

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—February 19, 1992

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

We are grateful, O God, for all the blessings that we have experienced in our land and the gifts of freedom and personal responsibility that have been our heritage. May we not lose the birthright we have received nor squander the richness of our inheritance. We pray, gracious God, for wisdom to see the truth, strength to lead, responsibility for our actions, tolerance toward each side, and enthusiasm to be about our tasks. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MINETA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON TODAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with today.

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

There was no objection.

JUSTICE AND FAIRNESS CALLED FOR IN UNITED STATES-JAPAN RELATIONS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 into law.

This law—born of wartime hysteria, racism, and weak political leadership—led to the unjust internment of 120,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry by the United States Government.

Forty-six years later, Congress approved the Civil Liberties Act of 1988. Another law. But unlike the law of 1942, this law restored the honor and dignity of Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Today, Japanese-Americans are reflecting on these events, and what they have meant in the life of our Nation.

And Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to stand here today and thank my colleagues in Congress for lifting the stigma of shame from Americans of Japanese ancestry.

Americans of Japanese ancestry had an abiding faith that our Nation would ultimately redress the injustices of the internment, and that faith was wholly justified.

But today, Mr. Speaker, Japan-bashing and America-bashing are again threatening Americans of Asian ancestry with a backlash steeped in hatred.

So, on this day, Mr. Speaker, my prayer is that what we do and say in this Chamber will be as wise as it was in 1988, and that Congress will continue to speak out as a force for justice and fairness.

AMERICANS WANT TAX RELIEF—PERIOD

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people are angry. They are tired of Congress piling ever higher taxes upon their shoulders. They are frustrated that Congress keeps passing bills which create an ever-increasing bloated Federal Government.

Moreover, the Democrat-controlled Congress, whether out of arrogance or ignorance of the will of the American people, has once again offered the failed policies of more traditional pump-priming spending policies to end the recession and get the economy back on its feet. Once again, the sound advice of tax relief, tax cuts, is being ignored.

Mr. Speaker, it is not morning in America anymore. In fact, there are

very few signs of economic sunshine. We have ducked the responsibility for the recession. In doing so we have squandered months that could have been used enacting legislation to create jobs. Instead, we have engaged in a partisan political battle over extending unemployment benefits.

The American people want tax relief, period. Let's cut taxes not only for the middle class, but across the board. Today, I stand to challenge this body to enact a growth package. We now have only 30 days until the March 20 Presidential deadline. Perhaps by getting to work, we might cool some of the anger within the American people, and with it bring a much-needed measure of respectability to this body.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICANS WITH HEAD INJURIES

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, serious head injuries resulting from accidents and violence are an epidemic in this country. Two million Americans suffer serious head injuries every year. The annual cost of their care is nearly \$25 billion.

Earlier today I chaired a hearing about the plight of people with head injuries. We learned that too often patients are warehoused in outrageously overpriced, resort-like facilities. We heard testimony that some unscrupulous operators are defrauding insurance companies and ripping off Medicaid and Medicare. Patients in these facilities receive substandard care, while paying \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 a month.

These institutions receive scant attention from Federal and State regulators. It is time that we cracked down on these entrepreneurs who profit from the grief of others. These greedy companies are driving health care costs further out of control, in addition to the human suffering they cause.

We must take away, legislatively, what today in far too many instances is tantamount to a license to steal.

WORKFARE FAVORED OVER FAILED WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, last evening in the Niagara County Court

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

House at Lockport, NY, hundreds of taxpayers joined to protest a welfare system that has failed.

Today's welfare system has encouraged the breakup of families, the destruction of communities, and the undermining of the very values of our Nation. The focus of last evening's hearing: 600 new welfare cases opened last year when out-of-staters moved there seeking higher benefits.

Our Nation's failed welfare system encourages families to move from State to State, not in search of jobs but rather, simply in search of bigger and easier welfare checks. In response, Niagara and other upstate New York counties are planning residency laws and other tough steps to regain control over welfare.

I am sponsoring legislation to cap welfare benefits for those who move seeking higher welfare checks. Each and every American taxpayer is footing the bill for these people, and I welcome cosponsorship of my legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the time has come for the complete elimination of the welfare system and its replacement with workfare. In Lockport, NY, and across America the message is clear. Taxpayers want action on welfare now.

WHY BUCHANAN FOUND SUPPORT IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

(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, it is not hard to figure out Pat Buchanan's success in New Hampshire. Taxpayers are fed up with a government that continues to spend over \$20 billion a year in foreign aid while cutting food stamps back home in America, a government that closes the Philadelphia navy yard but did not close one military base in Japan or China and still spends over \$150 billion a year protecting Japan and Germany, a government that turns its back on illegal trade causing our workers to lose their jobs and jobs going overseas.

That is why Buchanan did well. I think it is time for the Democrats to take a look at some of those issues, because America's workers do not want a tax cut once a year, they want a job five days a week and a paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, it would be wise for the Democrats to visit some of those issues Buchanan is talking about.

□ 1410

THE BLOB THAT ATE YOUR PAYCHECK

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, this morning an editorial in the Washington Post captured the essence of the Democratic tax bill in these words:

This is a shapeless bill, itself the product of vote-buying within the committee.

I like the word "shapeless" to describe this bill because the bill has the qualities of one of those grade B horror movies of the 1950's. It could be titled "The Blob That Ate Your Paycheck," or "I Was a Vote-Buying Vampire."

Shapeless, bulging this way and that with special interest goodies, hissing the rhetoric of class warfare, the Democrat bill slouches and lurches its way toward the petrified taxpayer.

But wait—Paul Tsongas, the Democrat Presidential front runner, ran against the Democrats' bill in New Hampshire, and he won.

It would appear for the next few weeks, we will be treated to Paul Tsongas bashing his own party's tax bill in the horror epic entitled, "Mr. Excitement Versus the Democratic Tax Godzilla."

Mr. Speaker, it should be indeed an entertaining, as well as enlightening, performance.

ELIMINATION OF BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS WILL NOT ELIMINATE BAD STATISTICS

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

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration is embarrassed by continuing morbid statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. What does the Bureau of Labor Statistics do? They come out and tell you how many people are unemployed. They categorize them into women, into young people, into blacks.

But the President is going to do something about it. Do you know what he is going to do? He is going to eliminate the money that funds the Bureau of Labor Statistics so that there will not be any statistics any more. Out of sight, out of mind.

I remind the President that it is not going to go away. Now he can add to the statistics the unemployed that are working for the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

So what are you going to do, Mr. President? It just ain't going to disappear, and you had better wake up.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

FEW PEOPLE WILL SUPPORT DEMOCRAT BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the first response to what happened yesterday in New Hampshire is that one party has a battered candidate for President and the other party does not have a candidate at all.

Second, and I think perhaps more significant, is that the leading vote getter on the Democrat side and the President's opponent on the Republican side both criticized the President's economic recovery program for not doing enough.

So perhaps the real message of New Hampshire is not to the presidential politics at all, but to the Congress. We ought to understand the desire of the American people to enact a real economic recovery plan.

I would especially want to draw to the attention of my farm friends across this country that the Committee on Ways and Means proposal will do two things. First of all, it will deny any farmer the opportunity to have a capital gains tax benefit on the sale of their farm. Second, it will turn around and have an 84.5-percent sequestration on all farm support programs to pay for the other programs within that Democratic package.

As we learn more about it, I am sure we will see there are even fewer people than Paul Tsongas that support this.

PATRICK BUCHANAN: THE MOST DANGEROUS DEMAGOGUE OF THE DECADE

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

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, no President has been reelected after losing at least 35 percent of the vote to a single rival in the New Hampshire primary. It happened to Harry Truman, to Lyndon Johnson, to Gerald Ford, and to Jimmy Carter.

Yesterday it happened to George Bush. So I think it is about time that, among other things, we took a close look at Patrick Buchanan. No, not the Patrick Buchanan who is the TV personality, not the Patrick Buchanan who clearly understands why people are angry with George Bush's economic mess, but the real Patrick Buchanan. The one who says he would accept terrorist Yasser Arafat as the "first president" of the new Palestinian homeland as the price for peace in the Middle East, the one who says that the survivors of the Holocaust have exaggerated their suffering, the one who says that South Africa has been misunderstood, and the one who says that gays are the cause of the decay of this society.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Buchanan appeals to the dark, mean, intolerant underbelly of the United States. I think these facts make him the most dangerous demagogue of the decade.

PRESIDENT'S GROWTH POLICY NEEDED TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Independent Business has pointed out that the Democrats' \$91 billion tax bill that appears headed to the floor next week contains a \$17 billion tax cut for the giant corporations of America, while it has a tax increase for most of the small mainstream businesses of the United States. I think that is really remarkable, that the Democrats are producing that kind of a bill, a big bill for big corporations of America, and a bill that hurts small business.

The way we understand that that is to be presented out here is that you have to first of all realize that 90 percent of America's businesses are not incorporated. They are sole proprietorships or they are partnerships. They pay their taxes as individuals. Only 10 percent of businesses in America today are incorporated.

So the Democrats propose a tax cut on corporations in America, but they propose a 4-percent increase in the taxes for individuals in the income tax bracket where most of these businesses pay their taxes.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to stimulate economic growth in this country. That is not the way to get small businesses working, to have tax increases for 90 percent of them.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is a growth policy such as the President's proposal with investment tax allowances, and to have something with respect to capital gains.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to take a serious look at the flaws of the Democratic tax proposal.

PUT AMERICANS BACK TO WORK ON CONSTRUCTION JOBS

(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, occasionally we have to go backward in order to go forward. And, sometimes we have to study the past to get a glimpse of the future.

If we study the past, in the mid-1970's, we will find that public works programs were the quickest and best way to put Americans back to work and to move our Nation out of recession. Then, we went through a period where people did not use the term "public works programs." They talked about infrastructure, about public investment.

Now, 20 years later, we are back where we started saying that public works programs are the best way to put people back to work.

Today I testified before the Committee on the Budget urging the committee to institute such a program. I introduced into the RECORD the February 12 letter I received from Mayor Jerry Abramson of Louisville advancing a program called Ready To Go endorsed by the Nation's mayors, which will put Americans to work quickly in public works projects.

Mr. Speaker, there are \$100 million worth of Ready To Go projects in Louisville. There is no better way to put Louisvillians and all Americans back to work than on construction jobs. H.R. 4175 introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] will help do that trick. Let us all get behind that bill.

HOW MUCH DOES IT COST? WHO PAYS?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional office, our motto may strike some as simplistic—but it gets to the heart of the matter. When soliciting me or my staff for support on proposed legislation, you can expect us to ask two basic but critical questions: How much does it cost? And who pays? If the answers don't add up, the legislation will not get my support. It is that simple. No more big deficit spending proposals—no more socking it to the American taxpayer.

I don't want to sound like the innocent who always asks "why," but in days of \$400 billion annual deficits and in a Congress that cavalierly casts its blessing on \$375 billion in appropriations by voice vote—maybe "why" is not such an innocent question.

I know many of my colleagues are serious about fiscal discipline, and for them I have had reminders made—at my own personal cost—displaying our straight forward message. I think it is about time we got back to budget balancing basics and reading the fine print. "How much does it cost? And who pays?"

The people we work for want to know.

DEMOCRAT TAX PACKAGE FAVORS SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have a statement prepared which criticizes the President's budget because of the \$350 billion deficit he proposes. We have an administration that year after year says it is in favor of balanced budgets, but it never offers one. In 11 years of Reagan-Bush economics, the administration has never offered a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, let me instead address a comment that one of my colleagues made about the provisions of the Democratic tax package that is allegedly antismall business.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell Members that the Committee on Ways and Means has adopted a provision, first authored by Senator BUMPERS and introduced in the Senate in 1987 and here by me in the House in 1989 which targets capital directly to small business. It allows a capital gains cut for investments made directly in businesses with gross assets of \$100 million or less that are held for 5 years.

□ 1420

This is in direct response to President Bush's capital gains proposal, and this will revolutionize the flow of capital into small businesses in America. This is a dramatic proposal and would help our small business community greatly.

BUSH'S BUDGET: MORE DEFICITS

President Bush's fiscal year 1993 budget that came to Congress last month contains some proposals worth considering to revive our faltering economy. But there is one glaring omission in the President's plan: No plan to eliminate the Federal deficit.

The President's budget proposes a fiscal year 1993 deficit of \$352 billion. But this is nothing new. The President's proposed budget for the current year had a deficit of \$281 billion. He has now revised that estimate to \$399 billion. The President's proposed budget for the last fiscal year had a deficit of \$63 billion. These are from the President who promised us a balanced budget by fiscal year 1993. This is from an administration who always campaigns for a balanced budget, but never proposes one.

Barry Bosworth, a noted economist from the Brookings Institution, testified earlier this month before the Economic Stabilization Subcommittee that the Government borrows two-thirds of all private savings for current expenditures. Those private savings would otherwise be used for investment, which in turn would increase productivity. America saves only 3 percent of earnings while our international competitors save 10 to 15 percent. The Federal Government leads the list of dissavers. We simply must put an end to this borrowing because it is corroding our economy. But we must have leadership from the administration. It is not acceptable to submit a budget with a \$350 billion deficit.

I have introduced a bill to require the President to propose and the Congress to pass a balanced budget. I call on the President to exercise his leadership and to join Congress in developing a budget that ends deficit spending, a practice that do in American households in short order.

MR. PRESIDENT—NO MORE NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's primary in New Hampshire proved that however much President Bush may try, he never will be able to please or move to the right of the far right. If he keeps trying, he will just see more New Hampshires.

As a progressive Republican, I plead with President Bush to return to the George Bush who rose to national prominence as a man concerned with the environment, family planning, the world population explosion, and civil rights—the George Bush who eschewed voodoo economics. That is the real George Bush, the George Bush who can appeal to the vast majority of Americans and who can provide our Nation and the world with the leadership they need in the critical days ahead.

A MESSAGE FOR PRESIDENT BUSH

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the American public is very forgiving. For more than 12 years they have endured policies that ignored the middle class, gave tax breaks to the rich, and have thrown the Nation into a deep recession.

But yesterday the voters of New Hampshire told the country that their patience had run out. They sent a strong message—a message shared by Americans across the country: They are tired of government that works against them, government that looks out for the rich but not the working middle class, government that ignores our pleas for affordable health care and a fair tax system.

It has been said that the President has lost touch with the people of this country. That this is a common belief was made clear by the votes cast yesterday in New Hampshire. Yesterday's voting returns demonstrate that even members of the President's party are skeptical of the course he has set to ease the burden of recession.

I hope this is a message the President will heed. I hope that he will reconsider his tax proposal that rewards the wealthy and again ignores the middle class; I hope he will reconsider his health care plan, that does nothing to control costs or answer the fears of Americans worried about their ability to keep their families healthy; and I hope he will reconsider his budget, which looks to the past and has no vision of the future.

ANOTHER MESSAGE FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, there were lots of messages out of New Hampshire

yesterday. The message for all of us is that the economy is weak. The people want us to act quickly to strengthen it. But the message for House Democrats is, "Scrap your misguided tax proposal and start over."

The man who is today the Democratic front runner for President, Paul Tsongas, won the primary by running against the policies of House Democrats. Listen to Tsongas' position recorded on Saturday by the Washington Post.

Tsongas told reporters today that if he were President, he would veto a House Democratic proposal that would give tax credits of up to \$400 to most Americans. He said the proposal grew out of polling data, not sound economics.

If that is where the Democratic Party wants to go, either by the candidates or the Congressional leadership, then leave me out."

The front runner of the Democratic Party's nomination said.

He went on to make a prediction about what his victory would mean. "All the old Democrats who are into give away, give away, give away, antibusiness, corporate bashing, that will end," said Paul Tsongas, predicting what would happen to the Democratic Party in the event that he won the New Hampshire primary.

Really, come visit us, Mr. Tsongas. You will find your enemy is not George Bush; it is the House Democratic leadership.

THE WHITE HOUSE COMMEMORATIVE COINS BILL

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

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, today the House will vote on H.R. 3337, the White House commemorative coins bill. I urge all Members to support it.

Title III of that bill is my legislation to grant a silver congressional commemorative medallion to Desert Storm veterans. The Desert Storm Medal, which will be provided at no cost to taxpayers, passed the House overwhelmingly on suspension in July.

In the heat of this year's battles up in New Hampshire and over in the Ways and Means Committee room, it's easy to forget that just a year ago today, the United States was in an air war in defense of Kuwait. On February 23, the ground war began. On the 27th, Kuwait was liberated.

Last year, Congress took the opportunity to thank two of the architects of that victory. General Powell and General Schwarzkopf, with special gold medals. Today, let's thank the troops.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the administration for its support of H.R. 3337. And, let me express once again my appreciation for the help of the chairman and ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Coin-

age. I urge Members to vote for H.R. 3337 today.

DEFEAT H.R. 3337

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

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the issue of coin redesign. Why would we want to take Monticello off the nickel? For that matter, why take the Lincoln Memorial off the penny; Liberty's torch off the dime; and the American eagle off the quarter and half dollar?

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want their coins redesigned. If H.R. 3337 is defeated, we can strip out coin redesign, added by the Senate, and pass the White House coin, the Columbus coin, the World Cup coin, the Madison coin, and the Desert Storm Medal by unanimous consent.

Mandatory coin redesign should not be a part of this legislation. If Members are opposed to coin redesign, they should not vote against H.R. 3337. We should reject coin redesign and then pass the commemorative coin programs. But first we must defeat 3337.

IMPORTANT COMPONENTS OF A SENSIBLE BUDGET

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is now beginning to develop the budget for the next fiscal year, and it seems to me that any sensible budget must contain at least three important components.

No. 1, we must immediately break the unfair and regressive budget agreement of 1990. No. 2, now that the cold war is over, we must reduce military spending by at least 50 percent over the next 5 years. And No. 3, and most importantly, we must use those hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in savings to reinvest in the United States of America so that finally we can begin to address the enormous economic problems facing this country which have been ignored for so many years.

The Soviet Union is no longer our enemy. The Warsaw Pact is no longer our enemy. They do not exist. But hunger, 9 million Americans who are unemployed, a decline in our educational system, 20 percent of our kids living in poverty, a decline in our standard of living, those are our enemies.

We now have a historic opportunity to deal with these issues during this budget session. Let us do it.

NEW HAMPSHIRE VOTERS REJECT LIBERAL ECONOMICS

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the bad news for America is that House Democrats have offered their economic reform package. But the good news is that their own candidate for President, Paul Tsongas, who won the New Hampshire primary yesterday would veto it.

Yesterday's primary clearly showed rejection of liberal economic principles. Out of all votes cast in both the Democratic and Republican primaries, almost 70 percent supported the probusiness economic plans of President Bush, Buchanan, or Tsongas.

The message in New Hampshire from both Democrats and Republicans is this—we are a nation with a government, not the other way around.

Judging by the tax bill offered by Ways and Means Committee Democrats, that is a message Congress hasn't heard.

The Ways and Means Democrats offered what the Washington Post called "a shapeless bill * * * that will hurt more than help the economy."

That is because the Democratic package is based on outdated ideas, gimmicks, and out-of-touch views from career politicians.

The New Hampshire primary demonstrates that when Democrats address our economy they should heed the advice of one of their own Presidents—Woodrow Wilson. He said: "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of government, not the increase of it."

After all, 70 percent of New Hampshire's voters can't be wrong.

□ 1430

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE NORTH OF IRELAND

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I are introducing a resolution which addresses the human rights situation in British-controlled areas of Ireland. Senator DODD is planning to sponsor a similar resolution in the other body. The international community has become increasingly critical of British policy in what is commonly referred to as Northern Ireland as evidenced by recent reports from the Norwegian Helsinki Committee, Amnesty International, and the Helsinki Watch Committee.

I had originally intended to speak in general terms about human rights in the north of Ireland. However, I learned this morning that Joe Doherty has been deported to Britain. His long fight here in the American court system is finally over, not because he lost his case on its merits, but because the

Reagan and Bush administrations refused to allow him a political asylum hearing. They would not allow him a hearing because they were convinced that he would win and by winning would highlight the appalling human rights policy in the north of Ireland and American complicity in that policy.

When it comes to Ireland, American policy is made in London, not at the State Department. I think this is shameful and disgraceful. The British Government refuses to admit that its rule in the north of Ireland is based on repression and refuses to admit that there are persons who legitimately fear for their lives if they are forced to return to the six counties.

My resolution focuses on British human rights violations in the north of Ireland. In honor of Joe Doherty's long struggle here in the United States, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

DEMOCRAT TAX BILL PATENTLY UNFAIR

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill emanating from the Democrat caucus is patently unfair to millions of Americans who operate and own small businesses. While you grant a multibillion dollar tax break to the largest 10 percent of U.S. corporations, you stick it to the little guy. You hang American small business, the backbone of our economy, out to dry with a huge tax increase.

Let us not forget that over 90 percent of businesses in America are unincorporated. Your bill increases taxes for the vast majority of America's small businesses which pay at individual tax rates.

As a former small business owner, I find it hard to believe at this critical juncture in our economic future, that the Democrat caucus could come up with a bill that would slam American small business and cost jobs.

Mr. Speaker, your bill has over a dozen tax increases in it. Rather than an economic stimulus, it penalizes the fruits of free enterprise. On top of this, it violates the budget agreement and increases the budget deficit.

I urge my colleagues to reject the failed Carter-esque policies of punishing American small business with higher taxes.

PRESIDENT SHAKEN BY NEW HAMPSHIRE VOTE

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

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the voters of New Hampshire in 1 day did what a

year of prodding and pushing could not: Convince the President to believe that the recession was real, families are truly suffering, and big changes are in the cards. New Hampshire voters have tagged the President in a way that no economic indicator, no unemployment figure, or blue chip forecaster could ever do.

No amount of pride doctoring or expectation lowering will change the fact that this President has rightfully been shaken to the core by the outcome of yesterday's vote in New Hampshire, and the man who shook him the most was Pat Buchanan, who made the President's bait and switch on middle-class tax relief his most cutting issue. Pat understands the middle class are in a squeeze. He understands it even if the man he calls King George does not.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOE FISHER

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House that our former colleague—Joe Fisher—has passed away. Joe died of cancer at his home in Arlington, VA. His death is a tremendous loss to all of us here and to the State of Virginia.

Joe served in Congress from 1974 to 1980 as the Representative of Virginia's 10th Congressional District. He also served on the Arlington County Board, the Arlington Planning Commission, the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Authority, the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, and numerous other government, civic, and charitable organizations.

In addition to his public service, Joe Fisher was an amateur boxer; he enjoyed white water canoeing; he was active in the Unitarian Church; and he was a devoted husband and father.

I extend my deepest sympathies and condolences to Joe's wife, Peggy, their seven children, and the entire family.

For information about funeral arrangements, please contact my office.

DAVID DUKE'S MESSAGE ALIVE IN PAT BUCHANAN

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the airwaves today are loaded with pundits expressing shock and surprise at Pat Buchanan's formidable showing in New Hampshire, but they should not be surprised at all. The people of New Hampshire were frustrated, and Pat Buchanan reaped the bitter harvest. He got a free ride there.

President Bush refused to lay a glove on Buchanan about his ugly 20-year track record of unrelenting race-baiting, anti-Semitism and rightwing politics. Buchanan is the man who beamed when presented with an AR-15 assault weapon by the extremist gun owners of America, and yet the President refused to repudiate him.

The question is why? Why did not the President call Buchanan to task on his extremist record? Was he scared at alienating the rightwing of the Republican Party?

David Duke is not in most of the Republican primaries from here on out, but his message is. It is being carried in large part by Pat Buchanan.

Mr. Speaker, Pat Buchanan represents more of a danger than David Duke because he has risen through the establishment of the Republican Party.

But he must be seen and repudiated for what he is: A provocateur who is to be feared and not embraced.

CONGRATULATIONS BONNIE BLAIR

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment on a lighter more pleasant subject than the economy to congratulate someone who all of us from central Illinois are very proud of—Bonnie Blair. On Friday, Bonnie won her second gold medal in the 1992 winter Olympics. This came on top of her extraordinary gold medal victory in the 500-meter race earlier in the week, making her the first woman to win the medal in two consecutive Olympic competitions, and the best female speedskater America has ever sent to the Olympics.

Bonnie, who grew up in the all-American city of Champaign, IL, has shown the world those great midwestern values of hard work, determination, sacrifice, and a commitment to being the very best she can be. Bonnie has worked long and hard to be the greatest speedskater, and she has certainly achieved that goal. To Bonnie and her family, all the sacrifices over the years must now seem well worth it.

Those of us who are Bonnie's friends and neighbors in central Illinois are very, very proud of her. Bonnie has lifted our spirits and brought us closer together as we cheered her on in Albertville. We as a community had a lump in our throat and a tear in our eye as Bonnie crossed the finish line, the greatest lady skater in American history.

Bonnie, you are a heroine to all Americans. Congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article from the Champaign News-Gazette concerning Bonnie's performance, as follows:

[From Champaign (IL) News-Gazette, Feb. 11, 1992]

BLAIR'S 500 PERFORMANCE WON'T BE EASY TO FORGET

(By Dave Anderson)

ALBERTVILLE, FRANCE.—Every four years they move in and out of the American sports consciousness as quickly as they move on their long blades. Their celebrity is usually measured in their time on the ice.

Even when Eric Heiden flashed through Lake Placid in 1980 with a record five gold medals, he soon seemed to vanish.

They are speedskaters, and even if one wins an Olympic gold medal, the face might be familiar but the name is not, as the 1988 women's 500-meter Olympic gold medalist discovered not long after returning from Calgary, Alberta.

"I know you," a New York cop told her, "I know you."

"I'm the speedskater," she replied, "Bonnie Blair."

"That's it," the cop said, "You're the speedskater."

The speedskater from Champaign is 27 now. But with her cute face that appears to have been drawn by a Disney artist, Bonnie Blair looks as if she is still a teen-ager. Her high-pitched voice always seems to be on the verge of cracking. Before every race she has a peanut butter and jelly sandwich and a back rub.

But now Bonnie Blair is more than just the speedskater. She's the best female speedskater the United States has ever produced.

By winning another 500 gold medal Monday, she created a historic women's double in what is primarily a European sport: the first to win the 500 in successive Winter Olympics and the first American to win two gold medals.

Only three other American women have won speedskating gold medals—Anne Henning in the 500 and Dianne Holum in the 1,500, in 1972, and Sheila Young in the 500, in 1976.

In those years, American speedskaters stopped competing at a younger age because there was no financial future in it. But under Olympic rules now there's commercial money out there.

As she swooped around the outdoor oval in 40.33 seconds, Blair wore Oakley sunglasses, to keep, she explained later, her eyes from watering once she glides onto the ice. She also has contracts with Visa, Xerox, Evian, Chrysler, Kraft and Mizuno that added to the burden of trying to be the first women's Olympic 500 champion to repeat.

"That's what I wanted to do more than anything," she said.

As the world record-holder in the 500, Blair was considered a lock. Her teammate, Dan Jansen, had even said, "after Bonnie wins . . ." And before Monday's race, U.S. coach Peter Mueller, the 1976 gold medalist in the men's 1,000, had only a few words of advice for her.

"I just told her, 'Be yourself, be Bonnie Blair out there,'" Mueller said. "The only way she could lose the race was to beat herself."

And when Blair burst the first 100 meters in 10.71 seconds, the best of any of the other 33 skaters, Mueller thought the gold was hers.

"We had worked on that; she had done a lot of sprints with Dan Jansen, Nick Thomets and David Besteman," he said, referring to three members of the men's team.

". . . And when she gets into this kind of condition, nobody can beat her."

Not in the 500. And maybe not in Friday's 1,000, in which she won a bronze medal four years ago. She also has a shot in the 1,500 on Wednesday.

"She has a chance to be the greatest woman skater in history," Mueller said. "Lydia Skoblikova won six Olympic gold medals, but Bonnie's got a shot at that."

Skoblikova won two golds in 1960 and four golds in 1964 while representing the Soviet Union. But if Blair were to add another gold medal or two here and two or three more in 1994 at Lillehammer, Norway, she would approach that record total, if not surpass it.

"I don't know about Lillehammer yet," Blair said. "I want to wait until the end of the season before I decide."

But with the next Winter Olympics only two years away instead of the usual four, Blair also would have an opportunity to return to the American sports consciousness that much sooner. Next time that New York cop might even remember her name.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 194.

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

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATS, AMERICA DOES NOT TRUST YOU WITH THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. President, former Senator Paul Tsongas, the clear winner in yesterday's Democrat primary in New Hampshire, said it best: "Democrats, America does not trust us with the economy, and that is the hard truth."

Mr. Tsongas won the Democrat primary with 34 percent of the vote. George Bush, our President, won the Republican primary with 58 percent of the vote. Both have probusiness philosophies.

The New Hampshire primary tells us one thing, despite all of the rhetoric we hear coming from the other side of the aisle today: The American people want jobs and real economic incentives for home ownership, investment and savings, not class warfare. But the Democrats, with the notable exception of Paul Tsongas, promised more sock-the-rich philosophy and less create more jobs policy.

Mr. Tsongas is right when he says the American people do not trust the Democrats when it comes to the economy, but the American people are absolutely correct in their distrust. The Democrats will not deliver more jobs, only more rhetoric, as we will see next week on this floor as we take up the tax bill. And sorry, Mr. Tsongas, your

party in this House is not about to change.

Only the Republican Party will deliver more jobs. Only the Republican Party can be trusted with the economy, and only the Republican Party, consistently, has the interest of American small business at heart. Mr. Tsongas knows it, and in their hearts so do the American people.

□ 1440

H.R. 355—THE EMERGENCY
DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 1992

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 355 and wish to thank Chairman MILLER for his efforts to bring relief to the drought-ridden Western States. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the devastating impact of the recent heavy rains in southern California and lesser amounts in southern Nevada. But what is less appreciated is that the snowpack feeding the depleted reservoirs in northern California and Nevada is still far below its normal water content.

An important provision of this bill is the technical assistance section authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a precipitation management technology transfer program to help alleviate problems caused by long-term drought in the West. Mr. Speaker, this is a fiscally responsible measure for the Bureau of Reclamation because State and local interests will share the costs of conducting the studies necessary to quantify the effects of weather modification technology. If the studies prove that stream flows can be augmented by this technology, it will be transferred to non-Federal interests for operation.

We need this type of applied science for the benefit of our thirsty municipalities and for our irrigation farmers. I am grateful that Chairman MILLER and ranking Republican member, JIM HANSEN of Utah, have seen fit to include the authorization for the Bureau's participation in this bill.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION
GIVING INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES
INCENTIVE TO SAVE AND INVEST

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we Americans are saving almost 50 percent less than we did in 1975. Who can blame us? Savings are overtaxed, dividends are overtaxed, almost everything we do is overtaxed.

This has to stop.

Today, I introduced legislation which will give individuals and families the incentive to save and invest again. This bill will allow taxpayers to deduct up to \$5,000 of interest and dividends from their gross income.

This proposal would benefit more than 82 percent of all taxpayers. That is over 93 million Americans.

A tax deduction on interest and dividends will have an immediate impact on our economy. It will put more capital into our banks, create new jobs, and spur long-term economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, let us give Americans a tax policy that makes sense—one that puts money back where it belongs, in the hands of the American people. Let's go America.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
OF COSPONSOR OF H.R. 33

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 33.

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

There was no objection.

THIS IS NOT ECONOMIC RECOVERY

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I stand here in disgust and anger, and that disgust and anger is what I felt from my constituents in Moon and Marshall townships over the weekend when I had my town meetings.

They are disgusted and angry with a Congress that is mismanaged and corrupt as a result of the uncovering of the House Post Office scandal and, of course, we have our kiting of checks in the House bank, and, of course, we have our restaurant scandal. They are upset with these things, but at the same time they consider this sort of an insider folly, that this place is just poorly mismanaged. They can get angry about it, but I tell you what they are really angry about, they are angry about the mismanagement of this institution by the leaders of this institution, of not coming to grips with the problems facing this country. They are not coming to grips.

They come to the floor with a proposal that their own leading candidate from their party says he would veto that gives 60 cents a day to Americans, and this is an economic recovery plan; this, Mr. Speaker, is a joke. This is not economic recovery. This is the wide-eyed waiting for the economy to deteriorate even more.

Why? Because they want to elect a President over there. That is exactly what is going on here, ladies and gen-

tlemen. It is a reason to be disgusted. It is a reason to be angry, and it is a reason to change this institution.

CAPITAL GAINS TAX REDUCTION

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, when the good-minded people of New Hampshire voted in the primary, Republicans chose George Bush, and Democrats chose Paul Tsongas. This is a clear referendum for economic growth policies, and I would like to point out today, for a cut in the capital gains tax. Capital gains tax reduction is front and center in President Bush's economic platform, and so it is for Paul Tsongas.

Mr. Speaker, the people of New Hampshire—Democrats and Republicans—know that if the United States is to compete successfully in world markets into the 21st century, the capital gains tax rate must come down.

Capital gains are taxed at a peak marginal rate of 28 percent. Such a high rate serves as a strong disincentive for investment; people are more likely to use their disposable income for consumption—or investment overseas.

There once was a day when there was only one place in the world where risk would be rewarded—the United States. That is no longer true. If you have a good idea and you would like to see it developed, take it to West Germany, and your capital gains will be taxed at zero percent. Take it to Japan, and your capital gains will be taxed at 5 percent. Or keep it in America, and if you are successful, you will be rewarded with a 28-percent marginal tax rate.

Those who would distort this issue—I can only think for political benefit—have argued that a capital gains cut is nothing more than robbing from the poor to give to the rich. Nothing could be further from the truth. One cannot deny that this will indeed help wealthy individuals who have money invested. But this help does not come at the expense of the poor.

Indeed, I believe that most of my colleagues who favor of a cut in the capital gains tax would strongly oppose any measure that would take money from the person struggling to put food on the table and give it to the wealthiest sector in the country. But the evidence shows that a cut in the capital gains tax will not take from the poor; rather it will help all Americans by spurring the economy and keeping many jobs in America.

The American economy needs a boost, and a cut in the capital gains tax is a good place to start. I thank the voters of New Hampshire for putting aside the politics of distortion and

demagoguery and endorsing this much needed measure for job creation and international competitiveness.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if a Member has reason to believe that the Chair has made an inaccurate ruling, and if, further, that Member has reason to believe that that inaccurate ruling was further made problematic by the addition of words to the RECORD spoken by the Chair or the deletion of words in the RECORD spoken by the Chair, what is the recourse of action available to the Member to bring about the appropriate correction?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the Member discuss the nature of the concern with the Chair so that he can further understand the concern?

Mr. WALKER. I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker. On Wednesday, February 5, the Chair was asked to rule on the matter of the rule on the task force concerning the holding of hostages by Iran in 1980.

At that time, this Member suggested that the Chair had ruled inaccurately by suggesting that this matter did not apply, because we were dealing with a subunit of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

When I go back and find the RECORD, I discover that that is precisely what the Chair ruled. I at that point challenged the ruling of the Chair. We had a vote. The Chair was upheld despite the fact that the ruling is inaccurate.

Later on, in raising questions about that, the Chair then made a number of statements to clarify its position. When I put the RECORD of the House, the written RECORD of the House, against the tapes of that day, I find that words were added to the Chair's message. I also find that things were deleted from what the Chair actually said in the course of clarifying its decision.

My question is: Given the nature of the fact that there was a ruling that I believe may have substantial precedents to it, as far as I know it was the first ruling of its kind, I believe that it was done inaccurately, I would now like to figure out how it is we can go about correcting both the ruling of the Chair and the fact that the RECORD has been changed with regard to the words of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ruling of the Chair that day was sustained by a vote, and that the Chair subsequently has the right to clarify his ruling.

Mr. WALKER. I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And it did not change the thrust of the ruling.

Mr. WALKER. In clarifying its ruling, does not the Chair have an obligation to the House to accurately reflect his ruling in the presentation to the House and not then modify that statement later on by both adding words and deleting words from the Chair's statement as the official RECORD appears?

□ 1450

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes that the gentleman who was occupying the Chair that day accurately reflected his views when he responded to the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Well, if that is the case, then why does the permanent RECORD of the House as reflected on the videotape differ with the RECORD reflected in the printed RECORD of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Because the gentleman was attempting to clarify his ruling as a result of the inquiry from the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. So a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Even in matters then where precedent is being set, we can have the person who occupies the Chair modify their words in the RECORD and thereby change, in my opinion, the intent of the ruling.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without changing the ruling, the Chair may do that.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Is it not true that Members are not granted that right, so therefore that is a special right that has now been created for the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members have the right to revise and extend their remarks continuously.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Under recent rulings, Members have been admonished very clearly that they are not to change in any way the substantive value of what they say in those revisions and extensions. In my opinion, the Chair has done that here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To the best of the knowledge of the Chair, the person who was in the Chair on that day did not change the substance of his ruling.

Mr. WALKER. Well, by eliminating certain words, I would say to the Chair that he has, because he refers to an entity which would in fact then clarify the fact that his original ruling was wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the Chair for that. At least that has not been taken away from me.

RESCISSION AND DEFERRALS OF BUDGET AUTHORITY MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102-193)

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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one rescission proposal, totaling \$16.7 million, one revised deferral, and one new deferral of budget authority. Including the revised and the new deferrals, funds withheld in fiscal year 1992 now total \$5.6 billion.

The proposed rescission affects the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The deferrals affect the Agency for International Development and the Department of Agriculture.

The details of the proposed rescission and deferrals are contained in the attached report.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1992.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, February 18, 1992, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 606, by the yeas and nays;
H.R. 543, by the yeas and nays; and
H.R. 3337, 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.

ALLEGHENY WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 606, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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 Senate bill, S. 606, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 3, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Derrick	Horn
Alexander	Dickinson	Horton
Allard	Dicks	Houghton
Allen	Dingell	Hoyer
Anderson	Dixon	Hubbard
Andrews (ME)	Donnelly	Huckaby
Andrews (NJ)	Dooley	Hughes
Andrews (TX)	Doolittle	Hunter
Annuzio	Dorgan (ND)	Hutto
Anthony	Dornan (CA)	Hyde
Applegate	Downey	Inhofe
Archer	Duncan	Ireland
Army	Durbin	Jacobs
Aspin	Dwyer	James
Atkins	Early	Jefferson
AuCoin	Eckart	Jenkins
Bacchus	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Edwards (OK)	Johnson (SD)
Ballenger	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (TX)
Barnard	Emerson	Johnston
Barrett	Engel	Jones (GA)
Barton	English	Jones (NC)
Bateman	Erdreich	Jontz
Bellenson	Espy	Kanjorski
Bennett	Evans	Kaptur
Bentley	Ewing	Kasich
Bereuter	Fascell	Kennedy
Berman	Fawell	Kennelly
Bevill	Fazio	Kildee
Bilbray	Feighan	Kleccka
Bilirakis	Fields	Klug
Billey	Fish	Kolbe
Boehlert	Flake	Kolter
Boehner	Foglietta	Kopetski
Bonior	Ford (MI)	Kostmayer
Borski	Ford (TN)	Kyl
Boucher	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Brewster	Franks (CT)	Lagomarsino
Brooks	Frost	Lancaster
Broomfield	Gallo	LaRocco
Browder	Gaydos	Laughlin
Brown	Gejdenson	Leach
Bruce	Gekas	Lehman (CA)
Bryant	Gephardt	Lehman (FL)
Bunning	Geren	Lent
Burton	Gibbons	Levin (MI)
Bustamante	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Byron	Gilman	Lewis (FL)
Callahan	Gingrich	Lewis (GA)
Camp	Glickman	Lightfoot
Campbell (CA)	Gonzalez	Livingston
Campbell (CO)	Goodling	Lloyd
Cardin	Gordon	Long
Carper	Goss	Lowery (CA)
Carr	Gradison	Lowe (NY)
Clay	Grandy	Luken
Clement	Green	Machtley
Clinger	Guarini	Manton
Coble	Gunderson	Markey
Coleman (MO)	Hall (OH)	Marlenee
Coleman (TX)	Hall (TX)	Martin
Collins (MI)	Hamilton	Martinez
Combust	Hammerschmidt	Matsui
Condit	Hancock	Mavroules
Conyers	Harris	Mazzoli
Cooper	Hastert	McCandless
Costello	Hatcher	McCloskey
Coughlin	Hayes (IL)	McCollum
Cox (CA)	Hayes (LA)	McCrery
Cox (IL)	Hefley	McCurdy
Coyne	Hefner	McDade
Cramer	Henry	McDermott
Cunningham	Herger	McEwen
Darden	Hertel	McGrath
Davis	Hoagland	McHugh
DeFazio	Hobson	McMillan (NC)
DeLauro	Hochbrueckner	McMillen (MD)
DeLay	Holloway	McNulty
Dellums	Hopkins	Meyers

Mfume	Rahall	Spence
Michel	Ramstad	Spratt
Miller (CA)	Rangel	Staggers
Miller (OH)	Ravenel	Stallings
Miller (WA)	Reed	Stark
Mineta	Regula	Stenholm
Mink	Rhodes	Stokes
Molinar	Richardson	Studds
Mollohan	Ridge	Sundquist
Montgomery	Riggs	Swett
Moody	Rinaldo	Swift
Moorhead	Ritter	Synar
Moran	Roberts	Tallon
Morella	Roe	Tanner
Morrison	Roemer	Tauzin
Murphy	Rogers	Taylor (MS)
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Myers	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas (CA)
Nagle	Rose	Thomas (GA)
Natcher	Rostenkowski	Thomas (WY)
Neal (MA)	Roth	Thornton
Neal (NC)	Roukema	Torres
Nichols	Rowland	Torricelli
Nowak	Roybal	Towns
Nussle	Russo	Trafficant
Oakar	Sabo	Traxler
Oberstar	Sanders	Unsoeld
Obey	Sangmeister	Upton
Olin	Santorum	Valentine
Oliver	Sarpalius	Vander Jagt
Ortiz	Sawyer	Vento
Orton	Saxton	Visclosky
Owens (NY)	Schaefer	Volkmer
Owens (UT)	Scheuer	Vucanovich
Oxley	Schroeder	Walker
Packard	Schulze	Walsh
Pallone	Schumer	Washington
Panetta	Sensenbrenner	Waters
Parker	Serrano	Waxman
Pastor	Sharp	Weber
Patterson	Shaw	Weiss
Paxon	Shays	Weldon
Payne (NJ)	Shuster	Wheat
Payne (VA)	Sikorski	Williams
Pease	Sisisky	Wilson
Pelosi	Skaggs	Wise
Penny	Skeen	Wolf
Perkins	Skelton	Wolpe
Peterson (FL)	Slattery	Wyden
Peterson (MN)	Slaughter	Wylie
Petri	Smith (FL)	Yates
Pickett	Smith (IA)	Yatron
Pickle	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Porter	Smith (OR)	Young (FL)
Poshard	Smith (TX)	Zeliff
Price	Snowe	Zimmer
Pursell	Solarz	
Quillen	Solomon	

NAYS—3

Crane	Stearns	Stump
-------	---------	-------

NOT VOTING—22

Ackerman	Dreier	Moakley
Blackwell	Dymally	Mrazek
Boxer	Galleghy	Ray
Chandler	Gillmor	Savage
Chapman	Hansen	Schiff
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Whitten
Dannemeyer	Levine (CA)	
de la Garza	Lipinski	

□ 1513

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote 14. Had I been present during this vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 14.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). 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.

MANZANAR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 543.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. 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 concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 543, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 13, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie	Carper	Fazio
Alexander	Carr	Feighan
Allard	Chapman	Fields
Anderson	Clay	Fish
Andrews (ME)	Clement	Flake
Andrews (NJ)	Clinger	Foglietta
Andrews (TX)	Coleman (MO)	Ford (MI)
Annuzio	Coleman (TX)	Ford (TN)
Anthony	Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)
Applegate	Combust	Franks (CT)
Archer	Condit	Frost
Army	Conyers	Gallo
Aspin	Cooper	Gaydos
Atkins	Costello	Gejdenson
AuCoin	Coughlin	Gekas
Bacchus	Cox (CA)	Gephardt
Baker	Cox (IL)	Geren
Ballenger	Coyne	Gibbons
Barnard	Cramer	Gilchrest
Barrett	Cunningham	Gillmor
Barton	Darden	Gilman
Bateman	Davis	Gingrich
Beilenson	DeFazio	Glickman
Bennett	DeLauro	Gonzalez
Bentley	DeLay	Goodling
Bereuter	Dellums	Gordon
Berman	Derrick	Goss
Bevill	Dickinson	Gradison
Bilbray	Dicks	Grandy
Bilirakis	Dingell	Green
Billey	Dixon	Guarini
Boehlert	Donnelly	Gunderson
Boehner	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Bonior	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Borski	Dorgan (ND)	Hamilton
Boucher	Dornan (CA)	Hammerschmidt
Brewster	Downey	Harris
Brooks	Durbin	Hatcher
Broomfield	Dwyer	Hayes (IL)
Browder	Early	Hayes (LA)
Brown	Eckart	Hefley
Bruce	Edwards (CA)	Hefner
Bryant	Edwards (OK)	Henry
Bunning	Edwards (TX)	Herger
Burton	Emerson	Hertel
Bustamante	Engel	Hoagland
Byron	English	Hobson
Callahan	Erdreich	Hochbrueckner
Camp	Espy	Hopkins
Campbell (CA)	Evans	Horn
Campbell (CO)	Fascell	Horton
Cardin	Fawell	Houghton

Hoyer	Molinari	Schaefer
Hubbard	Mollohan	Scheuer
Huckaby	Montgomery	Schroeder
Hughes	Moody	Schulze
Hutto	Moorhead	Schumer
Hyde	Moran	Sensenbrenner
Inhofe	Morella	Serrano
Ireland	Morrison	Sharp
Jacobs	Murphy	Shaw
James	Murtha	Shays
Jefferson	Myers	Shuster
Jenkins	Nagle	Sikorski
Johnson (CT)	Natcher	Sisisky
Johnson (SD)	Neal (MA)	Skaggs
Johnson (TX)	Neal (NC)	Skeen
Johnston	Nowak	Skelton
Jones (GA)	Nussle	Slattery
Jones (NC)	Oakar	Slaughter
Jontz	Oberstar	Smith (FL)
Kanjorski	Obey	Smith (IA)
Kaptur	Olin	Smith (NJ)
Kasich	Olver	Smith (OR)
Kennedy	Ortiz	Smith (TX)
Kennelly	Orton	Snowe
Kildee	Owens (NY)	Solarz
Kleccka	Owens (UT)	Solomon
Klug	Oxley	Spence
Kolbe	Packard	Spratt
Kolter	Pallone	Staggers
Kopetski	Panetta	Stallings
Kostmayer	Parker	Stark
Kyl	Pastor	Stenholm
LaFalce	Patterson	Stokes
Lagomarsino	Paxon	Studds
Lancaster	Payne (NJ)	Sundquist
LaRocco	Payne (VA)	Swett
Laughlin	Pease	Swift
Leach	Pelosi	Synar
Lehman (CA)	Penny	Tallon
Lehman (FL)	Perkins	Tanner
Lent	Peterson (FL)	Tauzin
Levin (MI)	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Lewis (FL)	Pickett	Thomas (CA)
Lewis (GA)	Pickle	Thomas (GA)
Lightfoot	Porter	Thomas (WY)
Livingston	Poshard	Thornton
Lloyd	Price	Torres
Long	Pursell	Torricelli
Lowery (CA)	Quillen	Towns
Lowey (NY)	Rahall	Trafiacant
Luken	Ramstad	Traxler
Machtley	Rangel	Unsoeld
Manton	Ravenel	Upton
Markey	Reed	Valentine
Marlenee	Regula	Vander Jagt
Martin	Rhodes	Vento
Martinez	Richardson	Visclosky
Matsui	Ridge	Volkmer
Mavroules	Riggs	Vucanovich
Mazzoli	Rinaldo	Walker
McCandless	Ritter	Walsh
McCloskey	Roberts	Waters
McCollum	Roe	Waxman
McCrery	Roemer	Weber
McCurdy	Rogers	Weiss
McDade	Rohrabacher	Weldon
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Wheat
McEwen	Rose	Williams
McGrath	Rostenkowski	Wilson
McHugh	Roth	Wise
McMillan (NC)	Roukema	Wolf
McMillan (MD)	Rowland	Wolpe
McNulty	Roybal	Wyden
Meyers	Russo	Wyllie
Mfume	Sabo	Yates
Michel	Sanders	Yatron
Miller (CA)	Sangmeister	Young (AK)
Miller (OH)	Santorum	Young (FL)
Miller (WA)	Sarpalius	Zimmer
Mineta	Sawyer	
Mink	Saxton	

NAYS—13

Allen	Hancock	Stearns
Coble	Hastert	Stump
Crane	Holloway	Zeliff
Duncan	Hunter	
Ewing	Nichols	

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Collins (IL)	Dymally
Blackwell	Dannemeyer	Galleghy
Boxer	de la Garza	Hansen
Chandler	Dreier	Lantos

Levine (CA)	Mrazek	Schiff
Lipinski	Ray	Washington
Moakley	Savage	Whitten

□ 1524

Messrs. ZELIFF, HASTERT, and HOLLOWAY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote 15. Had I been present during this vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 15.

THE 1992 WHITE HOUSE
COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3337.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3337, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 172, nays 241, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—172

Allard	DeLauro	Hefner
Anderson	Dellums	Hobson
Andrews (NJ)	Dickinson	Hochbrueckner
Annunzio	Dingell	Horton
Anthony	Dixon	Hoyer
Aspin	Dooley	Hubbard
Atkins	Early	Huckaby
AuCoin	Edwards (CA)	Hyde
Bacchus	Espy	Jenkins
Baker	Fascell	Johnson (CT)
Barnard	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Berman	Fish	Johnston
Boehert	Flake	Jones (NC)
Bonior	Foglietta	Kaptur
Boucher	Ford (MI)	Kildee
Brooks	Ford (TN)	Kolbe
Brown	Frank (MA)	Kolter
Bruce	Frost	Kopetski
Bunning	Gallo	Lancaster
Bustamante	Gedensson	LaRocco
Callahan	Gekas	Lehman (FL)
Campbell (CA)	Gephardt	Lent
Campbell (CO)	Geren	Lewis (GA)
Cardin	Gibbons	Machtley
Carper	Gilchrist	Manton
Clay	Gillmor	Markey
Clement	Gilman	Marlenee
Coleman (MO)	Gingrich	Martinez
Coleman (TX)	Gonzalez	Matsui
Collins (MI)	Green	Mavroules
Combest	Guarini	McCrery
Conyers	Gunderson	McDade
Cox (IL)	Hall (OH)	McMillan (MD)
Darden	Hatcher	McNulty
DeFazio	Hayes (LA)	Meyers

Michel	Rowland	Swift
Mineta	Roybal	Synar
Morella	Sanders	Tauzin
Nowak	Sangmeister	Thomas (GA)
Ortiz	Sarpalius	Thomas (WY)
Owens (NY)	Sawyer	Thornton
Owens (UT)	Schumer	Torres
Oxley	Serrano	Torricelli
Pallone	Shays	Towns
Pastor	Sisisky	Traxler
Payne (NJ)	Skaggs	Valentine
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Vander Jagt
Pelosi	Slattery	Vucanovich
Peterson (MN)	Smith (FL)	Washington
Petri	Smith (IA)	Waxman
Pickett	Smith (TX)	Weiss
Rangel	Solarz	Weldon
Reed	Staggers	Williams
Richardson	Stallings	Wilson
Ridge	Stokes	Wyden
Rinaldo	Studds	Wyllie
Roe	Stump	
Rose	Sundquist	

NAYS—241

Abercrombie	Goodling	Mink
Alexander	Gordon	Molinari
Allen	Goss	Mollohan
Andrews (ME)	Gradison	Montgomery
Andrews (TX)	Grandy	Moody
Applegate	Hall (TX)	Moorhead
Archer	Hamilton	Moran
Army	Hammerschmidt	Morrison
Ballenger	Hancock	Murphy
Barrett	Harris	Murtha
Barton	Hastert	Myers
Bateman	Hayes (IL)	Nagle
Beilenson	Hefley	Natcher
Bennett	Henry	Neal (MA)
Bentley	Hergert	Neal (NC)
Bereuter	Hertel	Nichols
Bevill	Hoagland	Nussle
Bilbray	Holloway	Oakar
Bilirakis	Hopkins	Oberstar
Bliley	Horn	Obey
Boehner	Houghton	Olin
Borski	Hughes	Olver
Brewster	Hunter	Orton
Broomfield	Hutto	Packard
Browder	Inhofe	Panetta
Bryant	Ireland	Parker
Burton	Jacobs	Patterson
Byron	James	Paxon
Camp	Jefferson	Pease
Carr	Johnson (TX)	Penny
Chapman	Jones (GA)	Perkins
Clinger	Jontz	Peterson (FL)
Coble	Kanjorski	Pickle
Condit	Kasich	Porter
Cooper	Kennedy	Poshard
Costello	Kennelly	Price
Coughlin	Kleccka	Pursell
Cox (CA)	Klug	Quillen
Coyne	Kostmayer	Rahall
Cramer	Kyl	Ramstad
Crane	LaFalce	Ravenel
Cunningham	Lagomarsino	Regula
Davis	Laughlin	Rhodes
DeLay	Leach	Riggs
Derrick	Lehman (CA)	Ritter
Dicks	Levin (MI)	Roberts
Donnelly	Lewis (CA)	Roemer
Doolittle	Lewis (FL)	Rogers
Dorgan (ND)	Lightfoot	Rohrabacher
Dornan (CA)	Livingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Downey	Lloyd	Rostenkowski
Duncan	Long	Roth
Durbin	Lowery (CA)	Roukema
Dwyer	Lowey (NY)	Russo
Eckart	Luken	Sabo
Edwards (OK)	Martin	Santorum
Edwards (TX)	Mazzoli	Saxton
Emerson	McCandless	Schaefer
Engel	McCloskey	Scheuer
English	McCollum	Schroeder
Erdreich	McCurdy	Schulze
Evans	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Ewing	McEwen	Sharp
Fawell	McGrath	Shaw
Feighan	McHugh	Shuster
Fields	McMillan (NC)	Sikorski
Mfume	Miller (CA)	Skelton
Miller (OH)	Miller (OH)	Slaughter
Miller (NJ)		Smith (NJ)

Smith (OR)	Taylor (NC)	Wheat
Snowe	Thomas (CA)	Wise
Solomon	Trafiacant	Wolf
Spence	Unsoeld	Wolpe
Spratt	Upton	Yates
Stark	Vento	Yatron
Stearns	Viscosky	Young (AK)
Stenholm	Volkmer	Young (FL)
Swett	Walker	Zeliff
Tallon	Walsh	Zimmer
Tanner	Waters	
Taylor (MS)	Weber	

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Dreier	Miller (WA)
Blackwell	Dymally	Moakley
Boxer	Gallegly	Mrazek
Chandler	Hansen	Ray
Collins (IL)	Lantos	Savage
Dannemeyer	Levine (CA)	Schiff
de la Garza	Lipinski	Whitten

□ 1533

Messrs. BRYANT, GORDON, TALLON, and KOSTMAYER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Ms. HORN, and Messrs. KLECZKA, YATES, MORAN, TANNER, SAXTON, THOMAS of California, ALEXANDER, and SHAW changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I regret that pressing business in my district prevented me from being present. Had I been present, I would have voted for S. 606 and H.R. 543, and against H.R. 3337.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote 16. Had I been present during this vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 16.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the majority whip concerning the schedule for the rest of the week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there are no further votes scheduled for the rest of the week, although there will be committees that will be meeting. And we will have other activities on the Hill on legislation. But in terms of House action, there are no anticipated votes on the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I know that the schedule for next week is clouded at this point, but I would just

ask the majority whip as a member of the Committee on Rules, too, if the membership is going to be given 3 days in which to review any tax bill that might come on the floor; that is, according to the rules of the House?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the President has suggested we move expeditiously on the tax bill. We are trying to do that. We anticipate at this point in taking the tax bill up next week, and I cannot tell the gentleman exactly what day that will be. But we anticipate action next week.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for enlightening the membership.

CORRECTING ERRORS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3866, FLOWER GARDEN BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) entitled "Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3866," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Senate amendment: Page 3, strike out lines 6 through 24.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object, and yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared with the minority on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Back on January 28, the House passed H.R. 3866, the flower garden banks national marine sanctuary bill.

We then immediately passed House Concurrent Resolution 268 to make certain technical corrections to that bill.

As passed, H.R. 3866 contained a title implementing the United States-Soviet Union maritime boundary agreement of June 1, 1990.

Because of recent world events, in a number of places in this title, the word "Russia" had to be inserted in place of the reference to the Soviet Union. These changes were suggested by the administration.

Also, some cross-reference problems needed to be corrected.

The Senate has accepted our technical correction resolution but made one very minor change.

In effect, the Senate has sent us back a purely technical change to a purely technical correcting resolution.

I urge the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

□ 1540

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to explain to my colleagues that this resolution merely corrects technical problems in a bill that we passed earlier.

H.R. 3866, as originally enacted, contains several references to the Soviet Union. As we all know, the Soviet Union no longer exists. This resolution makes the proper references to the new non-Communist nations in Eastern Europe.

This resolution is fully supported by the administration, and I urge its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLAMATION STATES EMERGENCY DROUGHT RELIEF ACT OF 1991

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 355), to provide emergency drought relief to the Reclamation States, and for other purposes, 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: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The term "Federal Reclamation laws" means the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388) and Acts supplementary thereto and amendatory thereof.

(3) The term "Federal Reclamation project" means any project constructed or funded under Federal Reclamation law. Such term includes projects having approved loans under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1044).

TITLE I—DROUGHT PROGRAM

SEC. 101. ASSISTANCE DURING DROUGHT; WATER PURCHASES.

(a) CONSTRUCTION, MANAGEMENT, AND CONSERVATION.—Consistent with existing contractual arrangements and applicable State and applicable Federal law, and without further authorization, the Secretary is authorized to undertake construction, management, and conservation activities that will minimize, or can be expected to have an effect in minimizing, losses and damages resulting from drought conditions. Any construction activities undertaken pursuant to the authority of this subsection shall be

limited to temporary facilities designed to minimize losses and damages from drought conditions, except that wells drilled to minimize losses and damages from drought conditions may be permanent facilities.

(b) **ASSISTANCE TO WILLING BUYERS AND SELLERS.**—In order to minimize losses and damages resulting from drought conditions, the Secretary may provide nonfinancial assistance to willing buyers in their purchase of available water supplies from willing sellers.

(c) **WATER PURCHASES BY BUREAU.**—In order to minimize losses and damages resulting from drought conditions, the Secretary may purchase water from willing sellers, including, but not limited to, water made available by Federal Reclamation project contractors through conservation or other means with respect to which the seller has reduced the consumption of water. Except with respect to water stored, conveyed or delivered to Federal and State wildlife habitat, the Secretary shall deliver such water pursuant to temporary contracts under section 102: Provided, That any such contract shall require recovery of any costs, including interest if applicable, incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such water.

(d) **WATER BANKS.**—In order to respond to a drought, the Secretary is authorized to participate in water banks established by a State.

SEC. 102. AVAILABILITY OF WATER ON A TEMPORARY BASIS.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—In order to mitigate losses and damages resulting from drought conditions, the Secretary may make available, by temporary contract, project and nonproject water, and may permit the use of facilities at Federal Reclamation projects for the storage or conveyance of project or nonproject water, for use both within and outside an authorized project service area.

(b) **SPECIAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO TEMPORARY WATER SUPPLIES PROVIDED UNDER THIS SECTION.**—

(1) **TEMPORARY SUPPLIES.**—Each temporary contract for the supply of water entered into pursuant to this section shall terminate no later than two years from the date of execution or upon a determination by the Secretary that water supply conditions no longer warrant that such contracts remain in effect, whichever occurs first. The costs associated with any such contract shall be repaid within the term of the contract.

(2) **OWNERSHIP AND ACREAGE LIMITATIONS.**—Lands not subject to Reclamation law that receive temporary irrigation water supplies under temporary contracts under this section shall not become subject to the ownership and acreage limitations or pricing provisions of Federal Reclamation law because of the delivery of such temporary water supplies. Lands that are subject to the ownership and acreage limitations of Federal Reclamation law shall not be exempted from those limitations because of the delivery of such temporary water supplies.

(3) **TREATMENT UNDER RECLAMATION REFORM ACT OF 1982.**—No temporary contract entered into by the Secretary under this section shall be treated as a "contract" as that term is used in sections 203(a) and 220 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-293).

(4) **AMENDMENTS OF EXISTING CONTRACTS.**—Any amendment to an existing contract to allow a contractor to carry out the provisions of this title shall not be considered a new and supplemental benefit for purposes of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-293).

(c) **CONTRACT PRICE.**—The price for project water, other than water purchased pursuant to section 101(c), delivered under a temporary contract entered into by the Secretary under this section shall be at least sufficient to recover all Federal operation and maintenance costs and

administrative costs, and an appropriate share of capital costs, including interest on such capital costs allocated to municipal and industrial water, except that, for project water delivered to nonproject landholdings, the price shall include full cost (as defined in section 202(3) of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 (Public Law 97-293; 96 Stat. 1263; 43 U.S.C. 390bb)). For all contracts entered into by the Secretary under the authority of this title—

(1) the interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the capital costs expended pursuant to this Act shall be at a rate to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity of one year occurring during the last month of the fiscal year preceding the date of execution of the temporary contract or,

(2) in the case of existing facilities the rate as authorized for that Federal Reclamation project or,

(3) in the absence of such authorized rate, the interest rate as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction was initiated on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which were neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue: Provided, That for all deliveries of water for municipal and industrial purposes from existing facilities to nonproject contractors, the rate shall be as set forth in paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(d) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—The Secretary may make water from Federal Reclamation projects and nonproject water available on a nonreimbursable basis for the purposes of protecting or restoring fish and wildlife resources, including mitigation losses, that occur as a result of drought conditions or the operation of a Federal Reclamation project during drought conditions. The Secretary may store and convey project and nonproject water for fish and wildlife purposes, and may provide conveyance of any such water for both State and Federal wildlife habitat and for habitat held in private ownership. The Secretary may make available water for these purposes outside the authorized project service area. Use of the Federal storage and conveyance facilities for these purposes shall be on a nonreimbursable basis. Water made available by the Secretary in 1991 from the Central Valley Project, California, to the Grasslands Water District for the purpose of fish and wildlife shall be nonreimbursable.

(e) **NONPROJECT WATER.**—The Secretary is authorized to store and convey nonproject water utilizing Federal Reclamation project facilities for use outside and inside the authorized project service area for municipal and industrial uses, fish and wildlife, and agricultural uses. Except in the case of water supplied for fish and wildlife, which shall be nonreimbursable, the Secretary shall charge the recipients of such water for such use of Federal Reclamation project facilities at a rate established pursuant to section 102(c) of this Act.

(f) **RECLAMATION FUND.**—The payment of capital costs attributable to the sale of project or nonproject water or the use of Federal Reclamation project facilities shall be covered into the Reclamation Fund and be placed to the credit of the project from which such water or use of such facilities is supplied.

SEC. 103. LOANS.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans to water users for the purposes of undertaking construction, management, conservation activities, or the acquisition and transportation of water consistent with State

law, that can be expected to have an effect in mitigating losses and damages, including those suffered by fish and wildlife, resulting from drought conditions. Such loans shall be made available under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate: Provided, That the Secretary shall not approve any loan unless the applicant can demonstrate an ability to repay such loan within the term of the loan: Provided further, That for all loans approved by the Secretary under the authority of this section, the interest rate shall be the rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with periods to maturity comparable to the repayment period of the loan. The repayment period for loans issued under this section shall not exceed fifteen years. The repayment period for such loans shall begin when the loan is executed. Sections 203(a) and 220 of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982 and sections 105 and 106 of Public Law 99-546 shall not apply to any contract to repay such loan. The Secretary shall notify the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives in writing of any loan which the Secretary intends to approve not less than thirty days prior to granting final approval.

SEC. 104. APPLICABLE PERIOD OF DROUGHT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The programs and authorities established under this title shall become operative in any Reclamation State only after the Governor or Governors of the affected State or States, or on a reservation, when the governing body of the affected Tribe has made a request for temporary drought assistance and the Secretary has determined that such temporary assistance is merited, or upon the approval of a drought contingency plan as provided in title II of this Act.

(b) **COORDINATION WITH BPA.**—If a Governor referred to in subsection (a) is the Governor of the State of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, or Montana, the Governor shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration before making a request under subsection (a).

(c) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authorities established under this title shall terminate ten years after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLANNING

SEC. 201. IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR WATER SUPPLY CONSERVATION, AUGMENTATION AND USE.

The Secretary is authorized to conduct studies to identify opportunities to conserve, augment, and make more efficient use of water supplies available to Federal Reclamation projects and Indian water resource developments in order to be prepared for and better respond to drought conditions. The Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to States and to local and Tribal government entities to assist in the development, construction, and operation of water desalination projects, including technical assistance for purposes of assessing the technical and economic feasibility of such projects.

SEC. 202. DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLANS.

The Secretary, acting pursuant to the Federal Reclamation laws, utilizing the resources of the Department of the Interior, and in consultation with other appropriate Federal and State officials, Indian tribes, public, private, and local entities, is authorized to prepare or participate in the preparation of cooperative drought contingency plans (hereinafter in this title referred to as "contingency plans") for the prevention or mitigation of adverse effects of drought conditions.

SEC. 203. PLAN ELEMENTS.

(a) **PLAN PROVISIONS.**—Elements of the contingency plans prepared pursuant to section 202 may include, but are not limited to, any or all of the following:

- (1) Water banks.
- (2) Appropriate water conservation actions.
- (3) Water transfers to serve users inside or outside authorized Federal Reclamation project service areas in order to mitigate the effects of drought.
- (4) Use of Federal Reclamation project facilities to store and convey nonproject water for agricultural, municipal and industrial, fish and wildlife, or other uses both inside and outside an authorized Federal Reclamation project service area.
- (5) Use of water from dead or inactive reservoir storage or increased use of ground water resources for temporary water supplies.
- (6) Water supplies for fish and wildlife resources.
- (7) Minor structural actions.

(b) **FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS.**—Each contingency plan shall identify the following two types of plan elements related to Federal Reclamation projects:

(1) those plan elements which pertain exclusively to the responsibilities and obligations of the Secretary pursuant to Federal Reclamation law and the responsibilities and obligations of the Secretary for a specific Federal Reclamation project; and

(2) those plan elements that pertain to projects, purposes, or activities not constructed, financed, or otherwise governed by the Federal Reclamation law.

(c) **DROUGHT LEVELS.**—The Secretary is authorized to work with other Federal and State agencies to improve hydrologic data collection systems and water supply forecasting techniques to provide more accurate and timely warning of potential drought conditions and drought levels that would trigger the implementation of contingency plans.

(d) **COMPLIANCE WITH LAW.**—The contingency plans and plan elements shall comply with all requirements of applicable Federal law, including the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321), section 715(a) of the Water Resource Development Act of 1986 (33 U.S.C. 2265(a)), and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, and shall be in accordance with applicable State law.

(e) **REVIEW.**—The contingency plans shall include provisions for periodic review to assure the adequacy of the contingency plan to respond to current conditions, and such plans may be modified accordingly.

SEC. 204. RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) **APPROVAL.**—The Secretary shall submit each plan prepared pursuant to section 202 to the Congress, together with the Secretary's recommendations, including recommendations for authorizing legislation, if needed.

(b) **PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION.**—A contingency plan under subsection (a) for the State of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, or Montana, may be approved by the Secretary only at the request of the Governor of the affected State in coordination with the other States in the region and the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

SEC. 205. RECLAMATION DROUGHT RESPONSE FUND.

The Secretary shall undertake a study of the need, if any, to establish a Reclamation Drought Response Fund to be available for defraying those expenses which the Secretary determines necessary to implement plans prepared under section 202 and to make loans for non-structural and minor structural activities for the prevention or mitigation of the adverse effects of drought.

SEC. 206. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRANSFER OF PRECIPITATION MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance for drought contingency planning in any of the States not identified in section 1 of the Reclamation Act (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388), and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and upon termination of the Trusteeship, the Republic of Palau, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(b) **TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM.**—The Secretary is authorized to conduct a Precipitation Management Technology Transfer Program to help alleviate problems caused by precipitation variability and droughts in the West, as part of a balanced long-term water resources development and management program. In consultation with State, Tribal, and local water, hydropower, water quality and instream flow interests, areas shall be selected for conducting field studies cost-shared on a 50-50 basis to validate and quantify the potential for appropriate precipitation management technology to augment stream flows. Validated technologies shall be transferred to non-Federal interests for operational implementation.

TITLE III—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

Except as otherwise provided in section 303 of this Act (relating to temperature control devices at Shasta Dam, California), there is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$90,000,000 in total for fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996.

SEC. 302. AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.

The Secretary is authorized to perform any and all acts and to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary and appropriate for the purpose of implementing this Act. In carrying out the authorities under this Act, the Secretary shall give specific consideration to the needs of fish and wildlife, together with other project purposes, and shall consider temporary operational changes which will mitigate, or can be expected to have an effect in mitigating, fish and wildlife losses and damages resulting from drought conditions, consistent with the Secretary's other obligations.

SEC. 303. TEMPERATURE CONTROL AT SHASTA DAM, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT.

The Secretary is authorized to complete the design and specifications for construction of a device to control the temperature of water releases from Shasta Dam, Central Valley Project, California, and to construct facilities needed to attach such device to the dam. There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the authority of this section not more than \$12,000,000.

SEC. 304. EFFECT OF ACT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) **CONFORMITY WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.**—All actions taken pursuant to this Act pertaining to the diversion, storage, use, or transfer of water shall be in conformity with applicable State and applicable Federal law.

(b) **EFFECT ON JURISDICTION, AUTHORITY, AND WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as expanding or diminishing State, Federal, or Tribal jurisdiction or authority over water resources development, control, or water rights.

SEC. 305. EXCESS STORAGE AND CARRYING CAPACITY.

The Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with municipalities, public water districts and agencies, other Federal agencies, State agencies, and private entities, pursuant to the

Act of February 21, 1911 (43 U.S.C. 523), for the impounding, storage, and carriage of non-project water for domestic, municipal, fish and wildlife, industrial, and other beneficial purposes using any facilities associated with the Central Valley Project, Cachuma Project, and the Ventura River Project, California, the Truckee Storage Project, and the Washoe Project, California and Nevada. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into contracts for the exchange of water for the aforementioned purposes using facilities associated with the Cachuma Project, California.

SEC. 306. REPORT.

There shall be included as part of the President's annual budget submittal to the Congress a detailed report on past and proposed expenditures and accomplishments under this Act.

SEC. 307. FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS.

This Act shall constitute a supplement to the Federal Reclamation laws.

Mr. MILLER of California (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] to explain the legislation.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House this afternoon will pass and send down to the White House H.R. 355, the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act.

The House originally passed this legislation on March 21, 1991, nearly 1 year ago, while California and much of the West were enduring their fifth year of severe drought. Regrettably, the Senate took more than 8 months to pass a compromise version of H.R. 355, and did not send the bill back to the House until after this Chamber had adjourned following completion of the 1st session of the 102d Congress.

Despite that delay, and despite the rains that have inundated portions of California over the past week, this legislation is more urgent than ever. The drought is now in its sixth year, and the recent rainfall did not occur in areas that feed into the reservoir storage system of the Sierras and northern California. Even if we have a normal rain year, which is extremely unlikely, the collective impact of 5 years of drought will leave much of the economy, and the ecology, of California in shambles in 1992.

That is why it is essential to pass H.R. 355 without further delay.

The severity of the continuing drought crisis was illustrated by the announcement last week of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation that water deliveries for all uses—agricultural, municipal, industrial, and environmental—will be severely curtailed

again this year—even more substantial reductions than in 1991. Most agricultural deliveries will be eliminated altogether, and urban customers will face a 50-percent reduction. These restrictions, while necessary, will have massive impacts on employment, on local economies, on industrial production, and on individual residents.

The legislation before us today will help to cushion the impacts of this continuing drought.

H.R. 355 authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to take various actions, on a temporary basis, to allow water districts, contractors, and others to address some of the severe drought conditions in the Western States. It also gives the Bureau permanent authority to prepare contingency plans and take other steps to prevent or mitigate the adverse effects of future drought conditions.

The bill authorizes a total of \$90 million for these activities. It also authorizes \$12 million for design and partial construction of water temperature control facilities at California's Shasta Dam, in order to protect a valuable salmon fishery.

There are several differences between the bills as passed by the House and the Senate, most of them minor and technical in nature. While I am not in total agreement with several of the Senate provisions, I am prepared to accept them in the interest of expediting enactment of this important bill. There are two significant differences between the bills.

First, H.R. 355 now includes a loan program for water users wishing to augment supplies. Loans would be made on terms and conditions deemed appropriate by the Secretary of the Interior, but, unlike most other Reclamation loans to irrigators, would be interest bearing. This concession to fiscal reality is as welcome as it is unique in the Bureau's water development legacy.

Second, the House bill limits the temporary drought relief authority to 1 year; the Senate bill extends this authority to 10 years.

The Senate bill also makes 1991 water deliveries from California's Central Valley project to the Grasslands Water District nonreimbursable. The Bureau of Reclamation's policy of assessing charges for this water ignores the fact that local landowners in Grasslands make significant financial contributions to making wetlands in the district an invaluable source of waterfowl habitat, and I support this change.

Following passage of H.R. 355 by the Senate, I asked the Bureau of Reclamation to clarify several provisions of the bill, including the bill language authorizing the loan program. It must be clearly recognized, as we vote on this bill today, that the Commissioner of Reclamation clearly responded that the bill as passed by the Senate re-

quires that all loans—including loans for agricultural users—be interest bearing. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the exchange of correspondence between myself and the Commissioner of Reclamation on this matter.

Before we vote, I want to make an additional, important point about this legislation, and water policy in general.

Drought is a catastrophe that we, in this Chamber, cannot prevent despite our best efforts. But misallocation of water, misuse, and waste are another matter. The unsound fiscal and water management policies of the Bureau of Reclamation have not caused the drought. But they have undoubtedly worsened the impact of drought by squandering limited water resources on unnecessary crops and marginal lands that should never have been irrigated; by subsidizing water prices far beyond any rational public policy; by dragging its bureaucratic feet on the issues of water conservation, water management, drainage improvements, and water marketing.

Last year, I warned repeatedly that the Bureau was behaving shortsightedly in dispersing water to irrigators to grow rice and other highly consumptive crops. I called for emergency measures because I knew—based on years of experience—that the Bureau's drought policy was little more than opening the floodgates and praying for rain. We went through this during the drought of the 1970's; we are reliving the experience today because the fundamental policies of water management and conservation have not changed.

In the next few weeks, I am hopeful that this House and the Senate will have an opportunity to pass comprehensive water management legislation that will change the way that the Bureau does business. We are finalizing legislation that will attempt to undo the archaic allocation system, that will remedy the ecological genocide that the Central Valley project in California has committed on our environment, and that will, once and for all, cut the subsidies that are costing taxpayers tens of millions of dollars a year.

Passage of that legislation will end the bureaucratically imposed water shortage and misallocation of the past half century. That is another fight; it is coming, and it deserves the support of every Member in this Chamber.

Today's effort is different. This House cannot wait longer to address the catastrophic needs of millions of Americans throughout the West whose livelihood, economic security, and even health are being undermined by an enduring drought.

The House acted promptly on this measure last year, in the fifth year of shortage. It was the fault of no Member

of this Chamber that it was not on the President's desk 11 months ago. So let us move now, in this sixth year, to have this legislation enacted without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the valuable input on this legislation by all of the members of the committee and Members not on the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] who has been involved in working out some of the transfers between agriculture and urban areas in trying to facilitate the use of Federal facilities by municipalities and other agencies in this legislation. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I also want to recognize the input of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] who worked very hard on this legislation, recognizing that the drought is westwide and not simply within the State of California.

Mr. Speaker, I include letters pertaining to this legislation with my remarks, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, WASHINGTON,
DC, FEBRUARY 12, 1992.

HON. GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular
Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of January 30, 1992, seeking Reclamation's interpretation of certain provisions of H.R. 355 as passed by the Senate on November 27, 1991. Your questions and our responses follow.

"Sections 102(b)(3), 102(b)(4), and 103 all include language that excludes certain activities from the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982. Does the Bureau of Reclamation believe that these exclusions are necessary, proper and appropriate? If these provisions were removed from the bill, would the Bureau enforce the requirements of the Reclamation Reform Act?"

It appears that these provisions, like section 102(b)(2), were crafted to maintain the status quo. Water users subject to the Reclamation Reform Act (RRA) would remain so. Water users not already subject to the RRA would not be made subject to that Act solely by virtue of receiving temporary water as a drought relief measure. Given the emergency and temporary character of drought assistance to be provided by this legislation, we believe that those provisions are necessary, proper and appropriate to enable Reclamation to meet emergency needs expeditiously and in an equitable fashion. If they were removed, we believe Reclamation would be obligated to enforce the requirements of the RRA with regard to temporary contracts, amendments to existing contracts of loan repayment contracts entered into pursuant to this legislation.

"Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 102(c) describe procedures for setting interest rates. Are these procedures justified and appropriate? Do these procedures unfairly favor certain categories of water users with lower rates?"

Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 102(c) unnecessarily complicate the legislation. We believe, as reflected in the Administration's drought relief bill (S. 586), one interest rate criterion consistent with current Federal borrowing rates would be sufficient.

"Section 103 describes the terms and conditions to be used by the Secretary in making loans to water users. How would the Bureau interpret the second sentence of this section, which states: "Such loans shall be made available under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem appropriate . . . ?" Does this sentence suggest that the Secretary could decide that costs allocated to irrigation should be interest-free?"

Section 103 of the Senate version also provides that "for all loans approved by the Secretary under the authority of this section, the interest rate shall be the rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury based on average market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with periods to maturity comparable to the repayment period of the loan." (Emphasis added). Thus, we interpret the provision to mean that even though the Secretary may establish other terms and conditions for loans, the proposed legislation would establish that the loans will bear interest and how the interest rate should be determined. So, the answer is "No," the sentence referred to in your question does not suggest that the Secretary could decide that costs allocated to irrigation should be interest-free.

Again, thank you for your letter.

Sincerely,

DENNIS B. UNDERWOOD,
Commissioner.

COMMITTEE ON
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 30, 1992.

Mr. DENNIS UNDERWOOD,
Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. UNDERWOOD: As you know, H.R. 355, the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act, was passed by the Senate on November 27, 1991 and is currently awaiting consideration in the House of Representatives.

Before the House considers this bill, I would appreciate receiving your assessment of exactly how the Bureau of Reclamation would interpret and implement certain provisions of this legislation, should those provisions be enacted in their present form. The provisions in question are the following:

Sections 102(b)(3), 102(b)(4), and 103 all include language that excludes certain activities from the provisions of the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982. Does the Bureau of Reclamation believe that these exclusions are necessary, proper and appropriate? If these provisions were removed from the bill, would the Bureau enforce the requirements of the Reclamation Reform Act with regard to temporary contracts, amendments to existing contracts, or loan repayment contracts entered into pursuant to this legislation?

Paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 102(c) describe procedures for setting interest rates. Are these procedures justified and appropriate? Do these procedures unfairly favor certain categories of water users with lower rates?

Section 103 describes the terms and conditions to be used by the Secretary in making loans to water users. How would the Bureau interpret the second sentence of this section, which states: "Such loans shall be made available under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate . . . ?" Does this sentence suggest that the Secretary could decide that costs allocated to irrigation should be interest-free?

In view of the need to expedite consideration of this legislation, I would appreciate

your prompt attention to this matter. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Just very briefly I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] and others for seeing to it that this bill has been brought up this early in this session of the 102d Congress.

As the chairman mentioned, the bill was passed early last year and sent to the Senate. Unfortunately, it became entangled in other matters over there, and it took the Senate several months to untangle it and get it sent back over here.

This is a very important piece of legislation to the entire West and contains very badly needed authority for the Bureau of Reclamation to deal with drought situations, and I urge the House to adopt H.R. 355.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object I rise in support of H.R. 355, a bill which authorizes a comprehensive package of projects to serve Californians and residents throughout the West who have suffered greatly under prevailing drought conditions.

Despite recent storms which have resulted in extensive flooding and storm dangers in my district and other portions of California, the State remains in its fifth straight year of a drought unprecedented in recent history. Perhaps no region of the State has been more severely impacted by this drought than Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties, which I represent. In those counties, residents have been on strict water rationing for over 18 months. The current rationing was designed to achieve a 43-percent decrease below predrought usage levels for domestic consumption.

Like many regions around the country, especially in the West, south central California does not get an adequate supply of annual rainfall to meet its needs. Rather, in order to meet all the needs of the region, water storage and transfer/distribution systems are critical elements of our water supply program. I am pleased that many features of this bill address the water supply issues for regions like south central California.

There are a number of important sections in this bill which will aid my constituents and other persons who have been impacted by the drought. This bill provides for both short-term emergency actions and implementation of appropriate permanent solutions. Such

activities as authorizing Federal participation in water banking, authorizing minor construction projects to get the limited water supply to where it is needed most, facilitating conveyance of water between willing sellers and buyers, and participation in long-term drought response contingency planning will all prove beneficial. I am also pleased that this bill includes provisions to provide for protection of fish and wildlife values.

I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for including my amendment to the Warren Act in the bill before the House today. Under my amendment, the Federal Government will be authorized to use its reclamation facilities to transport and store, non-Federal water used for other than irrigation. Use of Federal reclamation facilities for transport and storage of non-Federal irrigation water has been authorized for 60 years. Such use was authorized because it was recognized that Federal facilities often had excess capacity, and in order to avoid the costs and environmental impacts of constructing duplicative systems. This same logic applies to use of Federal facilities for nonirrigation water.

The city of Santa Barbara, and the county water agency for example, propose to use Lake Cachuma and Lake Casitas for water storage, along with other Federal facilities to transfer water from the State water project and the city's new desalination plant.

One other section of this bill which is of special interest to persons in the south central coastal area is the authorization of feasibility studies for desalination projects. In the area which I represent, such technological approaches to water supply issues are likely to become even more important in meeting future water demands. Therefore, I would like to thank my friend, Mr. PANETTA, for authoring this section of the bill.

Overall, H.R. 355 is a very good bill which deserves the support of my colleagues. I would like to thank the chairman, Mr. MILLER, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and others for bringing this comprehensive package to the floor. I am hopeful that the President will sign this bill into law in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H.R. 3337, COMMEMORATIVE COIN BILL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, the last vote taken in the House was under suspension of the rules, and a two-thirds vote was necessary in order for H.R. 3337 to pass. It was defeated on a two-thirds to one-third vote.

That bill contains six sections, one dealing with the Columbus commemorative coin, a World Cup coin and a White House coin, and the Desert Storm medal, along with the Madison commemorative coin. The Senate at the last minute prior to our adjournment passed an amendment in that bill which would have required the redesign of our coins, even though currently under law the Secretary of the Treasury has that authority.

It is my intent, subject to the rules of the House and the concurrence of my subcommittee chairman and those who are responsible, to support an action on the part of this House when we convene tomorrow that would strike that section of the bill which was just defeated dealing with the coinage part, that being the redesign section, and to support the balance of the bill as originally brought to the floor of the House prior to adjournment.

I wanted to make this information available because I think it is important that we move ahead with the positive part of that bill.

□ 1550

LEGISLATION TO AMEND HOUSE RULES TO CREATE HOUSE ADMINISTRATOR

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, Last November, I joined my friend DAVID OBEY in a special order. The point I raised then is one he raised 15 years ago when he chaired the Obey Commission, that the House of Representatives needs a professionally administrator.

Essentially, the House of Representatives is professionally managed the way it was 100 years ago, and I think we are paying the price, from a public relations perspective, for our failure to bring operations into the modern world. I believe now is the time we need to take action to create effective, modern systems of congressional management, similar to what most large institutions in this country have done.

The recent revelations over the House bank, restaurants, and services viewed as perks have focused scrutiny on certain practices that would not stand up to normal business standards. I think these unfortunate events reflect the fact there is no one professional administrator overseeing the

running of an enterprise with about 25,000 employees and a budget of almost \$1.8 billion. Someone should be asking whether certain practices make any sense in 1992, instead of perpetuating a system simply because that is the way we have always done it.

I do not mean to denigrate the performance of the many dedicated public servants who work in the House, nor are my remarks meant to be critical of the Democratic and Republican leadership, or any Member of this body. While none of us is perfect in this body, most of us perform our duties honorably. But what makes me uneasy is the lack of an authoritative administrator, hired for his or her expertise in finance, management, and personnel, looking to see whether the House of Representatives is run in an efficient, sound manner.

The House of Representatives has changed a great deal in 200 years, running the Capitol complex has become a huge operation. We are a city within a city. We have dozens of buildings, a police force, restaurants, shops, mass transit system, library and research service, television station, car wash, post office, first aid stations, doctor's office, ambulance service, barber, hair salon, credit union, printer, paint shop, furniture factory, telephone system, moving company, and more. We cannot continue to run such an operation loosely, the way it was run 100 years ago.

Without modern management controls, the House could be spending millions of dollars unnecessarily. The current system is accountable to no one, yet, every one of us is held accountable when something goes wrong.

Another thing that has changed is the level of public scrutiny focused on the House of Representatives. Our floor debate is televised, our committee meetings are public, our buildings are open, and our bills and reports are readily available for anyone to read. Virtually everything we do is public and open to criticism, but everyone here is caught by surprise when the public reacts badly to practices to which we have become accustomed.

Each of us is held accountable for how we run the House, because we are all full-time legislators now. It used to be that Members of the House were citizen legislators, carrying on lives and professions at home apart from their functions in the legislature. They could not be expected to know the nuts and bolts of the Capitol complex.

But now, this is our job, we are responsible for how taxpayer dollars are spent. We are held accountable for any aspect of this operation that does not pass the test of public scrutiny.

We need to realize the public views how we run the House as a microcosm of the whole country. The public correctly demands that we manage well a \$2 billion entity over which we have di-

rect control, so they can have confidence in our ability to manage well a trillion dollar entity, the U.S. Government. It is clear we need to get our House in order as we can begin to tackle the daunting societal problems that face us. Let us not wait for the next shoe to drop which will further damage the reputation of this institution.

I am working on a resolution to amend the House rules to create a House Administrator. This person would be the manager of the House, nominated by the Speaker and confirmed by the House, on the basis of his or her experience in running a major institution, whether public or private, according to modern business practices. The administrator would plan, coordinate, and direct all the administrative support operations of the House. Serving under and hired by the administrator would be an auditor and a comptroller.

The comptroller would be the chief financial officer and oversee all financial aspects of the House, including spending and accounting practices by the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, and individual Members' offices and committees.

The auditor would conduct financial audits to see whether financial systems were working and would also pursue allegations of fraud, waste, or abuse, in much the same manner as the inspectors general do in Federal agencies. I think the inspectors general have proven their worth time and time again in various agencies and the same concept could work here in the House.

The administrator would report to the Committee on House Administration, which would put many aspects of running the House in bipartisan hands, thus avoiding allegations of one party concealing something from the other. Since both parties are held accountable for the actions of the House, both should share equally in the oversight and management functions.

While covering the finances of individual Members and committee offices may raise some hackles, I want to be sure we do not create this office and then promptly exempt ourselves from its reach. That would be a huge mistake and would be perceived as a hollow gesture.

I think it will actually be a big relief for all of us to know that this institution is being run in a sound financial manner, so we are not waiting for the other shoe to drop. Each of us needs to focus our attention on important issues of policy, like health care, and job creation, and not on whether the barber shop is charging enough for a haircut or if there is favoritism in the assignment of parking spaces.

I want to emphasize that the purpose of this proposal is to prevent future problems, and to ensure that tax dollars are being spent wisely, in a way we would be comfortable reading about on

the front page of our hometown newspapers. I should have a bill ready to introduce in about a week and I hope my colleagues will lend their support to bringing it to the floor in the coming months.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY ON HAITI IS IMMORAL AND CRUEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in calling on the administration in the strongest possible terms to reverse itself and provide sanctuary to Haitians who are fleeing that island nation for safety. The military coup which stole from the people of Haiti the democracy they have sought for decades is illegitimate; it is immoral; it is cruel. The people of Haiti are suffering economically, but also through the loss of liberties. As the administration is forcing people to return, we are hearing more and more about the tragic reaction of the Haitian dictatorship.

Immediately after the coup, I came to the well of the House and called on the administration to move aggressively to return President Aristide to office. I commend the fact that the administration initially worked with other nations in the hemisphere to isolate the harsh regime which has taken power. The measures initially taken against Haiti are harsh, there can be no doubt about that. But strong ongoing action is necessary if we are to restore to the Haitian people the freedom and democracy they have given so much to secure. It is deeply troubling now to see the administration move away from that strong multilateral approach to begin what can only be interpreted as an opening of relations with the illegitimate regime which expelled Aristide.

It is clear that those who have stolen control of that nation have no concern for their own people. Today, repression and violence have once again taken over Haitian society. The Haitian people live in fear. To return those who have fled is an outrage. To move toward some sort of routine relationship with the perpetrators of this horror is an outrage.

To have heard the administration say that they could not permit those who are fleeing to have temporary asylum here because they are fleeing economic, not political repression leaves me wondering if our State Department has made any attempt at all to understand what is happening to the Haitian people. I call on them to look—to listen—to the Haitian people and to realize that they want democracy and freedom.

Many of the Haitian people are being imprisoned in their own land. Why? Because they want to live in freedom. After decades of totalitarian rule, Americans praised their resolve in successfully holding the elections which led to President Aristide's election. Now, we have a responsibility to stand with the Haitian people. To work to restore their freedoms, and, in the meantime, to adopt policies which provide the Haitian people help and safe haven.

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, I had the opportunity to be on the program of the 40th annual National Prayer Breakfast. This wonderful event was attended by President and Mrs. Bush, Vice President and Mrs. Quayle, a large number of Senators and Members of Congress, as well as religious and government leaders from 50 States and 140 foreign countries.

I wanted to share the remarks of several Members of Congress who took part in this event, as well as a copy of the program.

This year the Prayer Breakfast was chaired by Senator TED STEVENS of Alaska, who did an outstanding job in coordinating the program and making it run smoothly.

The remarks follow:

OFFICIAL GREETING

(By Hon. Ted Stevens)

I'm Ted Stevens from Alaska. Welcome to the 40th annual National Prayer Breakfast. As chairman of the Senate Prayer Breakfast, I report on illness within our Senate family and ask Senators to offer silent prayers for those in special need. This morning, I report that former Senator John Stennis, long a leader of the Senate prayer group, now in retirement, is not well. Please remember his love of God and service to our nation in your silent prayers.

Ms. Shoshana Cardin, chairman of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry and the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations will offer our pre-breakfast prayer. Soon after Ms. Cardin, the West Point choir will sing for us. Enjoy your breakfast.

OPENING PRAYER

(By Hon. G.V. Montgomery)

Let us pray.

Good Lord, thank You for this new day and for giving us the opportunity to gather this morning to express our love for You and for our neighbor. To our friends from overseas, welcome to our country. We are proud that you are a part of this great National Prayer Breakfast.

In 1991, the world changed so much for the better. Many people in other lands can now worship without fear. Please give them the strength and courage to keep these new freedoms.

Bless our President and Barbara Bush and thank you for helping our President work through the many problems he faces each day. Bless Vice President and Marilyn Quayle, the Congress and all of the officials in our great government.

Lord, we are so proud of Doug Coe, his staff, and all the volunteers who work so hard to make this the most wonderful event held in our Nation's Capital.

Bless this food to the nourishment of our bodies and let us remember that every good and perfect gift comes from You.

Amen. Amen.

REMARKS OF SENATOR STEVENS

Mr. President, Mrs. Bush, Mr. Vice President, Mrs. Quayle, distinguished heads of state, honored guests, and friends. Coming from all walks of life, every political persuasion, and every corner of our globe, we gather together to pray. The book of Matthew tells us that where two or three are gathered

in God's name, He is among them. And where two or three agree in prayer, our Father in heaven will answer those prayers.

We have much for which to be thankful: a world earnestly seeking peace, the end of walls separating mankind, the rebirth of democratic freedoms—and almost all of our United Nations forces have returned after liberating Kuwait. Our prayers offered here in this room a year ago have been answered.

But while we may differ on issues of policy and politics, foreign affairs and business and commerce, our faith in God unites us. As we come closer together and our world is at peace, God will listen. Ask, and it will be given you. Seek, and you shall find. Knock, and it will be open to you.

INTRODUCTION OF GUEST SPEAKER

On August 19, 1991, dark clouds literally hung over Red Square in Moscow. It was the first day of the Feast of the Transfiguration for Russian Orthodox true believers—and one of the first days for open religious freedom in the capitol of the Soviet Union.

But, a coup was underway—as the patriarch of the Orthodox Church, Alexi the Second, was addressing his religious flock in Red Square, Soviet tanks rolled into that square, threatening the protectors of the Russian white house, in which Boris Yeltsin, the first elected leader of Russia, and the Russian Parliament were meeting.

That night, the cellist was in Paris. He went to the airfield, bought a ticket for Tokyo on a flight he knew stopped in Moscow. Upon arrival in Moscow, he went to the Russian white house and joined Yeltsin. And, he joined Father Beurkov—who gave out 2,000 bibles to young soldiers in the tanks—only one refused to accept a bible.

That trip of faith was taken by Mstislav Rostropovich. He returned to the country of his birth to defend freedom. We have asked maestro Rostropovich, the music director of national symphony orchestra for the past fifteen years, and a true believer, to be our speaker today.

Ladies and gentlemen, I present a great patriot, maestro Mstislav Rostropovich.

GREETINGS FROM THE HOUSE PRAYER BREAKFAST GROUP

(By Congressman Charles Stenholm)

"Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. I thank God for you because of his grace given you in Christ Jesus. . . . I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree with one another so that there may be no divisions among you and that you may be perfectly united in mind and thought."

From the reports you hear on the news, it may be difficult for you to believe that Members of Congress ever agree with one another or find it possible to be "perfectly united in mind and thought" as Saint Paul admonished us to do.

But it is my pleasure and privilege to bring you greetings from the House of Representatives Prayer Breakfast Group, where we try to take those instructions seriously. Like Saint Paul, I greet you in the name of Christ with thanksgiving for everyone gathered here from all across the world and from many different walks of life. And I want to share with you the good news of God's work in our House Prayer group.

Looking out across this impressive crowd this morning, I am reminded of the Prophet Isaiah's words when he said, "My house will be called a house of prayer for all Nations." This room may normally be a ballroom, but

this morning it is definitely "a house of prayer for all Nations" and it is a wonderful sight.

Normally on Thursday mornings at this hour I am sitting in a little room in the Capitol Building with about 40 or 50 of my colleagues. We meet without fanfare, without staff at our elbows, without the press ready to take down our words and read them on the nightly news—slightly improved, of course. We meet simply to find Christian fellowship with each other, to share each others burdens of joys, and to pray.

I have to tell you that prayer is something I don't totally understand, even though I am convinced of its power. The Holy Spirit, which the Bible says guides us in our prayers, is a lot like the wind that sweeps across the rolling plains of West Texas. The wind itself is invisible but its effects are undeniable.

The hostages, for whose release we praise God this year, have all told us about the power of prayer which sustained them through their long, lonely years. Those who were able to link hands in prayer while in their cells, which they called the "Church of the Locked Door," have testified that the strength they gained from each other and from the Holy Comforter was what kept them alive.

In the House Prayer Breakfast group, we have seen the power of prayer and the Holy Spirit at work as well. Through the report which we affectionately call "The Sick and Wounded Report" which General Sonny Montgomery brings us each week, we share our daily concerns with and for our fellow colleagues and their families. Through Jake Pickle's colorful explanations of the background of the hymns we sing, we both lift our voices in praise and gain a sense of how God has worked through the lives and experiences of past Christians. Through the message brought by a different Member of Congress each week—alternating between Republican and Democrat—we learn something of our colleagues' own spiritual journeys.

I personally have felt the impact which the fellowship and prayer can have on those of us who meet together. As a conservative farmer from the rural Southwest, it's not always obvious to me how I might relate to a liberal New Yorker. When we meet together on Thursdays, however, all the other labels are left at the door and we are transformed into simply being two men seeking fellowship and God's guidance. Even when we leave the room and re-attach our labels, something of that connection through fellowship remains with us.

Just as we Representatives meet every Thursday morning, asking God to direct us while we debate the laws of our Land, I ask that you pray for us as we make those decisions so that our words and deeds might be pleasing to God.

It is now my privilege to introduce to you Ms. Cissy Houston, who will bring us her rendition of "Sweet Hour of Prayer." While many people may be tempted to boast of a successful recording career, Grammy award nominations, or numerous other awards, I suspect that the one which may be most special to Cissy was being named Mother of the Year in 1991. While we don't know her other children, we do know that Cissy did a marvelous job of raising and training her daughter, Whitney. May I now introduce Ms. Cissy Houston.

INTRODUCTION OF PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH

(By Hon. Howell Heflin)

Last April, I had the privilege of representing the Senate prayer breakfast at the dedi-

cation of the Camp David chapel, which serves as a house of worship for the presidential party and over two hundred permanent residents, most of whom are naval and marine security personnel and their families. At a worship service, our nation's highest leaders will be co-mingled with average people like foresters, sailors, and marines. A marine "gunny" sergeant might stare at the President as he passes the collection plate.

When the President arose to give his remarks at the dedication service, a young mother took her crying baby out of the chapel. The President remarked that the first crying baby to be removed from the chapel just happened to be his grandson.

In 1789, George Washington, in his inaugural address, said, ". . . it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that almighty being who rules over the universe . . . that his benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves . . ."

Some 200 years later, in 1989, the second "George" to occupy the office made his first act as President a prayer: "Heavenly Father, we bow our heads and thank you for your love. Accept our thanks for the peace that yields this day . . . make us strong to do your will, and write on our hearts these words: 'use power to help people.' There is but one use of power, and it is to serve people. Help us to remember it, Lord."

Since this national prayer breakfast has a meaningful international attendance, let me mention another George, King George VI of Great Britain. During a World War II broadcast, he encouraged his countrymen, many in bomb shelters seeking protection from the Luftwaffe, by evoking words from Louise Haskins' poem, "The Gate of the Year":

I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year:

"Give me a light, that I may tread safely into the unknown!"

And he replied:

"Go out into the darkness and put your hand into the hand of God.

That shall be to you better than light and safer than a known way."

Throughout our history, we have been fortunate to have leaders who have sought God's guidance. How comforting it is to know that so many of our great leaders, including our President, George Bush, have placed their full confidence in his power.

It is my high privilege and distinct honor to present the President of the United States.

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace, Where there is hatred, let me sow love;

Where there is injury, pardon;

Where there is doubt, faith;

Where there is despair, hope;

Where there is darkness, light;

and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek

to be consoled, as to console;

not so much to be understood, as to understand;

not so much to be loved, as to love.

For it is in giving that we receive,

it is in pardoning that we are pardoned,

it is in dying that we are born again to eternal life.

FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Chairman: The Honorable Ted Stevens

Pre-Breakfast Prayer: Ms. Shoshana Cardin, Chairman, National Conference on

Soviet Jewry, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations

Opening Prayer: The Honorable G.V. "Sonny" Montgomery, U.S. Representative, Mississippi.

Opening Song: Savoonga Eskimo Singers, Saint Lawrence Island, Alaska

Breakfast

Welcome: The Honorable Ted Stevens, U.S. Senator, Alaska

Remarks—U.S. Senate: The Honorable Larry E. Craig, U.S. Senator, Idaho

Remarks—U.S. House of Representatives: The Honorable Charles W. Stenholm, U.S. Representative, Texas

Solo: Ms. Sissy Houston

Remarks: The Honorable Dan Quayle, Vice President of the United States

New Testament Reading: The Honorable Al Gore, U.S. Senator, Tennessee

Message: Maestro Mstislav Rostropovich, Music Director, National Symphony Orchestra

Prayer for Armed Services: General Colin Powell, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Remarks: The Honorable Howard Heflin, U.S. Senator, Alabama

The President of The United States

Group Song: Cadet Doug, McInvale, United States Military Academy

Closing Song: United States Military Academy

Closing Prayer: Dr. Billy Graham

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from the list of cosponsors of House Resolution 194.

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

There was no objection.

FUNDAMENTAL REFORM NEEDED IN HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, a few weeks ago I received a rather heartbreaking letter from a woman in my district. Her husband is a highly skilled machine builder who has not been able to find steady work for the last 3 years. This woman has four sons between the ages of 3 and 16 years of age.

Her husband can get work for a few months at a time working 70 hours a week; then he just gets laid off. "Just when we get caught up," she writes, "we start to drown again."

□ 1600

This family's greatest fear is not about jobs or income, precarious as those are. No, her greatest fear is about health care.

We have heard across the breadth of this country from towns in New Hampshire and towns in Michigan, all over America, people scared literally to

death about the inability to provide for their families because of the lack of adequate health care and the lack of adequate health care planning in this country.

Listen to what she writes:

My husband's current employer is making us wait 7 months for benefits. We have been without insurance for over a year and a half. We owe the Port Huron Hospital almost \$1,000 and we have been threatened by collection agencies. They want payment in 60 days. There is no possible way we can pay that. We can't get any social services, even when we are laid off, because we have too many assets. We have a boat and a camper and we have been trying to sell them for 3 years, but no one can afford the down payment. We are selling our boat for what we owe on it. We have gone five weeks without food shopping because we have no unemployment checks, but we still couldn't get food stamps. We have exhausted our savings because of layoffs. Not only that, we are scared to death every time one of the kids get hurt. My 14-year-old was involved in an auto accident. Since we didn't have health insurance, they want \$300 before they will pay any bills. We just don't have it.

I cannot tell my friends and colleagues how many letters I get like this over the course of a week or a month. They are more frequent, they are more desperate. People are frustrated. They are frightened, and they are fed up with a system that makes no sense, provides no coverage and does not insure them against the rising costs of health care.

This woman went on to sum up the problems better than any of the pundits I have heard. She wrote:

I am not looking for a handout. When middle class skilled trades people can't make it, something is wrong. We need help with health care. It is urgent now.

Well, of course, she is right. The health care system in this country needs a fundamental reform, not tinkering on the edges, not fooling around with a little adjustment here, but a fundamental reform, something we have not been able to face up to in this country, something every other industrialized democracy in the world has taken the steps to meet in terms of their obligation to their citizenry.

The Germans started in 1870 under Bismarck with a national health insurance plan. Every major industrial nation in this world has done the same.

The health care system in this country needs fundamental reform, and the heart of that problem, the guts of this whole issue, is soaring costs.

In 1980, health care for the average American family cost \$2,500 per year. Today it is about \$6,500 per year, and if we continue on this same path that we are on, it will be \$14,000 a year per family by the end of this decade. That will not only bankrupt families like the family that I just alluded to in the letter, it will bankrupt businesses, and I daresay will bankrupt this country. We cannot afford that.

No American family is immune from these soaring costs. Health care is ris-

ing three and four times the rate of inflation, and more and more employers are not paying the cost.

Nearly one out of every two working households had benefits cut by the employer, or they had been required to contribute more for coverage. Such costs are a cruel and a hidden tax on American families.

Mr. Speaker, after you have worked hard all day like the family that I just alluded to in the letter that I read from my district, you should not have to stay up all night worrying about whether your kid's health care is covered.

I had another group of women visit me in my congressional office about 1½ years ago. I will never forget that visit because it demonstrates to me now utterly desperate people are for insurance, and how ironic situations are that put people in a situation of not being able to provide for their children. These five women worked in nursing homes. There cared for your parents, my parents, our grandparents. They bathed them. They changed their bedpans. They took care of them. They belonged to a union, but not one of them had health insurance. They were by and large, single parents. One woman told me she goes to bed every night and says a prayer that her son does not become ill.

And what about the problem of those who are trapped in their jobs, afraid to accept new positions. We all know somebody out there who would like to move on to a different employer, but they cannot because they are worried about maintaining adequate health insurance. The other day I heard a story about a man who desperately wanted to change jobs, but he could not. It turns out he had a son with Downs syndrome and if he changed, the new company's insurance would not pick up the tab. Downs syndrome, as people know, is a preexisting condition.

The experts call this job lock, and that has got to change. Nobody should be locked out of a job because of a system we could change with just a little bit of common sense.

And what about quality? You know, people will tell you that we have got the best health care quality in the world. I do not know that I buy that. I know that we have some very competent and capable providers of health care in this country and we do some wonderful things, but you know, when you really look at the system of health care in this country, you find out there is a lot we can do to improve it. If we spend more money than any other nation on Earth for health care, then why does the United States, for instance, rank 21st out of 23 developed countries when it comes to infant mortality? A child born in Japan or West Germany, France, Canada, Great Britain, or any other industrialized nation has a better chance of surviving its first year than

a child born here in the United States. Even a baby that is born in poverty-stricken Honduras, one of the poorest countries in the Americas, has a better chance of surviving than a child born in Detroit, MI.

Why does the United States rank 23rd in recovery from heart attacks? Why do Canadians and the Japanese and the Germans live an average of 2 and 3 years longer than Americans?

In many cases we do have quality health care in this country, but we cannot be lulled into accepting secondary care in other areas.

America's working families have a right to expect affordable, high quality health care. I believe that is a right. I do not think that is something that is extra. It is as basic as earning a living, and they have the right to expect that high quality care is available to all Americans.

And speaking of all Americans, let us talk for a second about the uninsured. Even with our enormous health care budget, 34 million Americans have no health care insurance at all. Every one of us knows somebody in our families, in our neighbors, in our churches who falls into that category. Over a 2-year period of time, up to 60 million will be without coverage at some point. These are not just poor people, by the way. In fact, the majority of the uninsured, 85 percent live in families headed by a full-time worker.

In other words, no American family, regardless of income, can be sure that a job loss, a job change or a serious illness will not push them to the ranks of the uninsured.

The health care crisis is not just a tragedy for individual families. It is also an enormous drag on the Nation's economy and our ability to compete internationally.

□ 1610

We spent in this country \$671 billion, that is billion with a "b"—\$671 billion on health care in 1990, which is about 12.3 percent of our entire gross national product.

Compare that with the Japanese, who spend about 6.5 percent of their GNP, or the Germans at 8.1 or the Canadians at 9.0 percent, and they insure everybody.

If the United States continues at this rate, our health care costs will pass the \$1 trillion mark by 1994 and will approach \$2 trillion by the end of the decade. On the competitive side, General Motors spends more money on the health care of its workers and those who retire than it spends on steel for its automobiles.

One study by the University of Michigan found that health care adds \$1,083 to the sticker price of a car built in Detroit. That is more than the cost of the engine of that automobile.

In Canada that sticker price cost is about \$223 because they have organized

their country around a system that makes a little bit of sense and that controls costs.

We cannot continue to raise the prices of our products to keep pace with skyrocketing health care costs, not if we want to remain competitive.

A part of this whole uneasiness that the country feels, as demonstrated last night as it voted in New Hampshire, is the health care issue.

I watched the exit polls and I watched the polls that were done on the people who had voted, and they expressed that health care was right behind, and closely behind, the jobs issue as the most important issue that faces the people of New Hampshire.

Now, what is the President's plan to get us out of this health care mess? It is not a comprehensive plan to correct its laws; it is not a rigorous proposal to hold down costs; and it is not a comprehensive program to guarantee the health of the American families.

Instead, President Bush's big idea is a tax credit, a small amount of money to some lower income families who have no insurance. That is not a plan at all. It tinkers around the edges of a system that needs fundamental reform. It is a piecemeal election-year charade.

The President's approach completely ignores the crux of the problem facing the lower income families, which is soaring costs.

His plan does nothing to reform the network of hospitals, drug companies, insurance firms, doctors, all of which play a part in these skyrocketing expenses.

Take the cost of drugs, which the President did not mention in his speech: We are paying double, triple, and in some cases, seven times as much for prescription drugs here in the United States than people just across the border from us in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, my district borders Canada, and right across the river from my district people get good, decent prices on prescription drugs. A bottle of Tylenol with codeine, for example, costs \$18 in the United States. Do you know what the cost is in Canada? \$5.50. Same drug, same manufacturer, \$18 versus \$5.50; and not generic, the same pills, the same company.

Ativan, \$48 for a bottle of pills in the United States; same drug, same manufacturer, \$7 across the river in Canada.

Keflex, \$55 here; \$16 over there. Valium, over there Valium is \$8, and here \$24. Restoril, \$42 over here and \$14 over there.

I could go on and on, and everybody knows what I am talking about. The cost of prescription drugs in this country needs to be controlled.

No wonder drug company profits are triple the national average. Over the last 10 years the cost of prescriptions has shot up 152 percent. That is triple the inflation rate. As I have just demonstrated by the numbers that I read, it is still going up.

And what about the insurance companies? Do you know how many private health insurance companies we have? One thousand five hundred, and all of them have different forms.

No wonder they spend five times more on overhead than Medicare; no wonder out of every dollar on health care we spend 12 cents on overhead, and in Canada it is less than a penny.

I have heard retirees from my district whose pensions are being eaten up by insurance costs. In one case, retirees of a company were notified that their health insurance premiums had tripled and that it was all they were going to get; all of this was going to be taken out of their pensions.

I had a fellow come up to me during the Christmas holidays, and this man had 40 years' experience, hard work in a factory, where when you come home, you are dirty, your muscles ache, and all you want to do is sit in the chair and just try to catch your breath. Forty years, he earned a pension and he was retired.

Every month he would go to his mailbox to get that pension check. It amounted to \$500 a month. One day several months ago he went to his mailbox and there was a check, but not for \$500—\$32, with a letter that said that is all he is going to get from now on because his health insurance premium had tripled.

Mr. Speaker, that is happening every day across this country, and people are fed up and they are frustrated and they are frightened and they want us to do something about it.

I want to tell you, when we are done with this tax bill—and we will be done with it in a relatively short time—we have got to move on to this health care issue. This is intertwined with the success of where we go as a country as much as the tax bill that will come out of this House—and probably more so.

What about doctor bills, which the President did not mention? Between 1971 and 1985, American doctors raised their fees 22 percent over inflation. Doctors' offices are bloated beyond belief. Forty-eight percent of a doctor's income goes for professional expenses. That means billing patients, filling out forms, collecting bad debts. Is that what we want our medical people to be engaged in, to be concentrated in?

None of these problems are addressed in the President's plan. Meanwhile, middle-income families are being priced out of the health care system, and the costs are bankrupting families, businesses, and if we do not stop, the average American families are going to be paying more and more for less and less coverage.

The President's plan will do nothing, nothing to address these basic health care problems faced by most families. The absence of cost control is not the only glaring omission in the President's proposal. The President says he

wants to give low-income families a \$3,750 tax credit, a plan that would exclude most middle-income Americans. The full benefits of the President's tax credit would only be available to families at 50 percent of the poverty level. And even if the full tax credit were available to middle-class families, it would only pay for a fraction of the cost of health care.

For instance, a family of four with an income of \$28,000 would receive about \$500 under President Bush's plan. But everybody knows that health care costs, as I said earlier, have risen from \$2,500 for a family of four in 1980 up to about \$6,500 today. The President gives them \$500.

With insurance costs rising at about 14 percent per year, this halfway measure would provide even less coverage with each passing year.

With the tax credit that is too small and no curb on future growth of premiums, how can the President claim he is providing coverage for all Americans? It is beyond me. What does his plan do about the other major problems, as I mentioned earlier; those of job loss, for example? Nothing.

Long-term care for our parents and grandparents who need it? Nothing.

Most important, his plan does nothing for middle-income families who live in constant fear they will lose their health insurance. It does not give our families the peace of mind that comes with guaranteed health insurance coverage.

Instead, the President's plan takes care of his own, the doctors, the insurance companies, the health care providers, those who simply gobble up his meager tax credits, without making the necessary reforms; no assurances, no assurances that there is going to be any control on costs.

□ 1620

Where will the President find the \$100 billion to pay for his misdirected tax credits? Well, he did not say. He did not say.

Now I ask my colleagues: Is that responsible leadership? He proposes a patchwork response to a comprehensive problem and then calls on someone else to find the money to pay for it. He gives us a menu of things. "Pick it out." What kind of leadership is that?

Mr. Speaker, we need someone to step up to the plate, outline the problem, tell us where he needs to take the country or where we should be going, provide the means to restructure and to finance through premiums, if necessary, to get the job done. We need a national health care plan that will control cost so that it never increases more than wages. We need a plan that will make sure that no job—no job—is without health insurance. We need a plan that will insure that we can choose—choose our own doctor—and a plan that will include long-term care, a

plan that will improve the quality of all Americans, not just for us here, not just for the middle class, but those people in Detroit who have got to worry about that staggering, disgraceful infant mortality rate, a plan that reforms the network of insurance companies, and drug companies, and doctors so that they cannot charge \$48 for Ativan here when it is sold in Canada for \$7.50, and we need a plan that passes the savings on to the patient.

This Nation, Mr. Speaker, American families, paid a tremendous price for our failure to act in the Reagan-Bush years. The status quo is no longer working, if it ever did work. We need change, we need fundamental change, we need change that addresses the basic structure of the major problems in this country.

It is time for that change. Each day we delay, the costs rise, and I implore my colleagues, when we are finished, and we will be finished soon with the tax proposal to provide middle-income Americans with dollars for their pocket, and hopefully jobs, that we get on to this most important ingredient in healing the wounds that are so abundant in America in health care.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 330

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor from the bill (H.R. 330).

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

There was no objection.

SALUTE TO THE PROUD AND PERSEVERING PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSSO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this month the Soviet Union was conducting military maneuvers in illegally annexed Lithuania. The Soviet Union had cracked down on the Lithuanian independence movement usurping Government buildings and communications services and declaring invalid a Republic-wide nonbinding ballot on independence. In January of last year, 14 people were killed and 200 injured when Soviet troops stormed a television tower in Vilnius, Lithuania's capital. It is a great blessing to see the transformations that have occurred in Lithuania, the other Baltic Republics, and the Soviet Union over the last year.

Now, 12 months later, a free and independent Lithuania is fielding a four-person team at the winter Olympics under their own tricolored flag. The national flag of Lithuania has three

horizontal stripes of equal width—yellow, green, and red. The yellow is representative of the fields of ripening rye or wheat, symbolizing freedom from want; green is for the beautiful evergreen forests of Lithuania, symbolizing hope; and red symbolizes the blood shed for freedom. Although the display of this tricolored flag was illegal throughout the 50-year Soviet occupation of Lithuania, every Lithuanian believed in the freedoms and inspiration represented in that flag.

For many decades Americans have paused at this time of year to glory in Lithuania's 22 years of self-rule and express the fervent hope that Lithuania would someday be a free country again. Although a country barely the size of West Virginia, Lithuania has had no vacation from pain and suffering over the last 50 years. Soviet tyranny has cost many lives, broken up families, and imposed economic hardships on many Lithuanians. Yet their suffering has never been forgotten and the perils facing Lithuanians every day during their illegal annexation has been remembered each year on February 16, Lithuanian Independence Day.

While the Lithuanians may have been physical captives of their Soviet occupiers, the Soviets could never capture the dreams so deeply imbedded in Lithuanian hearts. The thirst for freedom cannot be quenched and the collective voice of the Lithuanian people could not be silenced.

This year for the first time in 50 years, Lithuania is truly free. And for the first time since 1941, Lithuanians can actually celebrate their freedom and their opportunity for self-rule under a constitution which recognizes the freedoms of speech, religion, and communication. While the tremendous personal tragedies suffered by the Lithuanian people, along with the countless repressive acts and tyrannical nature of the Soviet Union cannot be erased, this year's commemoration provides hope, inspiration, and celebration for the future of Lithuania. In the past we in the United States and others around the world have sent a message of support and brotherhood to the captive people of this Republic on Lithuanian Independence Day. Today we thankfully send our heartfelt congratulations to the brave citizens of an independent Lithuania for their perseverance, their strength, their devotion to democratic principles, and their peaceful transition to democracy.

Throughout Lithuania's occupation, the United States Congress has strongly supported the Lithuanian people's valiant struggle for independence. Our recognition of Lithuanian independence was important not only to Lithuanian-Americans, but to the Lithuanian people, serving as a symbol of our support for the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence. Evoking an image of a similar,

bold, proud, and courageous declaration at the beginning of our own Nation over 200 years ago, their subjugation served as a clarion to the American people, heralding messages of support for the Lithuanian people's basic right of self-determination and messages of condemnation to the Soviet Government for their subjugation of an independent republic.

To demonstrate the Congress' support for and celebration of Lithuanian independence, the House Foreign Affairs Committee today approved House Concurrent Resolution 239. This bill, which I authored, congratulates Lithuania and its people for their successful peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy. Our support for the Lithuanian people cannot end here, however. Many Lithuanian-Americans are upset because they cannot yet receive their Social Security checks in Lithuania. I have contacted the State Department and will be working with the State Department and the Lithuanian Government to settle this problem as quickly as possible. I ask those of Lithuanian-American extraction to join me in contacting their Lithuanian leaders in an effort to solve this problem.

Two years ago in a speech I gave right here on this floor, I remarked that it was once written that: "The greatest glory of a free-born people is to transmit that freedom to their children." For those who were born free in Lithuania and then forced under Soviet control, this dream has finally come true. From now on, every free and independent Lithuanian citizen will be able to give the gifts of freedom, choice, and self-determination to his or her children. A nation cannot ask for a more basic right.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the proud and persevering people of Lithuania.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have joined with my colleagues each February to commemorate Lithuanian Independence Day. In the past, this event has dramatized our support for those Lithuanians who longed to cast off the yoke of Soviet totalitarianism.

We now may look upon these earlier meetings and say, "What a difference a year makes."

Lithuania today is free and her people have begun a noble effort to rebuild their homeland after nearly 50 years of Soviet exploitation. The challenges the Lithuanians face are enormous, but the task before them is a labor of love because the people are now in control of their own destiny.

I must confess that at the height of the cold war, there were times when I wondered if we would ever see the return of freedom to Lithuanian. I am now delighted to note that Soviet rule in Lithuania collapsed last August following the attempted coup against the central government.

You will recall, however, Mr. Speaker, that just 1 year ago Members of this Congress were grappling with a desperate situation in

Lithuania. Soviet tanks were stationed throughout the country, and storm troopers in black berets were wreaking havoc on innocent people. At least 14 people died in Lithuania during peaceful protests in January 1991, and the threat of renewed bloodshed hung over the country like a pall.

Today, the Lithuanians have begun the task of consolidating their democratic gains by making plans for a new constitution. We must never forget the sacrifices that made this possible. And as Lithuania makes progress in areas ranging from international trade to competition in Olympic sports, it is fitting for us to pay tribute to those heroes who helped restore Lithuania's freedom.

As supporters of Lithuania's drive for independence, the United States has an obligation to nurture Lithuanian democracy and to assist in her economic reconstruction. Lithuania needs American logistical and technical help so she can begin revitalizing her economy. And to survive a difficult winter, Lithuania needs expanded shipments of food and medicines from the United States. American industries can help by expanding trade links with Lithuania. The country has a well-educated work force that is eager for joint ventures with U.S. firms.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America stood by Lithuania throughout her long struggle against totalitarianism. Now we must recommit ourselves to helping her establish democracy. A half-hearted effort would dishonor the memory of those who risked all during Lithuania's struggle for freedom.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congressman RUSSO for organizing this special order to congratulate the courageous people of Lithuania on achieving true independence.

On February 16, 1918, Lithuanian delegates proclaimed their independence. For a full generation, Lithuanians enjoyed freedom and independence. When the Red Army occupied the Baltic States in 1940, we refused to recognize their incorporation into the Soviet Union. The Soviet annexation of the Baltic States—the result of a cynical deal between Stalin and Hitler—was enforced with mass arrests, deportations, and executions. The Lithuanian people resisted courageously. Just a little over a year ago tanks rolled into Vilnius and Soviet paratroopers killed and wounded brave Lithuanians who were guarding their parliament.

But the Lithuanian people didn't give up; and the Lithuanian people's movement, Sajudis, continued onward with their non-violent campaign for democracy and independence, despite an economic blockade and armed assaults on their border posts.

For more than 50 years, Congress remained united in our support for Lithuania's right to self-determination and in our opposition to Soviet occupation. Today, we congratulate them as they celebrate their independence day.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, for over half a century, Lithuanian Independence Day was a day to gather together to gain strength in the face of sadness and adversity as Lithuanians struggled to cope with the Soviet occupation of their homeland. Today, Lithuanian Independence Day is a time for celebration, for finally Lithuania is free from the yoke of Soviet oppression—free to pursue its own destiny. At

long last, its people are free to live under their own government, their own laws, and their own religion. In 1992, Lithuanian Independence Day is truly a time to rejoice.

The history of the Lithuanian people is marked by a struggle against oppression. Lithuania was an independent state for over 500 years, from 1251–1795. In 1795, Lithuania was conquered by the czar of Russia. Having developed a deep cultural and political identity which could not easily be crushed, Lithuanians struggled for over a century for independence, mounting repeated rebellions against the Russians. They finally succeeded in overthrowing Russian rule on February 16, 1918, and temporarily won their freedom. That day, a council of Lithuanian leaders proclaimed their country's independence—temporarily freeing themselves from oppressive Russian rule. After their victory, the February 16 has been set aside as the day to commemorate Lithuania's national and cultural identity.

However, there were to be dark times ahead for Lithuania. As a people they would mourn, instead of celebrate on February 16. On August 3, 1940, the U.S.S.R. technically incorporated Lithuania into its union, and so began another period of pain and subjugation. Lithuanians were to suffer under the Soviet dictatorship for almost another 50 years, deprived of freedoms of religion and speech, and their basic human rights. In March 1990, Lithuania became the first of the Baltic Republics to declare independence.

To remember their heroic struggle, many people of Lithuanian descent attended a special mass in my district on February 16. This mass, in honor of Lithuanian Independence Day, was conducted in the Lithuanian language by Reverend Monsignor Dominic Pocus at the Our Lady of Sorrows Lithuanian Roman Catholic Church in Kearny, NJ. At the service, a wreath was placed at the church's wayside cross. Erected approximately 30 years ago, this cross is a full-sized, about 30 feet tall, hand-carved replica of the crosses used in Lithuania to mark prayer sites along roadways.

After the laying of the wreath, a celebration was held at the Kearny town hall park where the Lithuanian flag was raised, and the Lithuanian national anthem was sung. In addition to celebrations like this which were held all over the country, on February 23, Lithuanian-Americans from New Jersey will hold an independence day celebration at the Lithuanian Catholic community club, also in Kearny, NJ.

I would like to join together with my distinguished colleagues and Lithuanians all over the world in celebrating Lithuanian Independence Day. This year, all Lithuanians will celebrate their independence and freedom. Lithuanians will also face many challenges in rebuilding their country's economy and seeing that Soviet military forces are properly and quickly removed from their territory. However, knowing of the many struggles they have overcome throughout their history, I am confident that Lithuanians will succeed in their efforts to build a strong, vibrant country. As one would say in Lithuanian, I wish them *sviekas* or best wishes on the glorious road they will travel ahead.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take the opportunity of today's special order

commemorating Lithuanian Independence Day to note the dramatic positive turn of events that has taken place in that nation over the course of the last year.

One year ago, Mr. Speaker, those of us who take an interest in the affairs of Lithuania were expressing our grave concern about developments that were occurring there, the most egregious of these being the use of Soviet Interior Ministry troops—the so-called Black Berets—to suppress the newly resurgent democratic movement in Lithuania. With a deep sense of outrage, we condemned the repressive actions of Soviet hardliners who sought to reimpose Stalinist rule in the wake of the first truly democratic elections in Lithuania in 50 years.

What a remarkable series of events has unfolded since that time. The Soviet Union, its Communist Party, and the corrupt and cruel security apparatus that was their underpinning, utterly collapsed—though not before a venal group of conspirators sought to turn back the clock and reimpose the rule of the gun one last time. Lithuanians, who clashed with Soviet central authorities over holding a national referendum on independence just last February, suddenly found themselves free from the clutches of Soviet power when, 8 months later, the Soviet State Council had no choice but to face reality and recognize Baltic independence.

Today, Lithuania is a vibrant parliamentary democracy, committed to a market economy and the strictest respect for human rights. Freedom of speech, the press, assembly, association, and religion have been guaranteed. Under the leadership of Vytautas Landsbergis, the courageous and able statesman who presides over the affairs of his nation, Lithuania has been rightfully restored to its place as a full participant in the family of nations.

Though the proud people of Lithuania have succeeded in reasserting their independence, much remains to be done there. The former Soviet-orchestrated command economy has left Lithuania, like the other former Soviet republics, in economic tatters. Lithuania is in better economic condition than most of the other ex-Soviet Republics, but that is not saying much.

Along these lines, I am pleased to note that President Bush has taken steps to assist Lithuania in its efforts to get back on its feet and assume its proper place in the world. He has established a Peace Corps Program in the Baltic States, and has granted them most-favored-nation trading status. He has also provided United States technical, medical, and other humanitarian assistance for Lithuania and has called for making Lithuania eligible for further assistance under the Support for East European Democracy [SEED] Program.

More can and will be done in the future. I am confident that the Congress will support continued efforts to assist Lithuania. Not the least of these efforts should be a renewed commitment to see all remaining Red army troops withdrawn from Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, it is just and fitting, given the historic events of 1991, that we now pay tribute to those brave Lithuanians who refused to back away from the many grave challenges posed by the former Soviet regime—including

those Lithuanian heroes who paid the supreme sacrifice in seeking to make their nation free.

I would be remiss, however, if in closing I did not also mention the many Lithuanian-Americans who worked diligently for many years to keep the attention of this nation and the world's other democracies focused on Lithuania's plight. They refused to give in even in the darkest times, and their good work kept the flame of hope burning brightly for millions of their brothers and sisters in Lithuania. They, too, deserve great credit for the happy and wondrous outcome that has occurred in their ancestral homeland.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the rebirth of Lithuanian independence, and to congratulate the people of Lithuania for their brave efforts toward self-determination.

Each year in February, a contingent of Lithuanian-Americans meet in front of city hall in Lowell, MA, to raise the yellow, green, and red colors of their homeland's flag to honor the Republic's Declaration of Independence in 1918. This year marks the 74th anniversary of that declaration and the 1st anniversary of Lithuania's newly found freedom in the post-Soviet era. Last Sunday, the Lithuanians in Lowell marked this important event by once again raising the Lithuanian flag in front of city hall.

In February 1918, the modern Republic of Lithuania was born, complete with a peace treaty and a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union. From 1939, until late last year, Lithuania has been occupied by outside forces, from the Nazis to the Soviets. In March 1990, the Lithuanian Parliament declared the reestablishment of its independence, and this was bolstered by 90.5 percent of Lithuania's voters last February.

A year ago at this time, Soviet black beret forces in Lithuania and Latvia left over a dozen civilians dead. At that time, Lithuania was under a state of siege: Concrete barricades protected the parliament buildings; tanks were pointed at publishing houses and television stations; and the leaders and people of that fragile democracy were desperately seeking help from the West. We all shared the hopes of the people of Lithuania for freedom and independence. We passed resolutions and wrote letters in support of Lithuania's freedom. But who among us would have guessed that a year later, we would be seeing the Lithuanians participating under their own flag in the Olympic games?

Lithuania, along with the neighboring Baltic States of Estonia and Latvia, now faces the tremendous task of restoring itself from five decades of Soviet dominance. Lithuania must now work to restore its economy and its environment. And we in the West will quite rightfully continue to follow through with our promise to support democracy by providing the necessary technical assistance to the Baltic Republics.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania proves that a proud and determined people can end foreign domination. Last year at this time, Vilnius was under virtual siege. Soviet forces occupied the television station, and killed many civilians in the process. An economic blockade cut off almost all of Lithuania's

imported energy and raw materials, and a number of factories were forced to close. It appeared to be only a matter of time before Soviet troops moved against the Parliament building and overthrew the Government of President Landsbergis.

However, Lithuania still refused to submit. Despite constant Soviet economic and military pressure, Lithuania continued to defy Moscow and to demand her right to rejoin the free world.

Today, we see the results of Lithuania's courage. The Soviet Union is gone, and the Republic of Lithuania has regained its historic independence. It is recognized internationally, and it is a member of the United Nations. Foreign troops are rapidly leaving the Republic, and both an American Embassy and a Russian Embassy have opened in Vilnius.

As a consistent supporter of Lithuania, I am proud to join my colleagues today in saluting the first Lithuanian Independence Day since the end of the Soviet occupation.

Lithuania has a proud heritage dating back over 1,000 years. At one time, she was the predominant power in the Baltic region, but lost her freedom after being defeated in a series of wars with Russia and Sweden. Despite brutal repressions, the Russian Empire's attempts to stamp out Lithuania's language and culture failed.

On February 20, 1918, the renewed Republic of Lithuania was proclaimed. Unfortunately, that independence only lasted 22 years, because on August 3, 1940, Soviet troops again crushed Lithuania's freedom and renewed her subjugation to Moscow.

In the next few years, scores of Lithuanian patriots were summarily executed, and thousands of her citizens disappeared into a Siberian exile from which few ever returned. Stalin again tried to eliminate the Lithuanian language and replaced the exiled Lithuanians with thousands of Russian colonists.

However, this effort failed, and the Republic of Lithuania proclaimed its resumed independence on March 11, 1990. Despite the best efforts of the Soviet Union, the Lithuanian people's will to be free could not be crushed by economic boycotts or military threats.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is not a gift. It must be earned and constantly defended. The people of Lithuania have worked, and suffered, and died for the rights that many of us in the United States take for granted.

Lithuania reminds us that freedom is the most precious possession of any nation, and is worth whatever sacrifices are necessary. I am proud to salute the Lithuanian people on their Independence Day, and to pledge my continued support to the free and independent Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Illinois, the Honorable MARTY RUSSO, for taking time today to focus on Lithuanian independence.

For those of us who have participated in these special orders in past years, we are acutely aware of the difference in this year's tone.

Today, there is no more Soviet Union. There is a Commonwealth of Independent States which is totally absorbed with resolving its own internal framework.

It is difficult to believe the scope of things which have happened inside the Soviet Union in less than a year. Last year Lithuanians went to the polls and voted overwhelmingly for freedom as an independent and democratic state. Within a few months of those elections, Congress was pushing the administration to formally recognize Lithuania. By early September, the President had, indeed, extended full diplomatic recognition to the Lithuanian Government.

The people of the former Soviet Republics are now negotiating with other governments on an equal footing and have successfully taken their place in the international community as a free society.

It is a great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to be able to stand here today and see that the fruits of our labors have been rewarded. The persistence and dedication of Lithuanians to be free will certainly be a beacon of hope to those nations still enjoined in their struggle.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the thousands of Lithuanian descendants in my district to recognize Lithuanian Independence Day.

Since I came to Congress nearly 12 years ago, our annual plea for Lithuanian independence has fallen on deaf ears. Now, however, our cries have paid off. The events of the past year in the former Soviet Union have led to the crumble of communism and dictatorial rule in the Baltics. I am proud that this year, unlike years past, we can truly proclaim that Lithuania is free.

For more than 45 years, Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet bloc. The hardships and religious persecution that plagued the people of Lithuania were unmeasurable. Lithuania, however, was never a stranger to repression. In 1795, Lithuania was annexed by Russia and came under complete Russian domination. While World War I took a great toll on Lithuania, independence was proclaimed on February 16, 1918. Independence, however, was short lived. In January 1919, the Red Army entered Lithuania and installed a Communist government. Independence was soon settled with Moscow but Lithuania again fell to Soviet occupation in 1944.

The United States has always recognized Lithuanian independence and has supported efforts to restore basic human rights in that area. As we celebrate a genuine Lithuanian Independence Day here in the House of Representatives, let us remember those who gave their lives in the name of freedom. In addition, it is paramount that we continue to unequivocally support the free Government in Lithuania. Maintaining stability and credibility will be an enormous task for the Lithuanian Government over the next several years. Lithuania must always know that they have a trusted friend in the United States, a friend who will continue to assist them in their striving for democracy.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1918—74 years ago—Lithuania declared its independence from Russia—which had ruled Lithuania since 1795—and from Germany—which had occupied Lithuania during World War II. Though that date has remained in the hearts of the Lithuanian people as the anniversary of their country's independence, sadly, that moment of triumph was not in reality long lived.

For 22 years, Lithuania clung to its sovereignty, through surely without a sense of security and permanence. For its neighbors, Lithuania was a territory with strategic value and economic assets, not a budding democracy with a long, proud, and distinct cultural heritage. It was a pawn that could be used for geopolitical bartering, not a homeland to its people.

After retaking Lithuania in 1944, Moscow sovietized Lithuania's economy by nationalizing industry and imposing collectivization on the agricultural sector. It banned Lithuanian religious traditions and substituted Russian for Lithuanian in classrooms and as the official language of the state. It administered governmental operations from the Kremlin and outlawed all political organizations except the Communist Party.

In spite of this, the Lithuanian spirit, culture, language, and—most important—hope for independence survived. As a result, when the political climate afforded an opportunity in March 1990, Lithuania declared full independence from the Soviet Union.

As before in its history, however, independence was not simply there for the taking, and well over a year of uncertainty passed before the Soviet Union recognized Lithuania as a sovereign state.

Their sovereignty is now secure, but the years ahead will be difficult for the people of Lithuania. This time, however, their struggle will not be in fending off those who would eradicate what we value. Rather, it is the struggle that so often accompanies the birth of a democracy. It is the struggle to rebuild political institutions and economic systems and to bring to the citizens the privileges and responsibilities of freedom.

I am sure all of my colleagues join me in wishing the people of Lithuania peace, prosperity, and liberty, and in pledging to do all that we can to ensure that this is what their future holds.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lithuania on the recent celebration of its independence. The Lithuanian people have struggled for their right to freedom and self-determination for much of this century, despite the hardships of imposed Communist dictatorship and the repression of their culture. The Lithuanians' impressive, non-violent resistance against foreign rule makes their independence especially significant to Americans. Czechoslovakia may have had a velvet revolution, but Lithuania had a singing revolution.

On February 16, 1918—nearly 75 years ago—200 Lithuanian delegates first declared that their country was independent and that their Government would be based upon democratic ideals. It is for this reason that February 16 is considered to be Lithuania's true Independence Day.

In 1939, the now infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact marked the beginning of foreign rule in Lithuania a short 21 years after their declaration of independence. The people of Lithuania were subjected to 51 years of oppression and suffering under the former Soviet regime.

Despite the power of the former Soviet Union, the Lithuanians courageously resisted Communist dictatorship by mobilizing and

forming Sajudis, a nonviolent movement for social and political change. Through citizen action, Sajudis promoted a peaceful transition to independence and democracy by participating in the first democratic election in Lithuania in over 50 years on February 24, 1990. The Lithuanian people, declaring the restoration of Lithuania's independence and the establishment of a democratic state on March 11, 1990.

For over 17 months, the Lithuanians persevered in the building of a democratic government under conditions of economic blockade and armed assault. In January 1991, the Lithuanians withstood a bloody assault by Soviet troops that brought worldwide attention to their plight.

Mr. Speaker, the tenacity in their fight for freedom of the Lithuanian people under these severe circumstances is worthy of great praise, and I am proud to extend my sincere congratulations to the people of Lithuania as they celebrate their renewed and hard-won independence.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in a tribute to Lithuanian Independence Day, February 16, 1992.

I join today with Lithuanians who have regained their freedom after years of foreign domination and suppression, and with my many Lithuanian-American friends residing in my district, in the State of New Jersey, and in the United States, and with all Americans in saluting Lithuania on its successful, but painful efforts in achieving independence and freedom.

On March 11, 1991, the former Soviet Republic of Lithuania, located on the shore of the Baltic Sea, declared its independence from what was then the Soviet Union. With the tidal wave of democracy that swept across Eastern Europe, Lithuania's declaration of independence was by no means startling. It was quite natural that they should have wished to free themselves from the dark days of Communist government and Soviet bloc oppression and to take pride in their freedom and national identity. Since then, and following Soviet persecution and killing of Lithuanian citizens, Lithuania has achieved independence, is recognized as a free state, and the Soviet Union is no more.

Mr. Speaker, the successful drive for Lithuanian independence reminds one of America's efforts to free itself from British colonial rule in the 18th century. Americans were discriminated and persecuted by the British then, as the Lithuanians were suppressed by first the Nazis and then the Soviets. The colonies rose up in revolt against the British, as the Lithuanians did against the Soviets. The Communists put trade and other restrictions against the Lithuanians, as the British did against the settlers of colonial America. The American people fought to win their independence, as the Lithuanians have. Indeed, the thoughts of freedom and equality expressed in the American Declaration of Independence have inspired the Lithuanians in their half a century long quest for independence.

In closing, I wish to congratulate Lithuania and the Lithuanians on their Independence Day, and to endorse their successful efforts of having once again made Lithuania a free and independent country.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in extending my congratu-

lations to a country that is commemorating the 74th anniversary of independence, Lithuania. I have celebrated this anniversary with Lithuanian-Americans across the country for more than a decade, but today I do so with a new found joy, for today we are no longer celebrating an independence that was but one that is again.

After 51 long years of Soviet repression, Lithuania and her Baltic sisters, Latvia and Estonia, stand free again. They are the victors of a long but peaceful battle against a brutal communist regime. They are truly a model to all who seek freedom and democracy.

And yet, sadly, this celebration is marred by continuing memories of the Soviet occupation, for even today, Lithuanians hear the footsteps of troops from the former Soviet Union marching across their soil. Estimates of the number of these troops reach well into the tens of thousands. While many of the troops are recent arrivals from former bases in what was East Germany, the fact is clear that they are trespassing on foreign soil in blatant violation of Lithuania's newly won sovereignty.

As the United States seeks to forge new relations with the Russian Federation and the Commonwealth of Independent States, we have insisted on the dismantling of the former Soviet military machine, respect for human rights everywhere and the development of democratic reforms. Evidence of a commitment to these goals can only be demonstrated by the immediate withdrawal of troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Today, I congratulate Lithuania on the realization of an independence that has been celebrated for over 70 years, but tomorrow I will continue to press for the removal of the last remaining vestiges of Soviet repression.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker—

One Saturday afternoon—it was June 1940—we were going for a walk down the main street of Kovno when suddenly we heard loud noises. From all sides there appeared military tanks. They came across the two bridges over the rivers, they were moving fast. They were closed so we couldn't see anyone. We thought the Germans were coming. We didn't know what was happening.

We knew, from the newspapers and radio, that the Germans were trying to take over all of Europe. They had taken Poland, France, everybody, so we thought these were the Germans. Right away panic started. People were running into their homes to hide, especially the Jewish population, because we had heard, we knew, what they were doing in other countries—they were coming in and sending Jews to ghettos, to concentration camps. We thought that if they were coming, that was what they were going to do with us, too. After all, we Lithuanian Jews were no better than any other Jewish population. But as the tanks slowed down and we looked more carefully out our windows, we saw the red stars and knew these were not the Germans but the Russians.

This account of the Russian invasion of Lithuania was written by Harry Gordon in his book "The Shadow of Death, the Holocaust in Lithuania." Harry spent his childhood in Kovno, Lithuania and emigrated to the United States in 1949. He currently resides in Madison, WI, a city at the heart of my congressional district. His book describes his life in prewar Kovno, the Russian invasion, and his experience as a Lithuanian Jew during WWII. It is because of

the strength of Lithuanians like Harry Gordon that that nation is once again free.

I am pleased to take this opportunity to commemorate the rebirth of Lithuanian independence. My Wisconsin congressional district has a proud Lithuanian heritage and today I would like to honor the Lithuanian people and their relatives in the United States who have made independence possible. The people of Lithuania have regained their right to self-determination after more than 50 years of Soviet domination and have done this in a remarkably peaceful manner. They deserve our acclamations and congratulations for their resolve.

Now that Lithuania has assumed its rightful place as an independent nation, it will be important to assist in developing the country's economy and culture. Programs such as the Sister City Relationship that was established between Vilnius, Lithuania and Madison, WI will be instrumental in providing assistance and promoting development in that country. Since the program began in 1988, over 250 Lithuanians have come to Madison to participate in cultural events and take advantage of the resources provided by the University of Wisconsin [UW]. In the spring of 1991, I met with a dozen Lithuanian journalists to talk about the things we could do in Congress to guarantee freedom of speech in the then-occupied country. More than 100 residents of Wisconsin have gone to Lithuania to provide assistance with development projects. Professors from the UW lecture at the University of Vilnius and future trips will center on agriculture and construction.

On behalf of all of the residents of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District, I would once again like to extend congratulations and best wishes to the people of the free and independent nation of Lithuania.

□ 1630

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

GIVE AMERICAN CHILDREN ACCURATE INFORMATION ON AIDS RISK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of subjects I would like to talk to my colleagues about tonight. I hope they are paying attention to some of these things. I think they are very important.

Today on the front page of the Washington Times there is an article that says, "HIV Or Aids Scare Wracks Small Town in Texas." It says:

There is big trouble in Paradise, in the small Texas towns east of Dallas that have traditionally been a refuge from the drugs, gangs, and gunfire of Dallas. A report last week from tiny Bogota, about 40 miles southwest of where Arkansas, Oklahoma and Texas meet, disclosed that six of the students, high school students, in the 197-member Rivercrest High School had tested positive for HIV, which causes AIDS.

That is 6 out of 197.

The article goes on to say,

Susan Tabb, president of Rivercrest High School's Drug-Free Youth in Texas Club, said, "Everyone is scared to death. I can't believe it has happened here," she said. "This is really touchy when it comes to dating."

Roy Truley, of Texas, a Greenville truck driver who stopped for coffee at the Amadillo Store in Bogota yesterday, reflected matter-of-factly on the new reality in paradise. He says, "All this does is tell the world the AIDS problem is everywhere. We can't run away from it forever."

The reason I bring this to the attention of my colleagues is, we continue to get misinformation about the AIDS pandemic. Young people in high school and even grade school are told that condoms are a panacea for the AIDS virus. They are told that there is such a thing as safe sex. That is an out-and-out lie. There is no such thing as safe sex, outside of a monogamous relationship; none, zero, zip.

You do cut down your risk. It is like playing Russian roulette with a couple of fewer bullets in the gun, but the fact of the matter is there is still risk in having sex outside of a monogamous relationship or marriage. Young people need to know that.

I am going to introduce legislation that will put a warning on condoms saying, "This is not 100 percent safe. There are risks involved." Young people need to know that.

The other thing is, the CDC has continually told the American people we only have a million and a half people infected. They said that 5 years ago, they said it 4 years ago, they said it 3 years ago, they said it 2 years ago, they said it last year, and before that they told us it was doubling every year to 18 months.

I have talked to scientists in this country who believe we have 4 to 6 million infected. I personally believe that is the figure, but we don't know for sure because the only way you can find out if somebody is infected with AIDS or HIV is to be tested, so probably 98 percent of the people in the country that are infected with AIDS don't even know it, so they are going on continually participating in activities that may have gotten them infected in the first place, and they are going to be infecting others in the future because they don't even know they have it.

The CDC said that we probably have a million and a half infected, and that the epidemic has leveled off. There is no problem any more.

Well, the fact of the matter is, they told us we would have about 200,000

people dead or dying by last year. We projected there would be 250,000 dead or dying by the end of last year, and when they reevaluated their position, the Center for Disease Control in Atlanta, they came up with a new formula that said, "No, we don't have 200,000 or 250,000, we have 300,000 plus that are dead or dying of the AIDS virus." So we are ahead of the projections that we made about 3 years ago on the AIDS virus by leading scientists and people who are using computers to draw graphs to show where we are going.

I believe, according to our statistical data, that we will have 1 million people or more dead or dying by 1996 or 1997 in this country, and the big problem is the people who are going to be hit the hardest in the years to come are the young people who are sexually active today, who are getting misinformation from the Centers for Disease Control and our health agencies.

Most of the universities, and one in my district, Ball State University, did a survey. They found that 80 percent of the college students at that university were sexually active, even though they know of the AIDS pandemic and the HIV problems. I presume that is true of probably every major university in the country, and it is true in high schools. A high percentage of our young people are ignoring the dangers and going on being sexually active.

We are not giving them the right message. We are saying, "Use condoms. That is safe sex." That is not the answer. They have to know that there is risk no matter what you do outside of a monogamous relationship. That has to be driven home very, very clearly.

Here we have, in a very small town in Texas, not a metropolitan area, this is a town 40 miles outside Dallas, and they don't have a high crime rate, they don't have a high drug rate, they don't have gang wars, and they have 6 students out of 197 in the high school who are infected with AIDS. That is a pretty high percentage.

Here in Washington, DC, we just found out that there was a 300-percent increase in the number of teenagers that were infected. It went from, I think, three-tenths or four-tenths of 1 to 1½ percent of the teenage population was infected in Washington, DC, in a 4-year period. That is a 300-percent increase, a 400-percent increase. Yet we don't hear anything about it.

Those young people are the future of America. The future of this country are the young people in high school and grade school and college today. If we have a large percentage of them dying of AIDS in the next decade or two decades, we are going to have a terrible problem not only economically but healthwise in dealing with the health care problems.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] was down here just a few minutes ago talking about the health care

problems we have in this Nation. We have 1.3 million hospital beds, and if our projections are right and we have over 1 million people dead or dying of AIDS by the late 1990's, the mid to late 1990's, where are you going to put all those people? What is that going to do to health care costs? For each person who gets active AIDS, it costs \$90,000 to \$120,000. Put a pencil to 1 million people at \$100,000 apiece and see what this does to our health care delivery in this country. You ain't seen nothing yet.

Yet CDC continues to say, "There is no big problem. We only have a million and a half infected," which is what they said 5 years ago. They have their head in the sand. They have also been sending out other information that I think is highly questionable.

I called Italy not long ago because I read an article in the paper where two soccer players ran into each other, and one was infected with AIDS and they butted heads and the blood was exchanged, and they both died of AIDS. Our NCAA and our Olympic Committee says there is no danger from people colliding and getting AIDS, it is a very small risk. So I called Italy and I talked to the doctor in question. He says, "There is no question that the person who was uninfected was infected during the collision in this athletic event."

I don't know how many people watch boxing, but I have yet to see a boxing match where blood does not go everywhere. These people are beating each other to death, and if one of those participants has the AIDS virus and he hits somebody else and that blood exchanges, there is a definite risk factor.

In basketball, Isaiah Thomas was elbowed in the head and had to take 40 stitches, and there was blood all over the place not long ago, and you folks know that. You see that in professional athletics, especially in contact sports.

In ice hockey the other day in the Olympics the Swedish player, Sweden's player, high-sticked one of our guys, and there was 40-some stitches in his face. If you looked at that, there was blood all over that ice and everybody had their hands in it. I want to tell you if any one of those people had the AIDS virus and there was an open cut on somebody's hand that was working with them, they are at risk, real risk.

For the NCAA and the Olympic Committee to say, and our professional athletes to say that there is no danger of transmission from contact is just dead wrong. There is a risk. That is why I have said that we need in contact sports, where there is an exchange of blood possible, to have testing so that the people who have the AIDS virus will take precautions and not give it to other people.

I am a great admirer of Magic Johnson. I think his position, the position he has taken in telling people about

AIDS, telling young people that the best thing to do is to abstain, but if you are going to have sex, use condoms, and so forth, he is sending the right message by saying "abstain."

□ 1640

But when they were talking about him playing in the All-Star Game, and he was the most valuable player, and I applaud him for that, when they talked about him playing in the All-Star Game they said there was no danger of any communication of the AIDS virus. If he had hit Isaiah Thomas or some other player with his elbow and there were stitches and there was an exchange of blood, there would have been a risk. There is no question about that.

Young people need to know the facts. We need an education program to deal with this problem, particularly where the future of this country is concerned. Young people need to know all the facts, and we need to know the facts in athletics and so on and so forth.

I believe that 97 or 98 percent of the people infected with AIDS do not even know it. I believe there are 4 million or 5 million of them. I believe that the AIDS virus is continuing to spread in a very rapid way, particularly among the young people in this country.

That is borne out when you find that 6 out of 197 kids in a small town high school in a real rural area of Texas get the virus. There is a problem. That is why I say again today to my colleagues, and this is not why I came down here tonight, but I say to my colleagues we need a comprehensive program to deal with AIDS, not some head in the sand approach like we have been taking.

We need education, of course. We need more scientific research, of course. We need to have penalties for people who know they have AIDS and continue to go out and spread it, and there are people like that.

There needs to be psychological help for those who have AIDS, because it is a terrible thing to cope with. We need to protect the civil rights and health benefits and housing rights of people with AIDS so they are not a pariah, are not outcasts like lepers in the old days.

Finally, we need testing. We need a routine testing program in this country so we know where the problem is. If we had a routine testing program, we could find out within a year how bad it is, where it is spreading the fastest, how rapidly it is spreading, who is spreading it, what portion of our population is most at risk. I think it is teenagers and college kids, people in their young formative years. Then we would be able to grasp this problem and deal with it. Right now we are not.

One of the problems that was brought out in this article is they were criticizing the lady who pointed out there were 6 people who had AIDS in this high school out of 197 students. One of

the authorities down there said that is the kind of information you are not supposed to give out.

We cannot even tell those kids' parents they have AIDS if they are over 14 years old. Now, that about that. In some parts of the country if a husband has AIDS and he goes to the doctor, and California is one of those States, and the doctor tells his wife that he has AIDS, that doctor is guilty of a crime.

Yet if there is another venereal disease in that community and it is reported to that doctor, that doctor must report syphilis, gonorrhea, or some other disease, to all the health agencies in the State.

If you have AIDS, which is lethal, you cannot even tell the guy's wife he has it without their being a criminal penalty.

We have stood this whole epidemic on its head. This is a pandemic that we have never faced in the annals of world history. It is going to take 10 million people's lives they estimate in the next 5 to 10 years around the world. Ten million in the next decade.

We have to come to grips with it. We need a comprehensive program to deal with it. This small town is one manifestation of the problem.

I submit to all my colleagues in the days and weeks and months to come, in the next 5 or 6 years, you are going to see a lot of young kids coming down with AIDS in areas where you would never have believed it possible. There probably will be very few families in this country that will be untouched by the AIDS virus.

For every person who catches the AIDS virus we know they have it, there are tens or hundreds of others that are infected that we do not know about. They do not know they have it and they continue to spread it in an exponential manner, in my opinion.

So we need to find out where it is spreading and how and so forth. That means we need a routine testing program as the cornerstone, coupled with education, scientific research, and all of the other things I have talked about.

I cannot think of anything that is more important than this. We are talking not just about people of my generation, people older than me, or a little younger than me, but we are talking about the future of America and the world.

We are the leaders in this world in the area of defense, economics, and health care and so forth. One thing we must do is address the most critical problem facing us in the health care area, and that is AIDS.

It is the most critical area because it is insidious. You do not know who has it. We see the top of the iceberg, this high, and underneath it there is a huge amount that you cannot see. That is what AIDS is and we have to deal with it and deal with it in a comprehensive way.

I want to talk about one other thing real quickly. My colleagues who were going to come down here and talk with me about some of the economic problems facing the country are not able to be here so I will not get into a lengthy discussion about that.

I want to talk about health care, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] talked about a few moments ago.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] and most of the Democrat majority are supporting one of two plans in the area of health care. One of those is called pay or play.

Pay or play is a plan which has received a pretty good amount of popularity in this country. What it does is it allows or mandates that an employer provide health insurance for his employees or put 8 percent or some percentage of his payroll into a side fund to pay for a Government plan.

It sounds good. It sounds like a solution to our problem.

But the real problem is you are going to see discrimination against older employees. They are going to be opting for the younger employee who will not have the health problems or whose problems will be much less of a risk to the financial stability of the country.

I think you are going to see discrimination caused by that. I think you will ultimately end up with a socialized medicine type of approach which they have in Canada.

Socialized medicine is something I do not think the people of this country want. If you look at the Canadian plan, the other plan that many Democrats are supporting, national health care, this is a socialized medicine approach. There are all kinds of horror stories that people in this country ought to really study when they think about a socialized approach to medicine.

There are people up in Canada for by-passes, for kidney transplants, for other procedures, who go back week after week, month after month. They go into the hospital for 6 or 7 days, wait for 2 or 3 days, and keep going back home. Many of them die before they have the procedure.

You do not have that problem here, but we do have problems.

Now, one innovative idea that I would like to just touch on tonight, which I hope my colleagues will look at, is the plan which was originated by an insurance company in my district, the largest individual insuring company in the country. It insures individuals, not corporations, primarily. So they are the largest insurer of individual policy holders in the country.

They suggested this plan, and it was embraced by William Raspberry, one of the liberal columnists in this town, because he said it was a commonsense approach to solving the problem.

Most people in this country spend about \$4,500 a year or their company

pays \$4,500 a year for their health insurance. What happens is when people get a health insurance program that is comprehensive, they go out and, if they have a problem in their family, their kids have a bad cold or a cut finger or something, they go to the doctor because they have first dollar coverage.

There is no incentive for them not to go to the doctor because they have first dollar coverage. If it was their money they would evaluate whether or not they should really go to the doctor every time they have a problem like this.

So what Mr. Pat Rooney, the chairman of the board of this company, is suggesting is instead of paying \$4,500 for comprehensive health care, you start off with a \$3,000 deductible, for instance.

Now, that \$3,000 deductible is covered by \$3,000 of the premium. What you do is you say the first \$3,000 is the employee's concern, but we are going to put \$3,000 into an escrow account to cover that \$3,000 deductible every year.

Now, that is the employee's money. If his child or he gets sick and they go to the doctor, they take the money out of that escrow account to cover the deductible.

Let us say at the end of the year they have spent \$500 or \$1,000. The remainder of that money that is in that escrow account is in their pocket. They keep it. They pay taxes on it, but it is their money.

So there is an inducement for them to evaluate their health care provider and doctor and whether or not they ought to go to the doctor themselves. They are not going to go there for every little procedure, which is very costly.

The administrative costs for small claims is about 35 percent. That is what most health care insurers will tell you.

What you do is cut out a lot of the small claims and paperwork in the health insurance industry and give people the \$3,000 to cover their deductible. If they spent it for health care, they have the money to pay for that \$3,000 deductible. If they do not spend it, it is in their pocket at the end of the year.

□ 1650

I guarantee you, if people know that it is their money they are going to be careful how they spend that because they will know they have that at the end of the year. Then if you take the other \$1,500 of the \$4,500 and you buy a million dollar excess policy that will give you first dollar coverage above the \$3,000 all the way up to \$1 million, and you can do that for that amount of premium in most cases. You certainly can, if you evaluate this on a nationwide basis.

The Rooney plan that I am talking about, which we will be looking at in the weeks to come, if it is adopted na-

tionwide, would cut down those people who are uninsured right now down to about 7, or 8, or 9 million people. They would still be covered by Medicaid and Medicare, but the preponderance, the vast majority of the people of this country would have a plan that gives them coverage, better coverage than they have right now.

If they do not spend the money, they put it in their pocket, and they are covered up to \$1 million with an excess insurance policy over the \$3,000 deductible, which they can put in their pocket if they do not spend it at the end of the year.

That is one answer to the health care problem, but I do believe that it is a much preferable approach than the socialized medicine approach which they have in many countries in the world which has not worked.

If you think socialism works in any form, look at all of the Eastern European countries that were under this heel of communism. They all had socialistic systems, they had socialized medicine, government control over everything. And one can see, they are running as fast as they possible can away from socialism. And we in this country in a very critical area, health care, should not be running toward socialism.

Granted, we have health problems in this Nation, but the socialism approach is not the right one. We need to have quality health care. We have that in this country. We need to tinker with the system to get it corrected, and I think the Rooney approach is the right one. Make people responsible and accountable for the spending of their health care dollars, but I do not believe we need socialism.

I would like to say to my colleagues tonight, we need a comprehensive program to deal with AIDS. We need a realistic approach to solving our health care problems, and we can do it. All we have to do is get down to brass tacks and work together, and we can get this job done.

THE PHONY MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUT

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the American people to listen to the rhetoric that has been emanating from New Hampshire over the last several months, particularly to listen to one gentleman who is extraordinarily honest. And that is Paul Tsongas, the present Democrat front runner for the Presidential nomination.

Mr. Tsongas has looked honestly and candidly at the so-called package for economic growth and jobs that has been offered by the Democrat leader-

ship in the House of Representatives. What has he said about this package? Well, very simply, he said that he would veto that package, if in fact it was placed in front of him, and he was President of the United States.

I think that says 2 things. It says a lot about Mr. Tsongas' honesty, which obviously has appealed to the voters on the Democrat side in New Hampshire. But it also says a lot about this phony package that has come from the Democratic leadership.

At a time when unemployment is going up, when the American people are looking forward to leadership from both the President and the Congress and looking forward to a partnership being formed between Democrats and Republicans in working for a common goal, that is to pull us out of the recession, put people back to work, it is sad that we see on the Democrat side of the aisle not an attempt to work with the President of the United States but rather an attempt to make a political statement while pretending to work with him but make a political statement in offering up a package that is not realistic and that will not create jobs.

How sad that we tell the American people that jobs is our No. 1 issue and our No. 1 goal and then we, when I say "we," I am talking about the Democrat leadership and the members of the party that support that particular package, then offer up a package that their Presidential front runner says is so phony that he himself, the Democrat front runner for President, would veto.

If we look at the elements of that package, I think it is clear why Mr. Tsongas has been so honest and so candid with the American people.

We have this 1 percent cut in corporate taxes. That will have, according to the analysts that have studied this package, a trivial effect or a negligible effect with respect to stimulating the economy. It does not do anything good.

With respect to the so-called middle class tax cut, the \$300 or so per year that the Democrats would give to the American people, the middle class families, Mr. Tsongas said it very well. He said:

These people want a job. They don't want a 60 cents a day handout from the Democrat leadership. They want a job, and nothing in that middle class tax cut goes toward creating jobs in America.

Now, President Bush understands what it takes to create jobs. It takes motivating the people who have money. And we all have to acknowledge that blue collar workers cannot hire themselves. They cannot hire each other. But the people who have the investment capital in this country have to be motivated to turn loose that capital, to put it to work, to invest it, to create construction, to create manufacturing operations, to create jobs so

that American families can sit down around the breakfast table knowing that their breadwinner or breadwinners are employed, can look forward to employment, that their children can go to school, can look forward to a college education, that they can buy a house and a car and fulfill their part of the American dream.

Mr. Bush realizes this and that is why he put forward a package that had a capital gains tax cut. It is interesting that even the Democrats that have been trying to create this class war with the President for the last several years now acknowledge, yes, we do need to motivate investors in America to start the wheels of American industry turning to start those factories working, to start those construction projects by motivating people who have money, investors who have money and employers who have money to turn loose with that capital. And that is the package that the Republicans have offered.

It is an honest package, and it goes toward economic growth. And that is why the American people trusted a Republican President for the last 12 years or so, because they know that the Republican idea of creating growth and thereby creating jobs is a sound one. And this phony idea of creating a class war by putting together some phony so-called middle-class tax cuts is just what Mr. Tsongas called it, phony.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992-96

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending for fiscal year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

This is the third report of the 102d Congress for fiscal year 1992. This report is based on the aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 as contained in House Report 102-69, the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 121.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, entitlement author-

ity, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, February 18, 1992.
Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: To facilitate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, I am herewith transmitting the status report on the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending estimates for fiscal year 1992, under H. Con. Res. 121, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

The enclosed tables also compare enacted legislation to each committee's 602(a) allocation of discretionary new budget authority and new entitlement authority. The 602(a) allocations to House Committees made pursuant to H. Con. Res. 121 were printed in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the resolution (H. Report 102-69).

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1992 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF FEB. 14, 1992

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1992	Fiscal years 1992-96
Appropriate level:		
Budget authority	1,269,300	6,591,900
Outlays	1,201,600	6,134,100
Revenues	850,400	4,832,000
Current level:		
Budget authority	1,276,896	NA
Outlays	1,207,449	NA
Revenues	853,364	4,829,000
Current level: over (+)/under (-) appropriate level:		
Budget authority	+7,596	NA
Outlays	+5,849	NA
Revenues	+2,964	-3,000

Note.—NA—not applicable because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure that (1) provides new budget or entitlement authority for fiscal year 1992 that is not included in the current level estimate for that year, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure that (1) provides new budget or entitlement authority that is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal year 1992, and (2) increases outlays in fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate and exceeds \$2,964 million for fiscal year 1992, if adopted and en-

acted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121. Any measure that

would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate for fiscal years 1992 through 1996, if adopted

and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for those years as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1992		New entitlement authority	1992-96		New entitlement authority
	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	
House committee:						
Agriculture:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	3,720	3,540	4,716
Current level	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	(1)
Difference	-2	-2	-1	-3,719	-3,539	-4,716
Armed Services:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	-7	-7	0	-83	-83
Difference		-7	-7		-83	-83
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	28	28	0	177	177	0
Difference	+28	+28		+177	+177	
District of Columbia:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Education and Labor:						
Appropriate level	0	0	56	0	0	20,153
Current level	-46	-46	0	0	4	0
Difference	-46	-46	-56	0	+4	-20,153
Energy and Commerce:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Foreign Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Government Operations:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
House Administration:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Interior and Insular Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	-2	-2	0	5	5	0
Difference	-2	-2		+5	+5	
Judiciary:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	16	16	16
Difference				+16	+16	+16
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	(1)	0	0	(1)
Difference			(1)			(1)
Post Office and Civil Service:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Public Works and Transportation:						
Appropriate level	16,358	0	0	117,799	0	0
Current level	18,514	0	0	113,048	0	0
Difference	+2,156	0	0	-4,751	0	0
Science, Space, and Technology:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Small Business:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—Continued
(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1992		New entitlement authority	1992-96		New entitlement authority
	Budget authority	Outlays		Budget authority	Outlays	
Veterans' Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	484	0	0	6,811
Current level	0	5	378	0	19	2,182
Difference	0	+5	-106	0	+19	N4,629
Ways and Means:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	620
Current level	7,036	7,036	8,036	7,458	7,458	9,098
Difference	+7,036	+7,036	+8,036	+7,458	+7,458	+8,478
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)
Difference	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)	+(1)

¹ Less than \$500,000.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1992
(In millions of dollars)

	Revised 602(b) subdivisions		Latest current level		Difference	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary	21,070	20,714	21,029	20,708	-41	-6
Defense	270,244	275,222	269,860	275,038	-384	-184
District of Columbia	700	690	700	690	0	0
Energy and water development	21,875	20,770	21,875	20,720	0	-50
Foreign operations	15,285	13,556	14,262	13,200	-1023	-356
Interior	13,102	12,050	13,105	12,198	3	148
Labor, health and human services, and education	59,087	57,797	59,085	57,832	-2	35
Legislative	2,344	2,317	2,343	2,310	-1	-7
Military construction	8,564	8,482	8,563	8,433	-1	-49
Rural development, agriculture, and related agencies	12,299	11,226	12,299	11,223	0	-3
Transportation	13,765	31,800	13,762	31,799	-3	-1
Treasury-Postal Service	10,825	11,120	10,824	11,119	-1	-1
VA-HUD-independent agencies	63,953	61,714	63,942	61,711	-11	-3
Grand total	513,113	527,458	511,649	526,981	-1464	-477

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 18, 1992.
Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1992 in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1992 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 121). This report is tabulated as of close of business February 14, 1992 and is summarized as follows:

(In millions of dollars)

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level +/- resolution
Budget authority	1,276,896	1,269,300	+7,596
Outlays	1,207,449	1,201,600	+5,849
Revenues:			
1992	853,364	850,400	+2,964
1992-96	4,829,000	4,832,000	-3,000

Since my last report, dated January 22, 1992, the President has signed the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension (P.L. 102-244) and the Congress has cleared for the President's signature H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act. These actions changed the estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT 102D CONG., 2D
SESS., HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR
FISCAL YEAR 1992 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS FEB.
14, 1992

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			853,364
Permanents and other spending legislation	807,617	727,237	
Appropriation legislation	686,331	703,643	
Continuing resolution authority	13,992	5,454	
Mandatory adjustments ¹	(1,208)	950	
Offsetting receipts	(232,542)	(232,542)	
Total previously enacted	1,274,190	1,204,743	853,364
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Emergency unemployment compensation extension (Public Law 102-244)	2,706	2,706	
PENDING SIGNATURE			
American Technology Preeminence (H.R. 1989)			(²)
Total current level	1,276,896	1,207,449	853,364
Total budget resolution	1,269,300	1,201,600	850,400
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution	7,596	5,849	2,964
Under budget resolution			

¹ Adjustments required to conform with current law estimates for entitlements and other mandatory programs in the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 121).
² Less than \$500,000.

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. McCANDLESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. WALKER, for 60 minutes, on February 20.
- Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes each day, on February 25, 26, and 27.
- Mr. RIGGS, for 60 minutes each day, on February 25, 26, and 27.
- Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. McCOLLUM, for 5 minutes, on February 20.
- (The following Members (at the request of Mr. GLICKMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
- Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.
- Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 60 minutes each day, on February 20, 25, 26, and 27.
- Mr. WOLPE, for 60 minutes, on February 25.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BONIOR) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

- Mr. MORAN, for 5 minutes, today.
- (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, 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. MCCANDLESS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. DORNAN of California.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. IRELAND.
Mr. MILLER of Washington.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in seven instances.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.
Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. PACKARD.

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

Mr. LAFALCE.
Mr. VENTO.
Mr. YATRON.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mr. HAMILTON in two instances.
Mr. LEHMAN of California.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. ATKINS.
Mr. BROWN.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. GLICKMAN.
Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. MARTINEZ.
Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. PENNY.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. MORAN.
Mr. FAZIO.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 20, 1992, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2838. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 92-11, reporting that it is in the national interest for the Export-Import Bank to guarantee, insure, extend credit, and participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by, for use in, or for sale or lease to Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2839. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political con-

tributions of Marc Allen Baas, of Florida, to be Ambassador to Ethiopia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2840. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2841. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 1993 and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2152. A bill to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations international driftnet fishery conservation program; with amendments (Rept. 102-262, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey:

H.R. 4242. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to require a reasonable attorney's fee to be awarded to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as a prevailing party; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYDEN:

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for optional coverage under State Medicaid plans of case-management services for individuals who suffer traumatic brain injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. APPELATE (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. STUMP):

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase, effective as of December 1, 1992, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCOIN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.R. 4245. A bill to establish a national demonstration program providing increased flexibility for schools in order to promote improved educational achievement for all students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 4246. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the availability of individual retirement accounts, to increase amount deductible for contributions to such accounts, and to permit penalty-free withdrawals from such accounts to pay educational, medical, and business startup ex-

penses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4247. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on Acarbose and on Nimodipine granulated blend and tablets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4248. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspensions of duty on ciprofloxacin hydrochloride, ciprofloxacin, and nimodipine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4249. A bill to temporarily permit penalty-free withdrawals from individual retirement plans and section 401(k) plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 4250. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for two-earner married couples; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee:

H.R. 4252. A bill to provide for a 3-year extension of a certain Medicaid health maintenance organization waiver; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEREN of Texas:

H.R. 4253. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide waiver of late enrollment penalty and establishment of a special enrollment period under part B of the Medicare Program for certain military retirees and dependents living near military bases that are closed; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 4254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain employee productivity awards from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California (for himself, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WELDON, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 4255. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to further the protection of wetlands, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. WEBER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. CAMP, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BERUTER, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT):

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of Emergency Medical Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUCKABY (for himself and Mr. GLICKMAN):

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the operation of farm loan programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide for State management of solid waste; to reduce and regulate the interstate transportation of solid wastes; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4259. A bill to amend title I of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 to provide each individual with handicaps who is eligible for services under such title with the right to select the entities that are to provide services pursuant to the individualized written rehabilitation program developed for the individual; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 4260. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the maximum Pell grant and to improve determination of need for such grants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4261. A bill to establish a deficit reduction trust fund and a build America trust fund in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for increasing research activities, and to restore the investment tax credit for a temporary period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4263. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to conduct a study of a value added tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the State water pollution control revolving fund program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 4265. A bill to encourage the establishment of rural telecommunications zones; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

H.R. 4266. A bill to establish a National Trade Council, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Rules, Foreign Affairs, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4267. A bill to provide for an increase in the number of United States and foreign commercial services officers in certain countries for the purpose of promoting U.S. exports to those countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a partial exclusion of dividends and interest received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONTZ:

H.R. 4269. A bill relating to the congressional procedures that apply to any bill to implement a free-trade agreement between the United States and Mexico; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Rules.

By Mr. MORAN:

H.R. 4270. A bill to ensure that law enforcement officers and agencies are responsive to the public by establishing minimum standards designed to promote effective and responsible policing and to provide for the rights of law enforcement officers and citizens in alleged cases of police misconduct; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4271. A bill to reform the system under which compensation for overtime customs inspectional services is determined; to

amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that customs inspectors and canine enforcement officers be treated as law enforcement officers for purposes of those chapters; and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIDGE (for himself, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. PENNY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. KOLTER):

H.R. 4272. A bill to establish the Congressional Office of Inspector General; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SARPALIUS (for himself and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 4273. A bill to permit adequately capitalized banks and savings associations to branch interstate to the extent expressly authorized by State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain minimum tax preferences relating to energy production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a non-immigrant status for the spouses of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. STARK, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 4276. A bill to amend the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act to place certain limits on appropriations for projects not specifically authorized by law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOHLERT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SKEEN, and Mrs. UNSOELD):

H.J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to designate September 13, 1992, as "Commodore John Barry Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COUGHLIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.J. Res. 414. Joint resolution to honor, on the eve of the second drug summit, the hundreds of South Americans and North Americans who have lost their lives while defending their nations and the world community from the threat of drug trafficking and drug-related crime and violence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 415. Joint resolution designating July 4, 1992, through July 11, 1992, as "Buy American Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.J. Res. 416. Joint resolution designating March 2, 1992, through March 7, 1992, as "National Saleswoman Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WEISS (for himself, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. WATERS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, Ms.

NORTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. ROE):

H.J. Res. 417. Joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on February 14, 1992, as "National Condom Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE):

H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should work with the participants at the San Antonio summit toward stopping the trade in illicit drugs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution concerning human rights in the north of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TRAXLER):

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the importance of the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution encouraging employee achievement awards; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCGRATH (for himself, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LENT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. KOSTMAYER):

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of France should be strongly rebuked for allowing infamous Palestinian terrorist George Habash to enter and leave France unimpeded and without detaining him for questioning for several terrorist attacks; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIDGE (for himself, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. PETRI):

H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the low income home energy assistance program should be funded for fiscal year 1993 at a level greater than or equal to its funding for fiscal year 1992; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CLAY:

H. Res. 367. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the second session of the One Hundred Second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 368. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to require a three-fifths majority on passage of any bill, amendment, or conference report that increases revenues or the statutory limit on the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 369. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the second session of the One Hundred Second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIDGE (for himself, Mr. WALKER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. KOLBE):

H. Res. 370. Resolution to provide that postal services and operations with respect to the House of Representatives shall be carried out by employees of the U.S. Postal Service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSE:

H. Res. 371. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on House Administration in the second session of the One Hundred Second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Res. 372. Resolution urging the Government of Syria to resolve the issue of Israelis who are prisoners of war or missing in action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS:

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

H.R. 53: Mrs. MINK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCCOIN, and Mr. BERREUTER.

H.R. 187: Mr. BRUCE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 384: Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 394: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 413: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 520: Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 576: Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 755: Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 780: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 812: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WISE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ECKART, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. REED, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. LONG, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. SABO, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 858: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 911: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 918: Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 976: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1000: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1161: Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 1168: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1241: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1245: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.R. 1334: Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 1339: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1380: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 1435: Mr. ALLARD.

H.R. 1483: Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 1572: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1692: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1693: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1771: Mr. PARKER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 2338: Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 2363: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 2448: Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 2561: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2571: Mr. WASHINGTON and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2580: Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 2861: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 2872: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 2879: Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 2880: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 2906: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2945: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 3013: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 3132: Mr. IRELAND and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 3176: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3230: Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 3281: Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 3286: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 3425: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 3438: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3439: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3440: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3441: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3442: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3473: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 3509: Mr. COYNE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. TORRES, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BROWN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 3526: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3542: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3553: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3602: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 3603: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 3654: Ms. LONG, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3661: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 3662: Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 3783: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 3844: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 3857: Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 3861: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 3939: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. STAGGERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3954: Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 3957: Mr. FUSTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 4002: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 4051: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 4079: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4089: Mr. GORDON, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 4093: Mr. ROGERS.

H.R. 4104: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PEASE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. DELAY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 4109: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 4121: Mr. EWING.

H.R. 4127: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 4130: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CAMP, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 4136: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4155: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 4169: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4186: Mr. WISE and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 4207: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 4230: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. KOLTER, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.J. Res. 19: Mr. ROBERTS.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. DICKINSON.

H.J. Res. 69: Mr. MINETA.

H.J. Res. 121: Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.J. Res. 283: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.J. Res. 378: Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 384: Mr. GALLO, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 390: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TALLON, Ms. LONG, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. ESPY, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. MINETA, Mr. CARR, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 394: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GOSS.

H.J. Res. 397: Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MANTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.J. Res. 402: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.J. Res. 403: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROYBAL, Ms. HORN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. WALSH, Mr.

PASTOR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. MAUROULES.

H.J. Res. 404: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.J. Res. 411: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. HORTON.

H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. SHAYS.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr.

MOODY, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BENNETT.

H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H. Con. Res. 245: Mr. WEISS.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. LAROCOCCO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MANTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. ROTH.

H. Res. 26: Mr. RIDGE.

H. Res. 204: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H. Res. 322: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Res. 332: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ZIMMER, and Mr. SAXTON.

H. Res. 350: Ms. LONG, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. BEREUTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 330: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H. Res 194: Mr. MCEWEN and Mr. EMERSON.