trying to distance themselves from the group.

Among those companies that have declined to be publicly identified with the coalition or that say they are no longer members are A.T.&T., Bank of America NT&SA, Bellsouth, Eastman Kodak, Hallmark Cards, Goodyear Tire and Rubber, Southwestern Bell, Hershey Foods, Nynex, the Pacific Telesis Group, Scott Paper, Sears, Roebuck & Company, and TRW Inc.

In addition, the Business Roundtable, made up of the chief executive officers of the nation's largest corporations, has withdrawn from the coalition.

Another corporation, the Exxon Company, U.S.A., was a member of the coalition last year, but a spokesman said the company would not comment on whether it was still a member.

Some of the companies that have dropped their membership say they still attend the group's meetings, participate in its discussions and back the coalition's goals. But they have declined to sign the group's "mission statement," which is a declaration of the organization's objectives.

"We feel we can represent our position effectively and with the appropriate amount of visibility without signing that statement," said Betsy Ricci, a spokeswoman for Nynex, which has opposed the civil rights bill.

A spokeswoman for a telephone company that has declined to sign this year's mission statement said the divisiveness of the debate over the civil rights bill had caused her company to rethink its membership in the coalition.

"The issue that the F.E.C. was formed around—civil rights—is such a hot potato right now that we've chosen to distance ourselves officially from the coalition," said the spokeswoman, who asked that neither she nor her company be identified.

But several major companies have retained their membership, including Boeing, Chevron U.S.A., Dow Chemical, United Technologies, Caterpillar and 3-M.

BUSH'S VETO THREAT

The legislation, now nearing a vote in the House, is intended to reverse six Supreme Court decisions that civil rights groups say have weakened Federal laws against discrimination in employment. The measure would also increase the amounts that courts can assess against employers who intentionally discriminate against women, religious minorities and the disabled. Last year, President Bush vetoed a similar civil rights bill, contending that it would force employers to adopt hiring and promotion quotas to avoid lawsuits. The Senate failed to override the President's veto.

On Thursday, Mr. Bush repeated a threat to veto this year's version of the bill, even though Democrats have eased some of the provisions in an attempt to make the bill more acceptable to the President. Mr. Bush called those changes "strictly cosmetic."

Peter Lunnie, the coalition's executive director, acknowledged that his organization was having a difficult time getting corporations to sign the mission statement this year.

"We're trying to get as many as we can just to provide cover for everybody," Mr. Lunnie said. "The associations are not a problem, but the companies are, because of not very veiled threats of boycotts."

ISSUE OF QUOTAS

The mission statement says that members of the Fair Employment Coalition "share a deep and common commitment to equality of employment," but that the group is united "in its opposition to legislation that would rewrite employment law in a manner which would encourage costly, unnecessary litigation at the expense of prompt, equitable resolution of disputes and induce employers to use quotas."

Wade Henderson, director of the Washington office of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said the withdrawal of companies from the group "confirms our belief that these companies were unaware of the cynical campaign undertaken by the coalition's Washington representatives.

"Many of these companies have a long record of support for civil rights efforts," Mr. Henderson said. "They should be commended for their recent actions."

NO SURPRISE IN DEFECTIONS

The defection of A.T.&T. and the Business Roundtable from the coalition is hardly surprising. The giant telecommunications company recently prodded the roundtable into taking part in protracted, but ultimately unsuccessful, negotiations with supporters of the civil rights bill in an attempt to draft compromise legislation. Recent published reports have credited the coalition, which has worked closely with the White House, with scuttling the talks.

Throughout the debate on the civil rights bill, the coalition has declined to make public the names of its members. But a list of members was obtained elsewhere.

Some supporters of the bill say the coalition is merely an arm of the National Association of Manufacturers, a trade organization that has opposed the civil rights bill.

Mr. Lunnie, the executive director, denies that his group is an arm of the association, asserting that the manufacturers' organization is simply the coalition's leader.

Mr. Lunnie is, however, an official with the manufacturers' association, and the coalition's meetings are held at the association's offices. The coalition is not registered as a lobbyist. Instead it is listed on the lobbying report of the manufacturers' association.

Mr. Lunnie also said he knew of only two companies that had withdrawn from the coalition.

CAMPAIGN TO SWAY VOTES

The coalition recently began an advertising campaign in the districts of 13 House members it considers swing votes on the civil rights bill, asking voters in those districts to urge their representatives to vote against the bill.

Copies of the print advertisements and transcripts of the radio commercials were circulated to all House members by Representative Tom DeLay, a Texas Republican who opposes the measure.

"It was just an F.Y.I.," said Roger Morse, an aide to Mr. DeLay. "Only the other side has really been applying the pressure. Mr. DeLay just wanted to let members know that there is another side that is applying pressure out there, and this is what is going to happen."

A SALUTE TO ROGER MARIS

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, 1991 marks the 30th anniversary of one of sport's most memorable and enduring achievements, Roger Maris' conquest of baseball's home run record.

While his 61 home runs marked 1961 as a year to remember for sports fans and admirers everywhere of heroic achievements, Roger Maris is remembered each summer in his hometown of Fargo, ND. To raise funds for the Roger Maris Cancer Center, the Hospice of the Red River Valley, and his alma mater, Shanley High School, the community sponsors a wonderful weekend that includes a banquet, auction of sports memorabilia, and a celebrity golf tournament.

Teammates of Roger's, Hollywood stars, some of the biggest names in the sports world today, and fans from around the country converge on Fargo to enjoy each other's company and to pay tribute to the extraordinary man who was Roger Maris. This year the event is June 30 and July 1.

The world knows that Roger still holds the home run record and baseball fans know Roger was twice the American League's most valuable player, played in seven World Series, and was, in addition to his famed batting exploits, one of the finest fielders to play the game. But there's another Roger Maris—one that his family, friends, and community know. That's the Roger Maris who was a loving father and husband, a loyal and dedicated friend, a modest and hardworking man who never forgot his roots.

I congratulate the people of Fargo who pour their energy and enthusiasm into a summer weekend to honor the memory of this uncommon man.

TRIBUTE TO NOAH EIG

HON. JOHN J. RHODES III

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 3, 1991

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, when I was growing up here in the Washington area, I at-

tended Landon School, in suburban Maryland. My son, Arthur, is now in the fifth grade at Landon. The school is well known in the area for excellence in all aspects of the education of young men.

Another well-known school, appreciated for its excellence, is St. Albans, in the district.

For more than 50 years a fierce but friendly rivalry between Landon and St. Albans has been a central feature of life at both schools. This rivalry is of Army-Navy proportions, and annual sporting events between the schools are highlights of the season, and victory marks the success or failure of the teams involved, regardless of sport, and regardless of record.

On May 17, 1991, the Landon and St. Albans lacrosse teams were locked in titanic struggle, not just for bragging rights between the two schools, but also for the championship of the Interstate Athletic Conference. More than 1,000 people were in attendance, including several members of my Landon class of 1961, who now have sons enrolled at the school, and including many who do not have students currently enrolled, but for whom the draw of another Landon-St. Albans contest could not be ignored.

In the midst of festivities, tragedy struck—literally. A typical Washington summer thunderstorm suddenly came up, the officials called a halt to the game, and the field was cleared. The teams sought safety in their buses and the gym, and the spectators scattered. A small knot of students and parents huddled under one of the huge, old trees that fringe the edge of the St. Albans playing field, and it was at this tree that fate flung a huge bolt of lightning, and it was under this tree that Noah Eig, 15-year-old Landon freshman died.

I didn't know Noah; I am acquainted with some of his family. His first cousin is in my son's class, and one of Arthur's best friends. One of my classmates who was there is a physician, and helped provide aid and assistance to the injured. His daughter, a senior at Landon's sister school, Holtyon Arms, and an intern in my office, arrived immediately after the lightning strike. Her younger sister was a close friend of Noah's.

The Landon family is large, and close. Graduation is not the end of the Landon experience, but just the beginning. This kind of tragedy touches every single one of us. I wonder how my son is dealing with this. It is his first experience with death. We have talked to him, and are talking to him, and he seems to respond to us, but how badly is he hurt? We know that the boys are talking among themselves, and Arthur has been sought out by his friend, Noah's cousin, and has spent a lot of time with him.

When a death occurs, it is natural to try to find some explanation, something that can help us to understand why a life has been taken from us. How can these young people understand what has happened to them? How can Noah's classmates and schoolmates explain to themselves why he is no longer with them? As a member of that large and loving Landon family, I am hurt by this loss, and I can only barely imagine the sense of loss of these young people, and I feel for them, very deeply.

To Noah's family, I can only express my deepest and most profound sympathies. I can think of nothing more tragic or heartbreaking than for a parent to have to bury a child. The Landon family can do nothing to make your burden any lighter or your sorrow any less deep, but we share it with you, and you have our love.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, June 4, 1991, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JUNE 5

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine the impact of certain pesticides manufactured in the United States and exported to Third World countries.

SR-332

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1992 for activities of the Secretary of the Interior, and Members of Congress.

S-128, Capitol

Armed Services

Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1066, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the total force policy report, and manpower and force structure plans.

SD-628

Governmental Affairs

Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine postal enforcement of the Agricultural Quarantine Enforcement Act.

SD-342

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 667, to provide support for and assist the development of tribal judicial systems.

SR-485

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans and Environment Subcommittee

Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1992 for foreign assistance.

SD-419

11:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine recycling programs of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1992 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-138

Armed Services

Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1066, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on ICBM modernization.

SR-222

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 106, to revise the Federal Power Act to prohibit the granting of a Federal license for a hydroelectric project unless the applicant complies with all substantive and procedural requirements of the affected State in which the project is located with respect to water acquisition and use.

SD-366

Foreign Relations

Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee

Closed briefing on Moscow Embassy construction plans.

S-116, Capitol

2:30 p.m.

Judiciary

To hold hearings on the nominations of Saundra Brown Armstrong, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California, Timothy K. Lewis, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and William L. Osteen, Sr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of North Carolina.

SD-226

JUNE 6

9:00 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nomination of Nancy Patricia Dorn, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works).

SR-222

Labor and Human Resources

Business meeting, to mark up S. 323, to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to ensure that pregnant women receiving assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act are provided with information and counseling regarding their pregnancies.

SD-430

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of John Schrote, of Ohio, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Program, Budget and Administration, and Mike Hayden, of Kansas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Protection Subcommittee
To continue hearings to examine recycling programs of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Program.
SD-406

Finance
To resume hearings to examine the causes and effects of rising health care costs and the status of access to health insurance, focusing on efforts by insurers to restrain rising health care costs and ways to improve access to affordable health insurance coverage for employees of small businesses and their dependents.
SD-215

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on enforcement and administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act (FARA).
SD-342

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up pending legislation.
SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
International Economic Policy, Trade, Oceans and Environment Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1992 for foreign assistance.
SD-419

10:30 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1194, to improve public transportation throughout the U.S.
SD-538

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH-216

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the future of the Soviet military.
SD-419

Judiciary
Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee
To resume hearings on overview of the bankruptcy code, focusing on cramdowns of residential real estate mortgages in Chapter 13 bankruptcies.
SD-226

JUNE 7

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Projection Forces and Regional Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1066, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on antisubmarine warfare programs, including attack submarine programs.
SR-222

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of Preston Moore, of Texas, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Commerce.
SD-342

Joint Economic
To hold hearings to review the employment-unemployment situation for May.
SD-562

JUNE 11

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Mineral Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 433, to provide for the disposition of certain minerals on Federal lands, and S. 785, to establish a Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to mining.
SD-366

JUNE 12

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold a briefing on the Persian Gulf War.
SH-216

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 962, and S. 963, bills to confirm the jurisdictional authority of tribal governments in Indian country.
SR-485

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 775 and S. 23, to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain disabled veterans, sections 111 through 113 of S. 127, and related proposals with regard to radiation compensation, and proposed legislation providing for VA hospice-care.
SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Finance
Taxation and Debt Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on miscellaneous tax bills, including S. 90, S. 150, S. 267, S. 284, S. 649, and S. 913.
SD-215

JUNE 13

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Carolyn R. Bacon, of Texas, Martha Buchanan, of Texas, and Sheila Tate, of Virginia, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review revenues from additional radio spectrum allocations.
SR-253

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Protection Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation on municipal pollution control, including S. 1081, authorizing funds for water pollution prevention and control programs of the Clean Water Act.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings of enforcement of anti-dumping and countervailing duties.
SD-342

10:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nominations of Gen. Gordon R. Sullivan, USA, to be Chief of Staff of the Army, and Lt. Gen. Carl E. Mundy, Jr., USMC, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps.
SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Foreign Commerce and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine national tourism policy.
SR-385

2:00 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the Agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, with Annex, signed at Washington, June 1, 1990 (Treaty Doc. 101-22).
SD-419

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings to examine efforts to combat fraud and abuse in the insurance industry.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To resume hearings on legislative proposals to strengthen crime control.
SD-226

JUNE 19

9:00 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the National Native American Advisory Commission.
SR-485

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the future of the Soviet economy.
SD-419

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 933, to provide fair funds to consumers of natural gas who are found to have been overcharged.
SD-366

JUNE 20

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review broadcasters' public interest obligations.
SR-253

JUNE 26

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations

To resume hearings to examine efforts to combat fraud and abuse in the insurance industry.

SD-342

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to mark up pending calendar business.

SR-418

2:00 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 362, to provide Federal recognition of the Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians of Alabama.

SR-485

JULY 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Surface Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for rail safety programs.

SR-253

CANCELLATIONS

JUNE 5

10:00 a.m.

Armed Services

Readiness, Sustainability and Support Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1066, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the Defense Environmental Restoration Account and the service environmental compliance funds accounts.

SR-222

JUNE 20

9:00 a.m.

Select on Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the Navajo-Hopi relocation program.

SR-485