HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, September 30, 1992*

The House met at 9 a.m.

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

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 51:

Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy steadfast love; according to thy abundant mercy blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity and cleanse me from my sin!

As You have assured us by Your word, we pray, Almighty God, that we will be filled with the promise of new lives, enlightened by Your assurance of forgiveness and pardon, and strengthened by Your promise of mercy. Having been renewed by Your spirit, may we go forward with integrity and honor and be of service and assistance to people whatever their need. 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 pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Will the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, after consultation with the minority, announces that any 1-minute requests will be postponed until later in the day.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON, AND PROVIDING FOR CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5503, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 581

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5503) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. Upon the adoption of the conference report the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution introduced by Representative Yates of Illinois (for himself and Representative Miller of California) on or before September 30, 1992, directing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5503) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only. At this time I yield the customary 30 minutes for the purpose of debate only, to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER]. Pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 581 provides for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 5503, the Interior and related agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1993. The conference report is debatable for 1 hour.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report will be considered as read.

Finally, upon adoption of the conference report, the House will be considered as having adopted a concurrent resolution jointly introduced by Representative YATES of Illinois and Representative MILLER of California. The concurrent resolution directs the Clerk of the House to make corrections in the conference report on H.R. 5503.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman SID YATES and ranking Republican RALPH REGULA should be commended for their hours of long, hard work.

They should also be commended for reporting a fiscally responsible bill. The conference report's new budget authority is $74 million below President Bush's funding request, and is $373 million below the fiscal year 1992 enacted levels. The conference report is also below the subcommittee's 602(b) allocations for budget authority and outlays.

Even though the funding levels in this conference report are below the President's request and well below last year's level, the committee was still able to fund many important programs like national park and battlefield land acquisition and preservation, energy conservation, and alternative fuels research.

I would like to once again commend Chairman YATES, RALPH REGULA, and their staff for their tireless efforts on behalf of so many important programs and policies. I would also like to personally thank Chairman YATES and his staff for their sincere commitment to the preservation of national parks and civil war battlefields.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure many of my colleagues have come to the same conclusion that I have, that one cannot amend conference reports. I was taught that when I first came here. Yet we are about to do so with the adoption of this rule. The rule permits a concurrent resolution to be adopted along with the conference report that calls for the removal of certain projects that were not authorized by the Committee on the Interior.

I agree that unauthorized programs should not be funded. I am also pleased that the conference report is within the President's budget, and that it does not contain other legislative provisions affecting mining patents and grazing fees. For these reasons, in addition to our time constraints, which everyone has noted by the fact that we are here at 9 o'clock in the morning, I do not plan to oppose the rule.

However, I am concerned that this rule does set a bad precedent. This type of procedure is generally used to make technical changes, rather than substantive legislative changes. The unauthorized projects should never have been in the conference report in the first place. This process should never have gotten this far, Mr. Speaker. It is my hope that in the future these types of problems will be addressed without resorting to unusual procedures that only pervert the legislative process.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5503, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 581, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5503) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Thursday, September 24, 1992, at page 27351.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, today I bring before the House the conference report on fiscal year 1993 appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. The total amount of new budget authority provided for these and many other important programs funded in the Interior bill is $12,150,342,000. This amount is within the allocation set by the budget agreement for both budget authority and outlays. It is also, Mr. Speaker, $74 million below President Bush's budget request for new budget authority. It is $373 million below the fiscal year 1992 enacted level, both of them amazing figures.

The activities in this bill are expected to generate receipts to the Treasury of approximately $8.2 billion, which will go a long way toward offsetting the appropriations made in this bill.

□ 0910

This has been a very difficult year for our committee. Not only were we faced with the daunting challenge of reconciling 160 amendments with more than 1,400 individual items in disagreement and meeting our 602(b) allocations for budget authority and outlays; but we also were faced with reducing the total budget authority in both the House and Senate versions of the bill by approximately $500 million to avoid a veto by the President. Mr. Speaker, we were able to do that in this bill.

The conference agreement provides for the continued operation of our national parks and wildlife areas as well as for the education and health programs which serve native Americans and Alaska Natives. In this bill, essential energy research and development programs are preserved, and special emphasis is placed on conservation programs, including alternative energy research and weatherization assistance.

Yes, we met our fiscal obligation, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the veto that President Bush had promised on our bill if it was higher than the level of funding that was set out in his budget. But at what cost, Mr. Speaker, at what cost to our vast natural resources, to the parks, the refuges, the wetlands, the other resources which we must preserve?

A number of agencies in this bill are funded below their figures for the previous year. The Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Minerals Management Service, the Territories, and the Departmental Offices in the Department of the Interior; State and Private Forestry, the National Forest System, and Construction in the Forest Service; and Fossil Energy Research, and Development in the Department of the Interior, all are funded below the requests that would be needed ordinarily to carry on their activities.

In the land management agencies of the Department of the Interior, there are lower construction and land acquisitions funding as compared to fiscal year 1992. We have tried to provide for some increases in the operations accounts of those agencies to ensure the continued protection of our natural resources.

For the first time in all of the years that I have chaired this appropriations subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, I believe our natural resources are underfunded. Over the last number of years, there have been additional responsibilities placed on all of these agencies by the authorizing committees and by the Congress. The funds do not really take care of the additional duties that these agencies will be required to perform.

We are providing less money. We have no option except to do as we have done because of the President's ultimatum.

The Forest Service appropriation strikes a reasonable balance between environmental concerns, including endangered and threatened species, and the need for timber and the jobs related thereto. While funds for timber sales are almost 18 percent below the fiscal year 1992 level and timber road construction is 36 percent below 1992, a 7-percent increase is provided for recreation, a 5-percent increase is provided for wildlife and fish, and a 13-percent increase is provided for trails. The conferees also agreed to include a provision providing for an expanded Forest Service decisionmaking and appeals process. The process will allow for continued citizens' rights to participate in, and appeal decisions of, the Forest Service while providing for more timely consideration of such appeals.

There is a total of $286 million for land acquisition and State assistance in the conference agreement. Appropriations for Federal acquisition total $258 million which is $72 million less than last year. State grants from the fund are set at $28 million, an increase of $5 million over the 1992 amount. Requests to the subcommittee from Members of this House for land acquisition from all sources totaled well over $1 billion.

The projects in this bill include many worthy items, but most of the items had to be turned down, unfortunately, I believe, because so many of them should have been and will have to be taken care of at some time in the future.

I believe the agreements reached by the conference amount to a good compromise which balances our many needs.

I am particularly grateful, Mr. Speaker, for the fine cooperation tendered to me by my good friend and colleague from the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who is the ranking minority member. I thank him for all of his efforts on this conference report.

For three of our members, this will be the last bill on which they have worked, and I want to thank them: The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], for their service and wish them well in all of their pursuits.

The subcommittee has just this week been informed of a possible settlement within the Department of the Interior involving payments of certain funds to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes. This matter was brought to our attention too late to be addressed in the conference, and we request that the Bureau of Indian Affairs complete its examination of the facts in this matter and report to the Appropriations Committees before taking any further action.

I would like to make two corrections to the statement of the managers. In the section addressing the National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs Program, the managers agreed that, in order to assure public funding does not displace the role of private sector sup-

port, no grant from this program may exceed 25 percent of an institution's annual income budget, as stated in House Report 102-626. Also, with regard to fossil energy research and development, amendment No. 104, in the seventh delineated item agreed to by the managers, the use of up to 5 percent of internal research and development funds for capital equipment also applies to the Western Research Institute.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I am including a table detailing the various accounts in the bill agreed to by the conferees.

Interior and Related Agencies, FY 1993 (H.R. 5503)

	FY 1992 Enacted	FY 1993 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	532,149,000	546,247,000	531,967,000	545,665,000	544,877,000	+12,728,000
Fire protection	120,473,000	119,560,000	119,560,000	119,310,000	119,310,000	-1,163,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	99,598,000	113,640,000	113,640,000	113,640,000	113,640,000	+14,042,000
Emergency contingency	.....	(51,200,000)	(51,200,000)	(51,200,000)	(51,200,000)	(+51,200,000)
Construction and access	14,138,000	14,228,000	13,225,000	17,913,000	15,810,000	+1,672,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	103,677,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	+1,323,000
Land acquisition	25,003,000	42,090,000	25,940,000	24,550,000	28,034,000	+3,031,000
Oregon and California grant lands	89,137,000	83,622,000	83,122,000	83,932,000	83,122,000	-6,015,000
Forest ecosystems health and recovery	.....	.....	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,687,000	10,747,000	10,747,000	10,747,000	10,747,000	+60,000
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite)	7,899,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	+101,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,285,000	7,380,000	7,380,000	7,380,000	7,380,000	+95,000
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,010,046,000	1,050,514,000	1,018,581,000	1,037,137,000	1,036,920,000	+26,874,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	512,870,000	544,075,000	530,211,000	531,177,000	535,085,000	+22,215,000
Construction and anadromous fish	113,447,000	49,410,000	47,513,000	90,351,000	82,085,000	-31,362,000
Land acquisition	97,891,000	79,509,000	67,397,000	78,615,000	76,192,000	-21,699,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,849,000	14,079,000	11,849,000	12,964,000	11,849,000	.....
Rewards and operations	1,186,000	1,201,000	1,201,000	1,201,000	1,201,000	+15,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	.....	15,000,000	7,500,000	11,000,000	9,250,000	+9,250,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	4,315,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,365,000	4,685,000	+370,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	6,621,000	5,700,000	6,621,000	6,621,000	6,621,000	.....
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	748,179,000	713,974,000	677,292,000	736,294,000	726,968,000	-21,211,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	953,498,000	1,031,813,000	992,059,000	989,282,000	992,431,000	+38,933,000
National recreation and preservation	22,799,000	30,991,000	22,715,000	23,791,000	23,765,000	+966,000
Historic preservation fund	35,478,000	40,931,000	36,931,000	36,931,000	36,931,000	+1,453,000
Construction	272,326,000	137,686,000	237,806,000	206,570,000	231,801,000	-40,525,000
Urban park and recreation fund	4,937,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-4,937,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	.....
Land acquisition and state assistance	105,227,000	144,404,000	106,500,000	119,271,000	118,911,000	+13,684,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	22,656,000	13,556,000	13,556,000	20,806,000	20,806,000	-1,850,000
Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission	247,000	.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	+3,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,387,168,000	1,369,381,000	1,379,817,000	1,366,901,000	1,394,895,000	+7,727,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	582,619,000	540,267,000	587,668,000	570,821,000	581,692,000	-927,000
Minerals Management Service						
Leasing and royalty management	204,461,000	197,812,000	197,514,000	194,014,000	197,014,000	-7,447,000
Oil spill research	.....	5,377,000	5,377,000	5,377,000	5,377,000	+5,377,000
Total, Minerals Management Service	204,461,000	203,189,000	202,891,000	199,391,000	202,391,000	-2,070,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	174,464,000	141,364,000	173,056,000	176,513,000	175,729,000	+1,265,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,700,000	112,282,000	112,674,000	112,674,000	112,674,000	+2,974,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,481,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	-281,000
Total	111,181,000	113,482,000	113,874,000	113,874,000	113,874,000	+2,693,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	187,803,000	156,151,000	188,041,000	191,041,000	189,541,000	+1,738,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	298,984,000	269,633,000	301,915,000	304,915,000	303,415,000	+4,431,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs	1,274,322,000	1,256,483,000	1,354,151,000	1,335,944,000	1,353,899,000	+79,577,000
Construction	149,658,000	81,591,000	152,446,000	141,746,000	150,896,000	+1,238,000
Miscellaneous payments to Indians	87,617,000	31,709,000	39,109,000	35,109,000	38,609,000	-49,008,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund	3,950,000	.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+50,000
Indian direct loan program account	4,008,000	.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-1,508,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(15,735,000)	.....	(11,300,000)	(11,300,000)	(11,300,000)	(-4,435,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account	9,412,000	9,770,000	9,770,000	9,770,000	9,770,000	+358,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(56,432,000)	(68,800,000)	(68,800,000)	(68,800,000)	(68,800,000)	(+12,368,000)

Interior and Related Agencies, FY 1993 (H.R. 5503), continued

	FY 1992 Enacted	FY 1993 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises	987,000	2,987,000	1,987,000	1,987,000	1,987,000	+1,000,000
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,529,954,000	1,382,540,000	1,563,963,000	1,531,056,000	1,561,661,000	+31,707,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Administration of territories	63,618,000	60,765,000	52,171,000	49,851,000	52,671,000	-10,947,000
Interest rate differential	29,047,000	1,260,000	28,980,000	28,980,000	28,980,000	-67,000
Total	92,665,000	62,025,000	81,151,000	78,831,000	81,651,000	-11,014,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	24,143,000	16,451,000	26,796,000	20,809,000	23,249,000	-894,000
Compact of Free Association	14,821,000	7,357,000	10,457,000	10,457,000	10,457,000	-4,364,000
Mandatory payments	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	.....
Total	24,821,000	17,357,000	20,457,000	20,457,000	20,457,000	-4,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs	141,629,000	95,833,000	128,404,000	120,097,000	125,357,000	-16,272,000
Departmental Offices						
Office of the Secretary	63,633,000	72,279,000	63,633,000	63,633,000	63,633,000	.....
Oil spill emergency fund	3,851,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,851,000
Office of the Solicitor	31,128,000	33,055,000	31,941,000	31,128,000	31,727,000	+599,000
Office of Inspector General	23,741,000	26,420,000	23,741,000	23,741,000	23,741,000	.....
Construction Management	2,215,000	2,330,000	2,191,000	2,215,000	2,191,000	-24,000
National Indian Gaming Commission	2,190,000	2,480,000	2,190,000	2,190,000	2,040,000	-150,000
Total, Departmental Offices	126,758,000	136,564,000	123,696,000	122,907,000	123,332,000	-3,426,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,204,262,000	5,903,259,000	6,157,283,000	6,166,032,000	6,232,360,000	+28,098,000
Appropriations	(6,234,262,000)	(5,933,259,000)	(6,187,283,000)	(6,196,032,000)	(6,262,360,000)	(+28,098,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(15,735,000)	.....	(11,300,000)	(11,300,000)	(11,300,000)	(-4,435,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(56,432,000)	(68,800,000)	(68,800,000)	(68,800,000)	(68,800,000)	(+12,368,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research	180,509,000	170,099,000	186,657,000	178,723,000	184,281,000	+3,772,000
State and private forestry	181,787,000	198,976,000	136,929,000	160,591,000	157,566,000	-24,221,000
Emergency pest suppression fund	.....	.....	(42,315,000)	(20,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(+26,000,000)
National forest system	1,342,529,000	1,367,727,000	1,312,937,000	1,306,077,000	1,318,481,000	-24,048,000
Forest Service fire protection	187,411,000	197,785,000	192,785,000	188,785,000	190,785,000	+3,374,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund	110,589,000	187,000,000	187,000,000	187,000,000	187,000,000	+76,411,000
Emergency contingency	.....	(188,000,000)	(188,000,000)	(188,000,000)	(188,000,000)	(+188,000,000)
Construction	271,711,000	310,525,000	241,449,000	258,570,000	257,447,000	-14,264,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite)	(-72,748,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-2,618,000)
Timber purchaser credits	(113,000,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(-2,331,000)
Land acquisition	88,306,000	100,000,000	62,072,000	62,240,000	62,947,000	-25,359,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	1,118,000	1,190,000	1,190,000	1,190,000	1,190,000	+72,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	1,214,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	-1,014,000
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	5,369,000	5,309,000	5,309,000	5,309,000	5,309,000	-60,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	96,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000	+9,000
Total, Forest Service	2,370,639,000	2,538,916,000	2,326,633,000	2,348,790,000	2,365,311,000	-5,328,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology	-50,000,000	-25,000,000	.....	.....	-525,000,000	-475,000,000
Fossil energy research and development	452,332,000	311,325,000	412,597,000	422,669,000	421,939,000	-30,393,000
Rescission	-8,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+8,000,000
Total (net)	444,332,000	311,325,000	412,597,000	422,669,000	421,939,000	-22,393,000
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-8,364,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	-7,500,000	+864,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	232,335,000	238,094,000	238,094,000	238,094,000	238,094,000	+5,759,000
Energy conservation	536,322,000	521,430,000	591,859,000	571,288,000	583,866,000	+47,544,000
Economic regulation	14,585,000	13,865,000	14,565,000	14,565,000	14,565,000	-20,000
Emergency preparedness	8,195,000	9,097,000	9,247,000	9,247,000	9,247,000	+1,052,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	185,062,000	176,600,000	176,600,000	176,600,000	176,600,000	-8,462,000
SPR petroleum account	-107,775,000	-125,625,000	-125,625,000	-125,625,000	-125,625,000	-17,850,000
Energy Information Administration	76,260,000	81,730,000	83,427,000	82,627,000	82,627,000	+6,367,000
Biomass Energy Development (Transfer)	.....	-44,000,000	-44,000,000	-49,000,000	-49,000,000	-49,000,000
Total, Department of Energy, new budget (obligational) authority	1,330,952,000	1,150,016,000	1,349,264,000	1,332,965,000	819,813,000	-511,139,000

Interior and Related Agencies, FY 1993 (H.R. 5503), continued

	FY 1992 Enacted	FY 1993 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services	1,431,603,000	1,384,446,000	1,559,615,000	1,518,553,000	1,537,851,000	+106,248,000
Indian health facilities	274,351,000	267,006,000	338,596,000	329,079,000	336,500,000	+62,149,000
Total, Indian Health Service	1,705,954,000	1,651,452,000	1,898,211,000	1,847,632,000	1,874,351,000	+168,397,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education	76,570,000	81,205,000	81,274,000	81,205,000	81,274,000	+4,704,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses	25,842,000	30,935,000	28,935,000	27,935,000	27,935,000	+2,093,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute	6,612,000	7,012,000	9,812,000	8,512,000	9,312,000	+2,700,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses	281,183,000	311,000,000	298,656,000	290,645,000	298,094,000	+16,911,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	7,899,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	+1,000
Repair and restoration of buildings	23,599,000	24,400,000	24,400,000	24,900,000	24,400,000	+801,000
Construction	19,156,000	21,400,000	17,330,000	18,100,000	16,830,000	-2,326,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	331,837,000	364,700,000	348,286,000	341,545,000	347,224,000	+15,387,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	48,572,000	52,630,000	51,663,000	51,438,000	51,627,000	+3,055,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	3,555,000	3,900,000	3,600,000	3,750,000	3,561,000	+6,000
Total, National Gallery of Art	52,127,000	56,530,000	55,263,000	55,188,000	55,188,000	+3,061,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses	5,744,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	+508,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration	145,839,000	145,455,000	145,839,000	144,245,000	145,555,000	-284,000
Matching grants	30,116,000	30,500,000	30,116,000	30,500,000	30,400,000	+284,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	175,955,000	175,955,000	175,955,000	174,745,000	175,955,000	.....
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration	150,727,000	157,050,000	152,108,000	152,669,000	152,518,000	+1,791,000
Matching grants	25,228,000	30,009,000	26,826,000	26,009,000	26,416,000	+1,188,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	175,955,000	187,059,000	178,934,000	178,678,000	178,934,000	+2,979,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration	26,999,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	+2,001,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	378,909,000	392,014,000	383,889,000	382,423,000	383,889,000	+4,980,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses	722,000	785,000	791,000	791,000	791,000	+69,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants	7,000,000	.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	.....
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses	2,623,000	2,798,000	2,757,000	2,757,000	2,757,000	+134,000
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	4,775,000	6,100,000	5,400,000	6,100,000	5,750,000	+975,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	33,000	35,000	535,000	535,000	535,000	+502,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2,807,000	2,686,000	2,686,000	2,686,000	2,686,000	-121,000
Public development	5,126,000	4,847,000	4,947,000	4,847,000	4,947,000	-179,000
Land acquisition and development fund	.....	6,500,000	6,500,000	1,750,000	6,500,000	+6,500,000
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	7,933,000	14,033,000	14,133,000	9,283,000	14,133,000	+6,200,000

Interior and Related Agencies, FY 1993 (H.R. 5503), continued

	FY 1992 Enacted	FY 1993 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	10,866,000	18,504,000	21,450,000	18,504,000	21,450,000	+10,584,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,319,138,000	6,321,287,000	6,539,885,000	6,477,417,000	6,022,965,000	-296,173,000
Rescission	(-8,000,000)					(+8,000,000)
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-72,748,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-2,618,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(113,000,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(-2,331,000)
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction of appropriations			-48,016,000		-104,983,000	-104,983,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	12,523,400,000	12,224,546,000	12,649,152,000	12,643,449,000	12,150,342,000	-373,058,000
Appropriations	(12,561,400,000)	(12,254,546,000)	(12,679,152,000)	(12,673,449,000)	(12,180,342,000)	(-381,058,000)
Rescissions	(-38,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(+8,000,000)
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-72,748,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-75,366,000)	(-2,618,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(113,000,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(110,669,000)	(-2,331,000)
TITLE I -DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	1,010,046,000	1,050,514,000	1,018,581,000	1,037,137,000	1,036,920,000	+26,874,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	748,179,000	713,974,000	677,292,000	736,294,000	726,968,000	-21,211,000
National Park Service	1,387,168,000	1,369,381,000	1,379,817,000	1,366,901,000	1,394,895,000	+7,727,000
United States Geological Survey	582,619,000	540,267,000	587,668,000	570,821,000	581,692,000	-927,000
Minerals Management Service	204,461,000	203,189,000	202,891,000	199,391,000	202,391,000	-2,070,000
Bureau of Mines	174,464,000	141,364,000	173,056,000	176,513,000	175,729,000	+1,265,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	298,984,000	269,633,000	301,915,000	304,915,000	303,415,000	+4,431,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,529,954,000	1,382,540,000	1,563,963,000	1,531,056,000	1,561,661,000	+31,707,000
Territorial and International Affairs	141,629,000	95,833,000	128,404,000	120,097,000	125,357,000	-16,272,000
Departmental Offices	126,758,000	136,564,000	123,696,000	122,907,000	123,332,000	-3,426,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,204,262,000	5,903,259,000	6,157,283,000	6,166,032,000	6,232,360,000	+28,098,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,370,639,000	2,538,916,000	2,326,633,000	2,348,790,000	2,365,311,000	-5,328,000
Department of Energy	1,330,952,000	1,150,016,000	1,349,264,000	1,332,965,000	819,813,000	-511,139,000
Indian Health	1,705,954,000	1,651,452,000	1,898,211,000	1,847,632,000	1,874,351,000	+168,397,000
Indian Education	76,570,000	81,205,000	81,274,000	81,205,000	81,274,000	+4,704,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	25,842,000	30,935,000	28,935,000	27,935,000	27,935,000	+2,093,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	6,612,000	7,012,000	9,812,000	8,512,000	9,312,000	+2,700,000
Smithsonian	331,837,000	364,700,000	348,286,000	341,545,000	347,224,000	+15,387,000
National Gallery of Art	52,127,000	56,530,000	55,263,000	55,188,000	55,188,000	+3,061,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	5,744,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	6,252,000	+508,000
National Endowment for the Arts	175,955,000	175,955,000	175,955,000	174,745,000	175,955,000	
National Endowment for the Humanities	175,955,000	187,059,000	178,934,000	178,678,000	178,934,000	+2,979,000
Institute of Museum Services	26,999,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	+2,001,000
Commission of Fine Arts	722,000	785,000	791,000	791,000	791,000	+69,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,000,000		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,623,000	2,798,000	2,757,000	2,757,000	2,757,000	+134,000
National Capital Planning Commission	4,775,000	6,100,000	5,400,000	6,100,000	5,750,000	+975,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	33,000	35,000	535,000	535,000	535,000	+502,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	7,933,000	14,033,000	14,133,000	9,283,000	14,133,000	+6,200,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	10,866,000	18,504,000	21,450,000	18,504,000	21,450,000	+10,584,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	6,319,138,000	6,321,287,000	6,539,885,000	6,477,417,000	6,022,965,000	-296,173,000
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction of appropriations			-48,016,000		-104,983,000	-104,983,000
Grand total	12,523,400,000	12,224,546,000	12,649,152,000	12,643,449,000	12,150,342,000	-373,058,000

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

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I rise in support of this conference report.

The chairman has done an excellent job of explaining the changes, and I will not belabor the point. I would simply say that, in my 8 years as ranking Republican on this subcommittee, this is the first time that we have been below the President's request, and certainly it reflects the fact that we made a Herculean effort to get the numbers down below that request. The original House-passed bill was $500 million over the President's budget, and today we are $373 million below last year's appropriation and $74 million under the President's request. We have had to make some painful cuts in terms of land acquisition. We are $82 million below the President's request; parks, $43 million below the President's request; and this is true in many of the other agencies.

What this is going to mean is substantial belt tightening by the agencies.

I want to point at this time to the fact that there are really dedicated people in the Park Service, the Forest Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and that is one of the reasons that these programs can function. These individuals care about the land. They care about providing good experiences for the public. They care about the resources, and in many instances they have substandard housing they need to contend with and not all the tools they need. I have visited facilities where the people were purchasing items out of their own pocket because they found that they needed things in the way of tools, for example.

Also, the public has a love affair with our public lands. The visitor days grow in all of these areas, and especially some of the multiple-use agencies such as the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

We regret that we cannot fund more visitor centers to allow the public to enjoy the facilities, and I think this is a problem we need to address in the future. One-third of the United States is owned by the Federal Government, and the people of the United States find these public lands a place of enjoyment, of solitude, an area to refresh the spirit, and we need to work hard to make sure they always have a good experience.

We had a couple of tough issues: the mining issue. We had a moratorium on patents that dropped out because of the Senate opposition to that, but we were also successful in keeping at the so-called mining reforms included in the Senate bill. I hope that the authorizing committees of this body can address the mining issue as well as the grazing issue in a responsible way.

□ 0920

This, of course, is what happens when there is a need to compromise in order to get a bill that can be agreed to by both Houses. But these subjects properly belong in the authorizing committees and should be addressed there.

We had thousands of differences in the original bill. I certainly give the staff of both our Interior Subcommittee and the chairman's staff as well as mine great credit for working with the Senate staff to resolve many of the differences between the two Houses. I think it is indicative of their understanding of the bill and a recognition of where our priorities should be.

Also, as the chairman mentioned, I regret that the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS], and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN] will be leaving the committee. Certainly their contributions have been very important in the years past. They have all been dedicated members of this subcommittee.

Lastly, it has been a real joy to work with the chairman, as I have said many times before on this floor. It is a totally nonpartisan process. We both work together along with the other members on the subcommittee to provide the best management possible for the public lands of the United States, what I call the jewels of America, our parks, forests, fish and wildlife facilities and BLM facilities. I do not think we always realize what a treasure these lands represent, and how important it is that we manage them in the best possible way for the enjoyment of the people of this Nation.

I certainly urge my colleagues to support this conference report. It is a good report. We worked hard to bring it under the President's numbers, as evidenced by the fact that we are substantially below his request. And I think it should have the strong support of all of the Members of this House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the other members of the subcommittee, especially the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member [Mr. REGULA] for the great job they have done in bringing this conference agreement to the floor.

This conference agreement provides investments in America—our public lands, wildlife refuges, fish hatcheries, national parks, and national forests. It provides funds for energy conservation and fossil energy development programs. It provides funds for Indian schools and hospitals. These programs are vital to the development and support of our country.

Mr. Speaker, what we spend here is going to enable us to help handle our national financial problems if they are going to be handled. Our country itself is our wealth; thus, it is imperative that we protect, preserve, and develop all of our country.

Examples of funding for other national programs in this conference agreement that are of special interest to my area and State include funds to continue construction of the Natchez Trace Parkway, the Natchez Historical Park, a Vicksburg park study, the Pvt. John Allen National Fish Hatchery, Marine Minerals Institute, forest research at Stoneville, Starkville, Gulfport, and Oxford, and magnetohydrodynamics research.

Mr. Speaker, against, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and the other members of the subcommittee have done a great job.

I urge this conference report be adopted.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the committee for working with me on the buy-American provision for the first time, not only accepting it, but keeping it in the bill. Chairman YATES has some concerns, but he took the time to work with me, as he has done with many other Members, and has given us that opportunity, and I appreciate that, Chairman YATES.

I also want to take time to rise and commend my neighbor who is on the other side of the aisle, RALPH REGULA. I think it is common knowledge back in the area that I am a big supporter of RALPH, and I have never let R's and D's get in the way. And one of the reasons is that RALPH has been a supporter of the American worker, and he has a very pragmatic outlook on the American economy. I would just like to say that if we are not recycling cash, and not recycling an investment, how are we here in America going to ever come out of the economic shambles we are in?

In addition, I would like to give credit today to Chairman JOHN MURTHA of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations. The very first appropriations subcommittee that accepted in earnest my buy-American language and placed it in the bill was JOHN MURTHA's subcommittee, and I personally thank him, and also thank Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI for not raising points of order, and, in fact, having this provision knocked from the bill. Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI could have done that. I appreciate the fact that he worked with all of us and gave us this opportunity.

I would just like to say in closing that the last thing we want to do is to

drive up prices and cause an inflationary problem in America. But one of our priorities should be, wherever possible, to encourage the American people to at least evaluate, shop, market, and purchase American made goods. If there are no American made goods, there are no workers making those goods, and there will be no consumers. And America is in the dilemma of this type of public economic policy right now.

So again I commend Chairman YATES and thank him for being accommodating, and thank my neighbor from Ohio, Mr. RALPH REGULA. I appreciate their help.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the chairman of the authorizing committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman YATES and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for their cooperation in dealing with the problem of the items that we on the Interior authorization committee disagreed with the Appropriations Committee that were included in their bill from the conference committee, and the Rules Committee for adopting a rule which provided for the concurrent resolution hopefully that will be taken up by the Senate so that those items that were not authorized in the appropriations bill will be taken from that bill. As the gentlemen on this committee know, this has been a matter of some concern to us where the authorizing committees have struggled to enact policy changes and to make determinations with respect to dollar amounts, and then to have that put in by Members of the Senate and others in the conference committee. And I want to thank Chairman YATES for his cooperation over the past year in trying to resist these efforts.

This is not a problem that is particular to this committee. It is a question I think of the institutional rules of the House, and to the extent to which we can separate and clear those lines between authorization and appropriation so that in fact we will know that we have given the best consideration we can to the expenditure of the public taxpayer dollars on each and every one of the projects that is appropriated by this committee. So I want to thank him for helping us resolve this issue for this year, and again I hope that we will see greater leadership on this matter with respect to the enforcement of the House rules against unauthorized provisions in an appropriations bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the other evening when we were discussing another appropriation bill on the floor, the HUD, VA, Independent Agencies bill, there was a considerable discussion at that time about funding that was going to be given to the Office of Science and Technology Policy for a project known as CIESIN. At that point it was mentioned on the floor that that funding was supported by the director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, and it was my response at that time that the director had no business doing that kind of thing.

I have since received a letter from Allan Bromley, the President's Executive Assistant or the President's Assistant for Science and Technology Policy who is the director of that office. He presents a quite different scenario in which the committee put the money, and then asked him on how it should be implemented. He has a fairly detailed letter about what actually took place. He is owed and apology by me for responding as I did to the chairman, but it seems to me the chairman also did not exactly present the situation as Mr. Bromley was involved.

Therefore, I include for the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of the letter from Director Bromley that points out the accurate nature of his dealings on this particular project.

The letter referred to follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY,
Washington, DC, September 29, 1992.

Hon. ROBERT WALKER,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALKER: I feel that I must set the record straight concerning the debate you and Congressman Bod Traxler during Friday's consideration of the VA, HUD appropriation bill. Statements made by you and your colleague about my conduct and intentions were inaccurate and once you know the facts, I think you will agree that I an owed an apology.

The first I learned about $2 million being inserted into OSTP's budget for CIESIN came during the meeting of House and Senate conferees on Tuesday, September 22. The Conference report was read, $2 million for CIESIN had been inserted into OSTP's budget, and that was that. I did not, nor did anyone associated with OSTP seek this additional funding, and I was neither consulted nor informed until it was a fait accompli.

The next morning I called Chairman Traxler to find out how OSTP had been selected for this distinction, which effectively boosted OSTP's funding by one-third. I thanked the Chairman for restoring the better part of a cut that had been made in OSTP's budget by the Senate. While I was curious about the CIESIN funding, I was not enthusiastic. Chairman Traxler also wanted to know whether OSTP had grant-awarding authority and I replied that we did not. I was asked to submit language and did so; having been told that this CIESIN appropriation was a certainly, I felt that we in OSTP should have some control over the process.

As further evidence that I was trying to make the best of the situation, I also approached Chairman George Brown on this matter and asked him if he would consider an amendment or colloquy similar to his effort on the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. Chairman Brown thanked me for this "heads up," said that he would see what he could do but was not optimistic. A member of my staff talked with your Committee staff on the morning prior to your debate and conveyed everything we knew concerning the appropriation at that time.

Unfortunately, your Committee's bipartisan effort to battle earmarking and abuses in the appropriations process has mistaken OSTP and me for the enemy.

In OSTP's historical role as an "honest broker" in science policy, and in my own forthright opposition to the growing abuse of earmarking in appropriations bills, I have fought—and will continue to fight—for scientific merit-based peer review in the awarding of research grants. The public record—ranging from press interviews and speeches to congressional testimony before your committee—reflects my strong conviction on this issue.

I appreciate your willingness to hear me out and provide me with this opportunity to set the record straight.

Sincerely,

D. ALLAN BROMLEY,
Director.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong support for the conference report on H.R. 5503, the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1993.

The distinguished chairman from Illinois, Mr. YATES, and the ranking Republican, Mr. REGULA of Ohio, have done an outstanding job in bringing to the House floor a conference report that meets the needs of the Nation but still complies with the severe budget restrictions that were placed on the bill.

This bill meets the criteria set forth by the President by falling $74 million in budget authority under his request. It falls $725 million under the 602(b) allocation in BA and $50 million under in estimated outlays. In addition, the bill is $373 million less than fiscal year 1992. By any yardstick, the bill can be called fiscally responsible.

Of course, such numbers cannot be achieved without considerable pain. The decisions made by the conferees were extremely difficult, and many worthy programs and projects were underfunded or passed over. An across-the-board cut had to be made to comply with the President's spending request.

I am pleased that the bill provides funding for the completion of the Steamtown National Historic Site, a project that I am happy to report is progressing on time and on schedule.

Steamtown has been scaled back by $7 million in compliance with the legislation initiated by the authorizing committee and passed by the House earlier this year. In my view, and the view of the National Park Service as outlined in testimony at subcommittee hearings, the authorizing committee set an unwise precedent with unnecessary and unwarranted micromanagement provisos in the authorizing legislation.

The bill had its share of controversy, and the conferees made realistic choices on timber sales, holding fees on miners and grazing fees on federal lands. These decisions, although they may not please everyone, ensure that the bill will be acceptable to the majority in the House and Senate as well as the President.

The conferees have done an excellent job under extreme fiscal restrictions. I commend

them for their skill and hard work, and I urge the strong support of my colleagues.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I must express my deep disappointment that our conferees were unable to agree to the bipartisan amendment from the other body sponsored by Senators REID, DOMENICI, DECONCINI, and BRYAN, nor the amendment sponsored by Senators REID and BUMPERS. I refer, of course, to those provisions which addressed concerns of the environmental community, the National Taxpayers Union and other advocates of reform of the mining law of 1872. We have heard the rhetoric from Chairman RAHALL of the Mining Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, the mining law allows patenting of land for fast-food hamburger prices and condos will be built upon patented claims if we don't reform this law, and no reclamation of patented claims is required by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I know that antimining advocates referred to the Reid-Domenici and Reid-Bumpers amendments as sham reform because neither of these amendments got to the heart of what they seek. The radical reformers insist that approval of mining plans on the public lands—and perhaps even on private lands—must be completely discretionary with the Secretary of the Interior, or Agriculture as the case may be. In other words, plan denial need not be predicated upon the inability to meet environmental standards, as is the case under current law. This "Just Say No" approach is the holy grail to the antimining crowd, and unless it is contained in proposed reforms they would just as soon the mining law not be amended. Otherwise, what rhetorical drum is there to beat next year? Well, it looks like they will get their wish.

Mr. Speaker, sham reform is that reform which cannot become law. H.R. 918 fits this description, while the Reid-Domenici and Reid-Bumpers amendments did not. On October 1, 1992, or shortly thereafter, those Members who have railed against the giveaway of the mining law could have taken comfort in seeing a fair market value requirement become law. Furthermore, had miners put patented claims to nonmining use their interests would have reverted to the Federal Government under the non-adopted amendment. Lastly, reclamation of patented claims to the extent required of unpatented claims under Federal law or under State law would have been required, together with strict statutory bonding requirements.

But, instead, we have the prospect of debating, for 6 hours, H.R. 918—the inappropriately titled Mineral Exploration and Development Act of 1992 knowing full well that it will then die. The other body has spoken quite clearly on this issue and will not pick up that bill, nor would the President sign it into law. Therefore, I suggest that it is H.R. 918 which is the true sham on this body not the Reid-Domenici and Reid-Bumpers amendments.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the argument that the Senate amendments were rejected because it was legislation in an appropriations bill holds no water, either. The $100 per claim holding fee which the conferees did adopt is clearly legislative language. Where is the consistency?

Lest I be misunderstood, let me say again to my colleagues on the committee, I understand the pressures upon Chairman YATES and RALPH REGULA to bring back a conference report that can be approved by the full House, but I am nonetheless dismayed that the opportunity has passed us by to lay the 1872 mining law demons to rest this Congress.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5503, the fiscal year 1993 Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations bill. In doing so, I would like to thank Chairman SIDNEY YATES for his support of the $150,000 appropriation for a study of the Sierra Nevada Forests ecosystems contained in H.R. 5503. Due to the extreme health problems associated with the Sierra Nevada Forests, the development of a comprehensive strategy is needed to help restore this precious resource. The funds provided in this bill will help us achieve that goal.

Last week, the House Agriculture Committee reported legislation which I authored, H.R. 6013, establishing guidelines for the conduct of the Sierra Forest study. This provision was devised in agreement with the California Members whose districts are affected by the study and enjoys bipartisan support. I would like to clarify for the record that it is the House's intent that the study funded in H.R. 5503 be conducted in accordance with the provisions of H.R. 6013. The specific requirements of the study are detailed in H.R. 6013 and I would ask that a copy of the bill be submitted for the RECORD.

I would also note that, to provide interim protection to particularly sensitive areas of the Sierra Nevada Range during the study, H.R. 6013 prohibits the Forest Service from permitting any logging activities in roadless areas and riparian corridors until December 31, 1996. These management guidelines are detailed in H.R. 6013 and I would strongly encourage the Forest Service to abide by those guidelines during the study.

On behalf of all the Members involved with this project, I would like to thank Chairman YATES for his efforts to include the Sierra Nevada study in this bill and for his commitment to preserving one of our greatest national treasures, the Sierra Nevada Forests. I urge my colleagues to support the bill. A copy of H.R. 6013 follows:

H.R. 6013

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sierra Nevada Forests Ecosystem Study Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Sierra Nevada Forests" means Federal lands and interests in land that are included within the following national forests in the State of California: Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Tahoe, Eldorado, Stanislaus, Sierra, Inyo, Toiyabe, and Sequoia; the area of the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit contained in the State of California; and the following national parks in the State of California: Lassen, Sequoia-Kings Canyon, and Yosemite.

(2) the term "Committee" means the Sierra Nevada Forests Scientific Committee established by section 3 of this Act; and

(3) the term "Secretaries" means the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. SIERRA NEVADA FORESTS SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Within 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretaries shall establish an 11-person Sierra Nevada Forests Scientific Committee. The Committee shall consist of the following members appointed by the Secretaries, acting jointly, from a list of candidates to be developed and submitted to the Secretaries by the National Academy of Sciences:

(1) One forest ecologist with expertise on old-growth (late seral stage) forest ecosystems.

(2) One forest ecologist with expertise on managed forests.

(3) One wildlife biologist.

(4) One forest economist.

(5) One silviculturist.

(6) One hydrologist.

(7) One fisheries biologist.

(8) One forest fire management specialist.

(9) One forest entomologist;

(10) One range ecologist.

(11) One risk analyst with, to the extent practicable, forestry expertise.

(b) CONFLICTS AND EXPERTISE.—Each candidate for appointment to the Committee shall be a recognized expert in the field for which the member is considered for appointment and shall be free of conflict of interest. To the extent possible and where relevant to the member's area of expertise, each member shall have substantial field experience in the Sierra Nevada Forests. The list of candidates provided by the National Academy of Sciences shall consist of at least 2 nominees for each of the positions specified in subsection (a).

(c) ADMINISTRATION OF COMMITTEE.—

(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the Committee each shall be paid at a rate not to exceed, and consistent with, the rate paid to employees of the United States performing similar duties with similar qualifications for each day (including travel time) during which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Committee. While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Committee, members of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) Other than reimbursement of expenses pursuant to paragraph (1), members of the Committee who are full-time officers or employees of the United States shall receive no additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Committee.

(3) The Chairperson of the Committee shall be elected by the members.

(4) The Committee, in consultation with the Secretaries, shall appoint a director for the Committee from individuals who have broad knowledge of, and experience in, the Sierra Nevada Forests.

(5) The director, with the approval of the Secretaries, may appoint and fix the pay of such additional personnel as the director, in consultation with the Committee, considers appropriate. The director and staff of the Committee may be appointed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53, of title 5, United States Code, except that an individual so appointed, other than the director, may not receive pay in excess of the maximum annual rate of basic pay payable for GS-14 of the General Schedule.

(6) The director and the staff shall be free of conflict of interest with regard to the subject of the Committee's study and report.

(7) Upon request of the Committee, the head of any Federal agency shall provide facilities, equipment, personnel, data, and other types of support to the Committee to assist it in carrying out it duties under this Act.

(8) The Committee shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(9) The Committee shall terminate on December 31, 1996.

SEC. 4. COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES AND REPORT.

(a) DRAFT REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 1994, the Committee shall prepare and submit to the Secretaries a draft report which shall include the following:

(1) A delineation of the various ecosystems of the Sierra Nevada Forests.

(2) An inventory of the lands and resources in each such ecosystem, including inventories of the watersheds and late successional forests, and the species dependent thereon or associated therewith, in each such ecosystem.

(3) An evaluation of the health conditions and trends of each such ecosystem.

(4) An identification of the processes, activities, and other factors (including but not limited to drought, fire and fire suppression, timber harvesting and forest practices, disease infestations, livestock grazing, urban and residential development, water projects, forest regeneration, soil erosion, and air quality) which affect the health conditions and trends of each such ecosystem.

(5)(A) Recommendations of alternative management strategies to protect and enhance each ecosystem of the Sierra Nevada Forests and the resources thereof, including the watersheds and late successional forests and their dependent and associated species, including a determination of whether late-successional reserves are necessary for the maintenance of the health of the Sierra forest ecosystems and if such reserves are necessary, what lands should be included in such reserves.

(B) Each alternative shall include a discussion of the risks such alternative would pose to the ecosystem.

(C) An economic analysis of each alternative shall be conducted, including the impacts on jobs, revenues to counties, and supply of timber to local, State, and national markets.

(6) An examination of the Mediated Settlement Agreement, Section B, Sequoia Groves for the Sequoia National Forest and recommendations for scientifically based mapping and management of Sequoia groves and those additional lands, if any, to ensure the long-term health and survival of Sequoia ecosystems.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 1995, the Committee shall—

(1) prepare a final version of the report described in subsection (a) of this section, which shall contain written responses to each of the peer review comments submitted pursuant to section 5 of this Act; and

(2) submit the final report to the Secretaries for immediate publication.

SEC. 5. PEER REVIEW.

Before submitting the draft report as required by section 4(a) of this Act, and again before submitting the final report as required by section 4(b) of this Act, the Committee shall submit its report to the National Academy of Sciences for technical peer review for a period of not more than 30 days. The Committee then shall consider the comments submitted in such peer review. Peer review comments shall be included in the records of the Committee and, together with a detailed response to such comments, in the submission of the report pursuant to sections 4(a) and (b) of this Act.

SEC. 6. INTERIM PROTECTION.

(a) Until December 31, 1996, the Secretary of Agriculture shall manage the national forests listed in section 2(1) of this Act in a manner consistent with the provisions of this section and applicable laws and land and resource management plans.

(b) Notwithstanding section 111 of the California Wilderness Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-425), the Secretary may not build or permit new roads or aerial and cable logging in areas which were identified as "roadless" in the Department of Agriculture second Roadless Area Review and Evaluation program (RAREII) and are roadless on the date of the enactment of this Act. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit logging in areas accessible from existing roads.

(c) No management practices causing detrimental changes in water temperature, chemical composition, blockages of water courses, or deposits of sediment which would seriously and adversely affect water conditions or fish habitat, and no logging, may be conducted within 100 feet on either side of all permanent streams and 50 feet on either side of all seasonally flowing and intermittent streams.

(d) The provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to timber sales prepared as agreed to in the Mediated Settlement Agreement for the Sequoia National Forest.

(e) Notwithstanding subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of Agriculture may conduct restoration projects in Sierra Nevada Forests damaged by fire or other natural disasters that require intervention to protect public safety, property, or water quality, after approval by the Committee. Only restoration projects that would sustain the Sierra Forest ecosystems can be approved. The Committee shall approve or disapprove a restoration project within 30 days after the project is submitted by the Secretary. The Committee may have an additional 30 days to review a project, upon notifying the Secretary. If the restoration project is needed to prevent imminent loss of property or is a threat to human safety, the Secretary may direct Committee review for approval or disapproval within 15 days of submission. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to exempt such projects from other applicable law, regulations, policy, or guidelines.

(f) Timber sales under contract on or before September 30, 1992, in the national forests listed in section 3(a) shall not be prohibited by this Act. The Secretary shall offer substitute volume from areas outside areas subject to this section for those sales for which timber preparation has been completed by September 30, 1992.

SEC. 7. SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.

At the time the reports are submitted to the Secretaries under sections 4 (a) and (b) of this Act, they shall also be submitted to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture of the House of Representatives and to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

SEC. 8. STANDARD.

In no event may this Act be construed to afford a lessor standard of protection to lands within the Sierra Nevada Forests than would otherwise be required by any other provision of law, rule, regulation, or land and resource management plan or regional guides.

SEC. 9. COORDINATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE EFFORTS.

To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall coordinate its studies, recommendations and activities with similar efforts being undertaken by other Federal agencies and the State of California, including (but not limited to)—

(1) the Forest and Range Resources Assessment Program;

(2) the California Spotted Owl Steering Committee;

(3) the Old-Growth Forest and Riparian Project;

(4) the Sierra Nevada Vegetation Mapping Project; and

(5) management of Calaveras Big Trees State Park, California.

SEC. 10. APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, first this Member would like to take the opportunity to recognize the conferees and specifically the chairman and the ranking minority member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] have been longtime supporters of Interior related projects that are very important to Nebraska.

This Member is especially pleased and gratified for their continued support and, in fact, increased support for forest research at the Center for Semi-Arid Agroforestry in Lincoln, NE. The center's research is dedicated to resolving environmental problems before they are created. By planting the proper species of trees and shrubs strategically, agricultural producers can lessen the erosion impact on our streams, rivers, lakes, and ground water from runoff polution. Ultimately, these sound forestry conservation practices can save many millions of dollars in environmental cleanup costs.

This Member is also pleased that conferees approved $200,000 in funding for the center from State and private forestry funds for technology transfer and demonstration. These funds are necessary to guarantee that the valuable research being conducted at the center reaches those who will most benefit from the research.

Conferees also approved $198,000 for Fish and Wildlife Service endangered species research including Platte River wetlands studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The Platte River in Nebraska serves as a major environmental corridor throughout the State, especially as an internationally significant staging area for migratory birds.

Mr. Speaker, finally, this Member is especially pleased that conferees agreed to a $700,000 increase in funding for tribal colleges. With the overall increase in student population at tribal colleges, these funds are essential and will provide an invaluable service to native Americans in my State who attend Nebraska Indian Community College and similar colleges around our Nation.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 1993 Interior appropriations and to congratulate Chairman YATES for doing a tremendous job on the bill.

The chairman, the ranking minority member, Mr. REGULA, and the other members of the subcommittee have successfully trimmed the Interior budget well below its allocation and even the President's request. This is never an easy task—let alone during an election year—and they deserve our recognition.

I am particularly grateful for their support of an area of great importance to me, Channel Islands National Park. Nearly 13 years ago, I authored legislation creating the Channel Islands National Park. Since then I have sought funding to purchase the few remaining private inholdings from willing sellers in the park. Given the tremendous backlog of authorized land acquisitions, it has taken some time to appropriate funds for Channel Islands.

I am extremely thankful the committee was able to retain my request for $8 million in the final bill. The funds will help purchase half of the Gherini family property on Santa Cruz Island and a site for a visitors center. Thanks to the committee's efforts, Channel Islands National Park will take a major step toward completion, for the benefit of all Americans.

Again, let me thank Chairman YATES, Mr. REGULA, Mr. LOWERY, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. SKEEN for their commitment in developing a bill we can all support.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Speaker, in the Pacific Northwest our timber resource has become increasingly valuable as the supply has been reduced. I am concerned that every effort be taken to guarantee that any tree measurement system which the Forest Service adopts be at least as accurate as the system presently in use. But I am equally concerned about the economic impact a new tree measurement policy may have on the men and women in Oregon who currently scale timber sold from our national forests.

I want it to be clear to the Forest Service that the language we have adopted in our conference report directs the Forest Service to develop and implement a cruise standard at least as accurate as the scaling standards currently in place to prevent a net loss of revenue to the Treasury and that these new standards be in place as the Forest Service moves toward more tree measurement.

I also want the record to clearly show that in taking steps to ensure consistency and standardization of measuring practices, as directed by the conference report, the Forest Service should consult with those people most impacted by such a conversion, including representatives of the men and women who currently scale timber sold off our national forests prior to further modification to the agency's tree measurement policy .

Mr. BACCHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to H.R. 5503, Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1993. I would like especially to commend the work and the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who has done a wonderful job in the face of some very difficult budgetary constraints.

I am pleased that the conference committee has agreed to a House provision recommending an increase of $100,000 over the administration's request for developing a habitat conservation plan [HCP] for the Florida scrub jay. The House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior approved this increase after I brought to their attention the need to develop an HCP for the scrub jay in Brevard County, FL, in my district.

The proposed HCP will help reduce conflicts between endangered species and human activities by providing for both habitat conservation and appropriate development. More than half of the population of the Florida scrub jay, which is federally listed as a threatened species, is found in Brevard County. As a result, this HCP likely will become a model for other countries in Florida.

I urge the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to utilize these funds as intended to help develop a habitat conservation plan for the scrub jay in Brevard County as soon as possible. By acting now, we can avoid far greater conflicts later.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Chairman YATES and his staff for the excellent work they have done on this bill. This bill represents a difficult task and I want to personally commend Chairman YATES and the conferees for their efforts.

I specifically would like to speak in support of the funding in this bill which recognizes the importance of native American higher education.

Haskell Indian Junior College, which is one of the only two national colleges for native Americans in the country and which is located in Lawrence, KS, has an important mission for native Americans across the country.

In the past Haskell has survived severe budgetary setbacks and has provided quality education to native Americans across the county despite efforts by the previous administration to shut it down.

I am pleased the conferees, under Chairman YATES' leadership, realized the importance of adequately funding Haskell, and I am especially pleased the final agreement includes provisions in both the Senate and House bills to restore $977,000 to Haskell's budget that President Bush had requested be cut.

This funding will bring Haskell's fiscal year 1993 instructional budget to the same level as the 1992 budget. More importantly, it will allow the popular and successful summer school and natural resources programs to continue next year.

Both the summer school and natural resources program are proven and effective. Cutting these programs, as proposed by the Bush administration, would have been a tragic mistake and posed a severe setback for Haskell.

The sum $100,000 was approved for necessary program development at Haskell. This funding will help Haskell implement its "vision 2000" plan, a comprehensive blueprint for improving the teacher training program at Haskell so that it will be possible for the school to achieve its goal of offering baccalaureate degrees in elementary education.

The ability to offer teaching degrees is critically important to the native American community given the well documented shortage of native American teachers, particularly on the reservations.

I would like to commend the conferees for including an additional $3 million which would allow Haskell to finance the construction of much needed on campus housing. Housing is a top priority for Haskell as overcrowding has become a serious problem. Haskell has been attempting to deal with a serious housing shortage for several years.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it has been a privilege and an honor to represent Haskell Indian Junior College since I was first elected to this body in 1982. While I will continue to support funding for this critically important national higher education institution for native Americans, due to redistricting, Haskell will no longer be in the Second District and I regret that I will no longer be their Representative in Congress. I do look forward to supporting Haskell in any way I can in the future.

We have fought over the past 10 years for funding in order to achieve equity and quality in the education programs and conditions at Haskell. It has at times been a long and frustrating struggle but it has also been a rewarding one.

I have enjoyed working with many individuals at Haskell committed to high standards in education for native Americans and individuals devoted to creating opportunities for young native Americans in order to learn and be educated. People like the president of Haskell, Bob Martin and his staff including Hannes Combest and many others are to be commended for their efforts. Over the years, I have personally enjoyed the opportunity to visit with many of the students and alumni of Haskell. Their education at Haskell is now being put to use all over the country. I am confident that Haskell will continue to grow and respond to the educational needs of native American students across the country.

Mr. Speaker, if self-determination and independence from Government are to remain the benchmark of Federal efforts toward native Americans, then we must do all we can to see that this population has access to quality education. Haskell Indian Junior College provides the tools for such an endeavor.

I am grateful to my colleagues on the conference committee for recognizing that it would be a tragic mistake to jeopardize the quality of education at the single most important institution of higher learning in the native American community.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report to H.R. 5503 and I urge President Bush to sign it.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of the conference report on H.R. 5503, the fiscal year 1993 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. I support the land use and cultural programs that are funded by this appropriation. They are extremely important to the American public and deserve sound policy direction and the funding to facilitate such policy path.

Three months ago Chairman GEORGE MILLER and I appeared before the Rules Committee to express our deep concerns with several of the provisions of H.R. 5503. The provisions in question included authorizations on an appropriations bill and funding for unauthorized projects; and involved matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. With the assistance of the Rules Committee, the House was able to address many of these matters and take appropriate action to uphold the authorization process and the rules of the House.

Unfortunately, the Senate, in considering H.R. 5503, saw fit to ignore these important House actions and overturned or otherwise negated the House provisions addressing the authorization process. In fact, the Senate went further and added a number of projects or provisions that, in the House, are violations of clause 2 of rule XXI of the House.

Prior to the House-Senate conference on H.R. 5503, I sent a letter to Representative YATES outlining my objections to the Senate provisions of H.R. 5503.

The conference report on H.R. 5503 contained numerous provisions constituting authorizations on an appropriations bill or funding for unauthorized projects that are in violation of the House rules. Several of these provisions are highly controversial and have significant policy implications. In fact, additional authorization language was agreed to by the conference committee that involved matters not committed to conference by either the House or Senate.

As a result of the deep concerns expressed by Chairman MILLER and myself of these violations of House rules and the authorization process, the rule on this conference report contained a provision providing for adoption of a House concurrent resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 365—introduced by Representative YATES and Representative GEORGE MILLER. House Concurrent Resolution 365 makes corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 5503. These corrections involve striking authorizing language in the conference report and making appropriations for unauthorized projects subject to a proper authorization.

The conference report on H.R. 5503 was seriously flawed and I regret that it was necessary to take the unusual step of the House concurrent resolution to correct these flaws. Nevertheless, the action by the House to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 365 is important to uphold the rules of the House and the authorization process.

Chairman MILLER and I are committed to seeing that this serious problem is not only addressed this time, but that steps are taken to correct it permanently. For too long appropriations bills have been used to bypass the authorizing committees and enact legislative policy and fund unauthorized projects of dubious value. We will continue to work with the leadership, the Appropriations Committee, and other Members of the House to resolve this important matter.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 5503, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1993.

The chairman of the Interior Subcommittee [Mr. YATES] and the ranking minority member [Mr. REGULA], are to be commended for the very fine job they did in this particularly difficult year in defending the interests of the House.

Despite the very severe spending restraints imposed on the conference committee, the bill before us today does a great deal to protect and allow for the better management of our natural resources, improve the health and educational opportunities of the native American population, and advance research and development in energy efficiency and fossil fuel technologies.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking minority member for their ongoing attention to the many demands which my own State of California places on this very important bill. The members of the subcommittee have always paid very careful attention to, and have largely met, these competing needs, particularly with the help and leadership of Mr. LOWERY, who is leaving this body and will be sorely missed by us all and our State in particular. Despite the severe budget restraints imposed on this conference, this year was no different.

I am particularly grateful for the assistance of the House conferees in meeting the many land acquisition needs of my part of the State. The conference report provides $5 million to continue U.S. Fish and Wildlife willing seller acquisitions for the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge, $1 million for the BLM to purchase a tract that includes 3½ miles of sensitive river frontage on the upper Sacramento River, and $3 million to continue the Santini-Burton single family lot acquisition program in the Lake Tahoe basin to help reduce erosion and water quality degradation in Lake Tahoe.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to thank Chairman YATES and Mr. REGULA for their efforts to help advance the newly designated Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge in southern Sacramento County and the Urban Forest Research and Education Center at Davis, CA. The conference report provides $300,000 in management funds for Stone Lakes that will allow the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to initiate a community educational program at the refuge as well as wetlands restoration efforts on land within the refuge boundaries that is already in public ownership.

And, the conference report's support for the urban forestry center, the only comprehensive urban forestry research and education program in the West, will allow the center to meet the growing demand for better information about how to use urban forestry techniques to make air quality improvements and promote energy and water conservation.

A testament to the need for this center, which was just dedicated in March of this year, is the fact that every major utility in California and a half dozen other utilities from other Western States have asked the center to develop information that will allow them to use urban forests to reduce peak generating loads, especially during the summer months. In addition, every dollar allocated in this bill for this center is being matched by the private sector, so it is clear that this center is performing a very vital and much needed service to this region of the country.

Mr. Speaker, again, this conference report is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 5503, the Interior and Related Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993. I supported this measure when it first came before the House last July, and am proud to do so again today. I commend the conference committee for its fine work.

I am particularly pleased that the report maintained funding for three programs important to the Third District of Kentucky.

First, the conference report provides a total of $36.9 million for the Historic Preservation Trust Fund, $30.7 million of which is targeted to the fund's grant program. This grant program has made possible the rehabilitation and preservation of many historic structures in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and in Louisville and Jefferson County. The program makes good economic sense, as well, because restoration of these structures provides jobs and increases tax revenues.

Second, the conference report provides $5.8 million for the Rivers and Trails Conservation Program, which is invaluable to communities along major rivers. Of course, Louisville sits along a major river—the Ohio—and this program has the potential to help establish a network of trails as part of the redevelopment of our historic waterfront. The program could also expand the use of the Jefferson Forest in southwest Jefferson County, and assist the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission in conducting a recreational-use survey for the Ohio River.

Third, the conference report funds the National Endowment for the Arts at a level of $175 million, and the National Endowment for the Humanities at $178 million. I have spoken before in support of these agencies, because on balance, I believe they are a net plus for our Nation and for my community. NEA grants have recently been awarded to the Louisville Orchestra and Stage One—Louisville's children's theater. Both of these arts organizations are nationally renown. And, an NEH grant helped fund the Kentucky Chautauqua Festival, which brought the history and lore of Kentucky to every corner of my State last summer.

Mr. Speaker, again, I commend the good work reflected in this conference report and urge its passage by the House.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman Yates and the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee for their work in crafting the fiscal year 1993 Interior appropriations bill. The conference report shows a commitment to fiscal responsibility while also meeting essential Federal commitments to native Americans, energy research, national parks, and natural resource management.

I point out to my colleagues that the conference agreement funds these programs at a level $500 million under the House bill, $375 million below the 1992 level, and $74 million less than the President's request. This reflects the kind of restraint we need to help reduce the deficit. Within these constraints, the conferees have given increased attention to priority items.

For example, I am pleased that the conferees were able to increase funding above the President's request for the following Indian programs: tribal colleges $1 million; United Tribes Technical College, $460,000; Indian priority system accounts for tribal services, $19 million; the Aberdeen area regional youth alcoholism treatment center, $3.2 million; and staffing and facilities at the new hospital on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, over $2 million.

This is not a year in which Congress was able to expand funding for most areas of energy research and development, but this bill will assist North Dakota institutions and energy industries to continue important research for

improved and cleaner use of coal and other fuels, and for continued advancement in methods of reclaiming mine sites.

The bill provides $1.5 million for the National Mine Land Reclamation Center, and a third of that will fund continuing work at the University of North Dakota on reclamation of western mining sites. The bill also provides $2 million for continuation of the basic energy research program conducted cooperatively by the Energy and Environmental Research Center at UND and the Department of Energy.

The appropriations for "refuge revenue sharing," which are funds for replacing the tax revenue local governments lose when the Federal Government buys land for wildlife refuges, was set at $11.8 million, the same as for 1992. Congress has a commitment to replace those lost revenues to local government, and the dollars appropriated represent 84 percent of meeting that commitment. We must try to raise that level next year.

In conclusion, the conference report manifests fiscal responsibility while continuing crucial programs that enjoy wide support.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOPTION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 365, MAKING CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 5503

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to House Resolution 581, House Concurrent Resolution 365, introduced today by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], on behalf of himself and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], is considered to have been adopted.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 365 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 365

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5503) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes", the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections, namely:

In the paragraph under the heading "Land Acquisition", Bureau of Land Management, after the figure "$28,034,000" insert ", of which $5,000,000 is for the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation and $23,034,000 is";

In the second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions", Bureau of Land Management, after the word "made" delete ", in fiscal year 1993 and thereafter," and after the word "expended" delete "for surveys of Federal lands and on a reimbursable basis for surveys of Federal lands and";

In the paragraph under the heading "Administrative Provisions", Bureau of Land Management, delete the third proviso;

In the paragraph under the heading "Operation of the National Park System", National Park Service, after the figure "$992,431,000" insert ", subject to authorization";

In the paragraph under the heading "National Recreation and Preservation", National Park Service, after the figure "$23,765,000" insert ", subject to authorization";

In the paragraph under the heading "Construction", National Park Service, after the figure "$231,801,000" insert ", subject to authorization";

In the second proviso under the heading "Construction", National Park Service, after the word "Illinois" insert ", subject to authorization";

In the paragraph under the heading "John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts", National Park Service, after the figure "$20,806,000" insert ", subject to authorization"; and

Under the heading "Administrative Provisions, Forest Service" delete the following paragraph:

"As a pilot effort, for the purpose of achieving ecologically defensible management practices, the Kaibab, Dixie, Idaho Panhandle, and Coconino National Forests and the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit are authorized to apply the value or a reasonable portion of the value of timber removed under a stewardship end result contract as an offset against the cost of stewardship services received including, but not limited to, site preparation, replanting, silviculture programs, recreation, wildlife habitat enhancement, and other multiple-use enhancements on selected projects: *Provided*, That timber removed shall count toward meeting the Congressional expectations for the annual timber harvest.".

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material and tabular information on H.R. 5503 and the conference report thereon just agreed to by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 0930

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair will take 1-minute on each side, at least one.

HOUSE SHOULD OVERRIDE MEDICAL LEAVE VETO

(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, U.S. flags are everywhere, the dollar is king, citizens want Cadillacs and Lincolns, American workers are admired, and the American system is held in the highest esteem.

Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about Ohio, Kentucky, California; I am talking about Russia, Mr. Speaker.

Even though the economy in America is in shambles, Europe and the rest of the world looks at our model. How nice it would be, in addition to having this model that looks so good to the rest of the world, that we begin to deal with the loss of manufacturing jobs, the tremendous growth in unemployment, the problems that exist in the workplace, and we could start today by overriding the President's veto on family medical leave.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for a kinder and gentler America and certainly an administration that promotes same.

UPDATE ON THE HAMILTON/GRADISON COMMITTEE

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let me just say it has been 55 days now since the Hamilton-Gradison Committee on Congressional Reform was established. We on the Republican side have appointed our members. We are ready to go.

I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, have not yet appointed your members.

Mr. Speaker, time is waning, and we need to be able to act. We need to be able to give some guidance to both the Democratic caucus and the Republican conference. I would hope we could get these appointments made so that our committee could officially meet and begin the work of trying to reform this House.

REQUEST TO PROVIDE FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 553, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 553) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes. Debate on the joint resolution shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moakley] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend,

the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for the purpose of debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution—Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution is withdrawn.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair will once again entertain requests by Members for 1-minute.

BUSH SPENDS HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS TO SHIP OUR JOBS OVERSEAS

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I was, frankly, stunned watching "60 Minutes" earlier this week. According to "60 Minutes," under the Bush and Reagan administrations the United States Agency for International Development has spent millions of dollars to encourage American firms to move to Central America. It sounds unbelievable. United States taxpayers pay for an ad campaign that encouraged businesses to move jobs to El Salvador. One of the ads went like this:

> Rosa Martinez produced apparel for U.S. markets on her sewing machine in El Salvador. You can hire her for 57 cents an hour. Rosa is more than just colorful. She and her co-workers are known for their industriousness. They make El Salvador one of the best buys. The ad was funded by FUSADES, an El Savadoran export promotion group that is almost entirely funded by U.S. tax dollars, and that has offices in the U.S. seeking to woo American firms. In a 1991 agreement, U.S. AID instructed FUSADES that within the U.S., the regions with the greatest concentration of relevant firms are likely to be in the Northeast and Southeast.

Mr. Speaker, the whole idea of U.S. tax dollars being spent to encourage U.S. firms to move jobs offshore is absolutely unconscionable.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, U.S. law prohibits duty-free imports from countries that violate fair labor standards, such as the right to organize unions. But a U.S. Government official taped by a "60 Minutes" hidden camera said that managers of the export zone will screen out potential workers who might want to join a labor union. Half a dozen managers of firms operating out of a U.S.-financed zone told CBS that workers who want to join unions can be fired on the spot, and their names placed on blacklists.

I think it is time for this administration and this President to explain to the American people what in the world they are doing with U.S. tax dollars. This is an outrage, Mr. Speaker, and it should be stopped.

Today I plan to introduce legislation that will make it clear that no employees of any U.S. Government agency will be spending tax dollars to encourage business to move jobs from this country offshore anywhere in the world. It is time this nonsense ends.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to try to alert the Members to a changing format here on the floor.

We were supposed to take up as the first order of business this morning a stopgap continuing resolution to keep the Government funded for 5 days. That was pulled. We then went to the rule on the Interior bill. We were then supposed to take up the continuing resolution rule after that, and now I understand that is no longer certain.

I do not mean to put you, Mr. Speaker, on the spot in any way, but the Members are calling in here wanting to know in what order legislation is going to be taken up this morning, so they can plan accordingly.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the reason why the schedule is being changed is that the Speaker wants to meet with 67 House Democrats to try to convince them to vote against the gentleman's effort to bring line-item veto onto the floor.

Sixty-seven House Democrats have indicated they would like to have a vote out here on the floor of this item. And the Speaker is attempting to dissuade them from voting with the gentleman in a few minutes on that particular matter. So, evidently, the House business is being held up so that the Democrats can try to muscle their people into line, not to support the line-item-veto effort that will be coming out or coming up on the floor a little bit later.

I just think the gentleman ought to understand that we are probably operating here on a basis of whether or not the proper conversations have taken place.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for his observations. Again, I realize it is the Speaker's prerogative, but it is also the Speaker's obligation to let the membership know what is going on.

I would withhold any kind of action and just hope that the Speaker could have someone from the leadership come to the floor and explain to us what is going to take place for the next couple of hours. I thank the Speaker for his time.

□ 0940

RAISING TAXES

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

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, it looks like we are going to have a Presidential debate after all, let us hope so. Whether we have two or four, let us have them so the American public can have an insight into what these two or three candidates stand for.

I have noticed that Mr. Clinton is running around the country saying he wants to raise taxes, but only on the rich. When I have heard that plea coming from my colleagues in the House over the years that I have been privileged to serve here, and when any American taxpayer hears that some politician wants to raise taxes on the rich, you better have that person define the rich, because it has been my experience and I think this applies to Mr. Clinton, that Mr. Clinton and the Democrat liberals define a rich person as anybody with a job. If you work for a living in America and Bill Clinton makes his way into the White House, my friends, you are going to be in the class known as the stuckees if you are working for a living, because in the definition of liberal Democracts a rich person is anybody who works for a living.

I hope the American people will realize that we are in this fiscal mess not because we are undertaxed as a people, but because Congress, this institution, is spending too much money. If we want to get rid of these rascals who run this place, we have to identify those big spenders, and the National Taxpayers Union has a list of them. Those big spenders need to be retired, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, to save this Nation from national bankruptcy.

THE PRESIDENT AND CRIME

(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, once again the President has proven that when it comes to crime, he can "talk-talk," but he cannot walk the walk.

When the President talks about crime, all he can do is repeat his favorite four-letter word, "veto." That is what he has been threatening to do for almost a year to the tough anticrime bill which includes the Brady bill. He has proved once again he would rather "talk-talk" and kowtow to the NRA than do what is right for the American people.

What he does not tell you is that the crime bill has the support of nearly every single law enforcement organization in the country. The cop on the

beat knows he is outmanned and outgunned. Illegal firearms flow as freely in the inner cities as from a water tap.

What has the President done? He tried to toss the Brady bill behind bars and throw away the key.

Now the President says he wants stiffer penalties for carjacking. The House will soon take a tough comprehensive auto theft bill up that I introduced, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], 6 months ago. It will make carjacking a Federal offense, but it goes further, taking the profit out of car theft, requiring parts labeling, something again backed by almost every police organization.

Where does the President stand on the bill? Right behind the roadblock. He has not even announced where he stands.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, it is time for the President to wake up to help get the Brady bill passed, help fight car theft, give the police the tools they need to win the war on crime. Only in that way will law-abiding citizens be able to come out of their homes without fear, without being caught in the political crossfire that envelops this town.

EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE PRODUCTS OF ROMANIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 512.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 512, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 88, nays 283, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 436]

YEAS—88

Alexander
Allard
Allen
Anderson
Anthony
Archer
Armey
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bellenson
Boehner
Broomfield
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Conyers
DeLay
Duncan
Fascell
Feighan
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Guarini
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hastert
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Kennelly
Kolbe
Leach
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Marlenee
Martin
Matsui
McDade
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (OH)
Mrazek
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Oakar
Orton
Oxley
Payne (VA)
Pease
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Quillen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Schaefer
Schiff
Shays
Shuster
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Sundquist
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walsh
Whitten
Wolf
Wylie

NAYS—283

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Ballenger
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Inhofe
James
Johnson (TX)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Porter
Poshard
Pursell
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Waters
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—61

Aspin
Baker
Barnard
Bilirakis
Camp
Chandler
Coleman (TX)
Condit
Donnelly
Dymally
Engel
Espy
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Gibbons
Hancock
Hertel
Holloway
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jefferson
Kaptur
Kasich
Klug
Kopetski
LaFalce
LaRocco
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
McCrery
Morrison
Nagle
Olin
Olver
Patterson
Perkins
Price
Rahall
Ray
Riggs
Roberts
Roe
Sanders
Santorum
Shaw
Sikorski
Smith (FL)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Torricelli
Traxler
Washington
Waxman
Weber
Wheat
Wise
Young (AK)

□ 1010

Messrs. MURPHY, COMBEST, NATCHER, MONTGOMERY, FAZIO, DINGELL, DURBIN, DANNEMEYER, HARRIS, McDERMOTT, SWIFT, SYNAR, DOOLEY, STUMP, MILLER of Washington, BLILEY, MARTINEZ, GLICKMAN, and UPTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ROSE, SMITH of Iowa, GUARINI, and HASTERT changed their 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

Mrs. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the record of votes taken does not show me as having voted on House Joint Resolution 512, a joint resolution to approve the extension of nondiscriminatory most-favored-nation treatment to the products of Romania, rollcall No. 436. The RECORD should state that I voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the record show that on today, September 30, 1992, I was unavoidably detained due to mechanical difficulties on my flight back from Michigan and that the RECORD reflect that had I been present I would have voted "no" on rollcall vote 436 and "no" on rollcall vote 437.

□ 1012

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the majority leader in a colloquy about the schedule for the rest of the day.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

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

Mr. Speaker, this would be a good point to give Members a sense of what to expect for the rest of the day in terms of schedule.

In a moment the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] will make a unanimous consent request to take up the D.C. appropriations bill. My understanding is that there is not likely to be a vote on that.

We will then go on to House Joint Resolution 553, the short-term continuing appropriation. There will be a rule and then the vote on the bill, then on to a possible motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 11, the Revenue Act; then a vote on overriding the President's veto of H.R. 5318, the conditional extension of most-favored-nation status for China, and then the conference report on S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act; and then on to a vote on overriding the President's veto of S. 5, the Family and Medical Leave Act.

After that there will be possible votes or votes on four suspension bills: H.R. 3281, National Air and Space Museum Expansion Site Selection; S. 2681, Native Hawaiian Health Care; H.R. 2548, Lincoln Interpretive Center; and S. 1528, Mimbres Culture Monument.

We should be finished no later than 9 o'clock. It could be earlier than that. We would hope for an earlier time, but I think if Members are trying to plan their schedules they should be aware that we could go until that point this evening.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the majority leader. Would he just again, while the Members are here, explain what is going to happen with the D.C. appropriations conference report and what votes they might expect in the next 15 or 20 minutes to a half-hour?

Mr. GEPHARDT. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not expect a vote on the D.C. appropriation bill. We will then have an hour's debate on the rule on the continuing appropriation, so Members could expect the next vote at the end of that period of time.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the majority leader. There will be a vote on the rule for the continuing resolution for the purpose of bringing up a line-item veto provision. I thank the majority leader for explaining the schedule.

H.R. 5517, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1992—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 5517, a bill providing appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for the District of Columbia.

Although I do not object to the funding provided by the bill, its language concerning the use of funds for abortion is unacceptable. I have stated my intention to veto any bill that does not contain language that prohibits the use of all congressionally appropriated funds to pay for abortions except when the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term. The limitation I propose is identical to the one included in the District of Columbia Appropriations Acts for FY 1989, FY 1990, FY 1991, and FY 1992.

H.R. 5517 would place such a limitation on the use of Federal funds to pay for abortion. However, the bill would permit congressionally appropriated local funds to be used for abortions on demand. As a matter of law, the use of local funds in the District of Columbia must be approved by the Congress and the President through enactment of an appropriations act. Under these circumstances, the failure of H.R. 5517 to prohibit the use of all funds appropriated by the bill to pay for abortions, except in the limited circumstances mentioned above, is unacceptable.

From the outset of my Administration, I have repeatedly stated my deep personal concern about the tragedy in America of abortion on demand. As a Nation, we must protect the unborn. H.R. 5517 does not provide such protection. I am therefore returning H.R. 5517 without my approval.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1992.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message, together with the accompanying bill, H.R. 5517, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on the veto of the bill, H.R. 5517.

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

There was no objection.

H.R. 6056, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order at any time to consider in the House, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, the bill (H.R. 6056) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, that debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO], and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to commit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the bill (H.R. 6056) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 6056 is as follows:

H.R. 6056

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

FISCAL YEAR 1993 APPROPRIATIONS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For payment to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, $624,854,400, as authorized by section 502(a) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, Public Law 93-198, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 47-3406.1).

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO RETIREMENT FUNDS

For the Federal contribution to the Police Officers and Fire Fighters', Teachers', and Judges' Retirement Funds, as authorized by the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act, approved November 17, 1979 (93 Stat. 866; Public Law 96-122), $52,070,000.

No funds made available pursuant to any provision of this Act shall be used to implement or enforce any system of registration of unmarried, cohabiting couples whether they are homosexual, lesbian, or heterosexual, including but not limited to registration for the purpose of extending employment, health, or governmental benefits to such couples on the same basis that such benefits are extended to legally married couples; nor shall any funds made available pursuant to any provision of this Act otherwise be used to implement or enforce D.C. Act 9-188, signed by the Mayor of the District of Columbia on April 15, 1992.

PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURATION

For payment to the District of Columbia in lieu of reimbursements for expenses incurred in connection with Presidential inauguration activities, $5,514,000, as authorized by section 737(b) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, Public Law 93-198, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 1-1803).

TRAUMA CARE FUND

For a Federal contribution to establish the Trauma Care Fund, $5,561,600, which shall be used to reimburse the actual cost of uncompensated care provided at Level I trauma centers in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no trauma center may receive an amount greater than its proportionate share of the total available in the fund, in any fiscal year, as determined by its proportionate share of total uncompensated care among Level I trauma centers in the District of Columbia for the most recent year such data is available: *Provided further*, That in no case may any trauma center receive more than 35 percent of the total amount available in any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That these funds are available for obligation and expenditure upon enactment of this Act and shall be subject to any modifications that may be enacted in authorizing legislation.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The following amounts are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

Governmental direction and support, $115,591,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,500 for the Mayor, $2,500 for the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, and $2,500 for the City Administrator shall be available from this appropriation for expenditures for official purposes: *Provided further*, That $10,200,000 of the revenues realized from the "Water and Sewer Utility Payment in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1992" shall be available for the Mayor's youth and crime initiative, but shall not be obligated or expended until the Mayor submits to the Council a plan for the allocation and use of the funds: *Provided further*, That any program fees collected from the issuance of debt shall be available for the payment of expenses of the debt management program of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby appropriated from the earnings of the applicable retirement funds $10,292,000 to pay legal, management, investment, and other fees and administrative expenses of the District of Columbia Retirement Board: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide to the Congress and to the Council of the District of Columbia a quarterly report of the allocations of charges by fund and of expenditures of all funds: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia Retirement Board shall provide the Mayor, for transmittal to the Council of the District of Columbia, an item accounting of the planned use of appropriated funds in time for each annual budget submission and the actual use of such funds in time for each annual audited financial report.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

Economic development and regulation, $102,888,000: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency, established by section 201 of the District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency Act, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-135; D.C. Code, sec. 45-2111), based upon its capability of repayments as determined each year by the Council of the District of Columbia from the Finance Agency's annual audited financial statements to the Council of the District of Columbia, shall repay to the general fund an amount equal to the appropriated administrative costs plus interest at a rate of four percent per annum for a term of 15 years, with a deferral of payments for the first three years: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing provision, the obligation to repay all or part of the amounts due shall be subject to the rights of the owners of any bonds or notes issued by the Finance Agency and shall be repaid to the District of Columbia government only from available operating revenues of the Finance Agency that are in excess of the amounts required for debt service, reserve funds, and operating expenses: *Provided further*, That upon commencement of the debt service payments, such payments shall be deposited into the general fund of the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Public safety and justice, including purchase of 135 passenger-carrying vehicles for replacement only, including 130 for police-type use and five for fire-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, $945,551,000, together with $1,523,000 to be derived by transfer from the object classes providing personal services under the appropriation heading "Governmental Direction and Support": *Provided*, That the Metropolitan Police Department shall maintain a force of not less than 4,889 officers and members: *Provided further*, That $188,200,000 shall be allocated for the Police Officers and Fire Fighters' Retirement Fund and $4,300,000 shall be allocated for the Judges' Retirement Fund: *Provided further*, That the Metropolitan Police Department is authorized to replace not to exceed 25 passenger-carrying vehicles and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger-carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicle exceeds three-fourths of the cost of the replacement: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 shall be available from this appropriation for the Chief of Police for the prevention and detection of crime: *Provided further*, That the Metropolitan Police Department shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on efforts to increase efficiency and improve the professionalism in the department: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, or Mayor's Order 86-45, issued March 18, 1986, the Metropolitan Police Department's delegated small purchase authority shall be $500,000: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia government may not require the Metropolitan Police Department to submit to any other procurement review process, or to obtain the approval of or be restricted in any manner by any official or employee of the District of Columbia government, for purchases that do not exceed $500,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to pay any full-duty employee of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who is detailed for more than 30 days annually from his or her assigned position in the Firefighting Division or Emergency Ambulance Division to an unfunded or unauthorized position with the exception of not to exceed four (4) full-duty employees who may be detailed for not to exceed 100 days annually to the Fire Department Training Academy solely for teaching purposes: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the District of Columbia Criminal Justice Act, approved September 3, 1974 (88 Stat. 1090; Public Law 93-412; D.C. Code, sec. 11-2601 et seq.), for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, shall be available for obligations incurred under the Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1975: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the District of Columbia Neglect Representation Equity Act of 1984, effective March 13, 1985 (D.C. Law 5-129; D.C. Code, sec. 16-2304), for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, shall be available for obligations incurred under the Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1985: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for expenses under the District of Columbia Guardianship, Protection Proceedings, and Durable Power of Attorney Act of 1986, effective February 27, 1987 (D.C. Law 6-204; D.C. Code, sec. 21-2060), for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, shall be available for obligations incurred under the Act in each fiscal year since inception in fiscal year 1989: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,500 for the Chief Judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, $1,500 for the Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and $1,500 for the Executive Officer of the District of Columbia Courts shall be available from this appropriation for official purposes: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall operate and maintain a free, 24-hour telephone information service whereby residents of the area surrounding Lorton prison in Fairfax County, Virginia, can promptly obtain information from District of Columbia government officials on all disturbances at the prison, including escapes, fires, riots, and similar incidents: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia government shall also take steps to publicize the availability of the 24-hour telephone information service among the residents of the area surrounding the Lorton prison: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 of this appropriation shall be used to reimburse Fairfax County, Virginia, and Prince William County, Virginia, for expenses incurred by the counties during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, in relation to the Lorton prison complex: *Provided further*, That such reimbursements shall be paid in all instances in which the District requests the counties to provide police, fire, rescue, and related services to help deal with escapes, riots, and similar disturbances involving the prison: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to implement any staffing plan for the District of Columbia Fire Department that includes the elimination of any positions for Administrative Assistants to the Battalion Fire Chiefs of the Fire Fighting

Division of the Department: *Provided further*, That the Mayor shall reimburse the District of Columbia National Guard for expenses incurred in connection with services that are performed in emergencies by the National Guard in a militia status and are requested by the Mayor, in amounts that shall be jointly determined and certified as due and payable for these services by the Mayor and the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be necessary for reimbursement to the District of Columbia National Guard under the preceding proviso shall be available from this appropriation, and the availability of the sums shall be deemed as constituting payment in advance for the emergency services involved.

PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

Public education system, including the development of national defense education programs, $713,592,000, to be allocated as follows: $513,552,000 for the public schools of the District of Columbia, of which not to exceed $1,600,000 shall be paid within fifteen (15) days of the enactment of this Act directly to the District of Columbia Public Schools Foundation for the continued implementation of the urban model demonstration initiative in mathematics, science, and technology known as the Anacostia Project ($1,000,000) and for the continued operation of the Cooperative Employment Education Project (not to exceed $600,000); $98,800,000 shall be allocated for the District of Columbia Teachers' Retirement Fund; $71,995,000 for the University of the District of Columbia, of which $2,000,000 shall be derived from revenues realized from the "Water and Sewer Utility Payment in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1992"; $20,978,000 for the Public Library, of which $200,000 shall be transferred to the Children's Museum; $3,527,000 for the Commission on the Arts and Humanities; $4,500,000 for the District of Columbia School of Law; and $240,000 for the Education Licensure Commission: *Provided*, That the public schools of the District of Columbia are authorized to accept not to exceed 31 motor vehicles for exclusive use in the driver education program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,500 for the Superintendent of Schools, $2,500 for the President of the University of the District of Columbia, and $2,000 for the Public Librarian shall be available from this appropriation for expenditures for official purposes: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available to subsidize the education of nonresidents of the District of Columbia at the University of the District of Columbia, unless the Board of Trustees of the University of the District of Columbia adopts, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, a tuition rate schedule that will establish the tuition rate for nonresident students at a level no lower than the nonresident tuition rate charged at comparable public institutions of higher education in the metropolitan area.

HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES

Human support services, $886,777,000: *Provided*, That $19,015,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: *Provided further*, That the District shall not provide free government services such as water, sewer, solid waste disposal or collection, utilities, maintenance, repairs, or similar services to any legally constituted private nonprofit organization (as defined in section 411(5) of Public Law 100-77, approved July 22, 1987) providing emergency shelter services in the District, if the District would not be qualified to receive reimbursement pursuant to the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Act, approved July 22, 1987 (101 Stat. 485; Public Law 100-77; 42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.).

PUBLIC WORKS

Public works, including rental of one passenger-carrying vehicle for use by the Mayor and three passenger-carrying vehicles for use by the Council of the District of Columbia and purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles for replacement only, $227,622,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for collecting ashes or miscellaneous refuse from hotels and places of business.

WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER FUND

For the Washington Convention Center Fund, $13,250,000.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

For reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned in compliance with An Act to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896; Public Law 79-648); section 1 of An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City, approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183; Public Law 85-451; D.C. Code, sec. 9-219); section 4 of An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to plan, construct, operate, and maintain a sanitary sewer to connect the Dulles International Airport with the District of Columbia system, approved June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 211; Public Law 86-515); sections 723 and 743(f) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, approved December 24, 1973, as amended (87 Stat. 821; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-321, note; 91 Stat. 1156; Public Law 95-131; D.C. Code, sec. 9-219, note), including interest as required thereby, $291,299,000.

REPAYMENT OF GENERAL FUND RECOVERY DEBT

For the purpose of eliminating the $331,589,000 general fund accumulated deficit as of September 30, 1990, $38,342,000, as authorized by section 461(a) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, approved December 24, 1973, as amended (105 Stat. 540; Public Law 102-106; D.C. Code, sec. 47-321(a)).

OPTICAL AND DENTAL BENEFITS

For optical and dental costs for nonunion employees, $3,423,000.

INAUGURAL EXPENSES

For reimbursement for necessary expenses incurred in connection with Presidential inauguration activities as authorized by section 737(b) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, Public Law 93-198, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 824; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1803), $5,514,000, which shall be apportioned by the Mayor within the various appropriation headings in this Act.

FACILITIES RENT/LEASES

For the purpose of funding costs associated with the rental and leasing of facilities for governmental purposes, $16,682,000.

TRAUMA CARE FUND

For the purpose of establishing the Trauma Care Fund, $5,561,600, which shall be used to reimburse the actual cost of uncompensated care provided at Level I trauma centers in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no trauma center may receive an amount greater than its proportionate share of the total available in the fund, in any fiscal year, as determined by its proportionate share of total uncompensated care among Level I trauma centers in the District of Columbia for the most recent year such data is available: *Provided further*, That in no case may any trauma center receive more than 35 percent of the total amount available in any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That these funds are available for obligation and expenditure upon enactment of this Act and shall be subject to any modifications that may be enacted in authorizing legislation.

FURLOUGH ADJUSTMENT

Each agency, office, and instrumentality of the District, except the District of Columbia Courts, shall furlough each employee of the respective agency, office, or instrumentality for one day in each month of the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, or a proportional number of hours for part-time employees. The personal services spending authority for each agency, office, and instrumentality subject to this section is reduced in an amount equal to the savings resulting from the employee furloughs required by this section, for a total reduction of $36,000,000. The Council shall enact legislation to implement this section which may include but shall not be limited to procedures to ensure that public health and safety functions are carried out.

WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADJUSTMENTS

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no employee of any agency, office, or instrumentality of the District shall receive within-grade salary increases during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and no time during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993 shall accrue toward the waiting period for advancement to the following rate within the grade. The spending authority for each agency, office and instrumentality is reduced in an amount equal to the savings resulting from the adjustments required by this section, for a total reduction of $13,000,000.

PERSONAL AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES ADJUSTMENTS

The Mayor shall reduce appropriations and expenditures for personal and nonpersonal services in the amount of $30,798,600, within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For construction projects, $393,639,000, as authorized by An Act authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes, approved April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244; Public Law 58-140; D.C. Code, secs. 43-1512 through 43-1519); the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954, approved May 18, 1954 (68 Stat. 101; Public Law 83-364); An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs and to amend provisions of law relating to Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City, approved June 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 183; Public Law 85-451; D.C. Code, secs. 9-219 and 47-3402); section 3(g) of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 686; Public Law 85-692; D.C. Code, sec. 40-805(7)); and the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969, approved December 9, 1969 (83 Stat. 320; Public Law 91-143; D.C. Code, secs. 1-2451, 1-2452, 1-2454, 1-2456, and 1-2457);

including acquisition of sites, preparation of plans and specifications, conducting preliminary surveys, erection of structures, including building improvement and alteration and treatment of grounds, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $13,779,000 shall be available for project management and $12,749,000 for design by the Director of the Department of Public Works or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Mayor: *Provided further*, That funds for use of each capital project implementing agency shall be managed and controlled in accordance with all procedures and limitations established under the Financial Management System: *Provided further*, That all funds provided by this appropriation title shall be available only for the specific projects and purposes intended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing, all authorizations for capital outlay projects, except those projects covered by the first sentence of section 23(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, approved August 23, 1968 (82 Stat. 827; Public Law 90-495; D.C. Code, sec. 7-134, note), for which funds are provided by this appropriation title, shall expire on September 30, 1994, except authorizations for projects as to which funds have been obligated in whole or in part prior to September 30, 1994: *Provided further*, That upon expiration of any such project authorization the funds provided herein for the project shall lapse.

WATER AND SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund, $251,630,000, of which $39,602,000 shall be apportioned and payable to the debt service fund for repayment of loans and interest incurred for capital improvement projects, and $12,200,000 collected as payment in lieu of taxes pursuant to the "Water and Sewer Utility Payment in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1992" shall be transferred to the general fund to provide $10,200,000 for the Mayor's youth and crime initiative, and $2,000,000 for the University of the District of Columbia.

For construction projects, $45,908,000, as authorized by An Act authorizing the laying of water mains and service sewers in the District of Columbia, the levying of assessments therefor, and for other purposes, approved April 22, 1904 (33 Stat. 244; Public Law 58-140; D.C. Code, sec. 43-1512 et seq.): *Provided*, That the requirements and restrictions that are applicable to general fund capital improvement projects and set forth in this Act under the Capital Outlay appropriation title shall apply to projects approved under this appropriation title: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $22,705,000 in water and sewer enterprise fund operating revenues shall be available for pay-as-you-go capital projects.

LOTTERY AND CHARITABLE GAMES ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund, established by the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, approved December 4, 1981 (95 Stat. 1174, 1175; Public Law 97-91), as amended, for the purpose of implementing the Law to Legalize Lotteries, Daily Numbers Games, and Bingo and Raffles for Charitable Purposes in the District of Columbia, effective March 10, 1981 (D.C. Law 3-172; D.C. Code, secs. 2-2501 et seq. and 22-1516 et seq.), $8,450,000, to be derived from non-Federal District of Columbia revenues: *Provided*, That the District of Columbia shall identify the source of funding for this appropriation title from the District's own locally-generated revenues: *Provided further*, That no revenues from Federal sources shall be used to support the operations or activities of the Lottery and Charitable Games Control Board.

CABLE TELEVISION ENTERPRISE FUND

For the Cable Television Enterprise Fund, established by the Cable Television Communications Act of 1981, effective October 22, 1983 (D.C. Law 5-36; D.C. Code, sec. 43-1801 et seq.), $2,500,000.

STARPLEX FUND

For the Starplex Fund, an amount necessary for the expenses incurred by the Armory Board in the exercise of its powers granted by An Act To Establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes, approved June 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 339; D.C. Code, sec. 2-301 et seq.) and the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957, approved September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 619; Public Law 85-300; D.C. Code, sec. 2-321 et seq.), of which $1,847,000 shall be transferred to the general fund: *Provided*, That the Mayor shall submit a budget for the Armory Board for the forthcoming fiscal year as required by section 442(b) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 824; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-301(b)).

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 102. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, all vouchers covering expenditures of appropriations contained in this Act shall be audited before payment by the designated certifying official and the vouchers as approved shall be paid by checks issued by the designated disbursing official.

SEC. 103. Whenever in this Act, an amount is specified within an appropriation for particular purposes or objects of expenditure, such amount, unless otherwise specified, shall be considered as the maximum amount that may be expended for said purpose or object rather than an amount set apart exclusively therefor.

SEC. 104. Appropriations in this Act shall be available, when authorized by the Mayor, for allowances for privately-owned automobiles and motorcycles used for the performance of official duties at rates established by the Mayor: *Provided*, That such rates shall not exceed the maximum prevailing rates for such vehicles as prescribed in the Federal Property Management Regulations 101-7 (Federal Travel Regulations).

SEC. 105. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for expenses of travel and for the payment of dues of organizations concerned with the work of the District of Columbia government, when authorized by the Mayor: *Provided*, That the Council of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Courts may expend such funds without authorization by the Mayor.

SEC. 106. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making refunds and for the payment of judgments that have been entered against the District of Columbia government: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as modifying or affecting the provisions of section 11(c)(3) of title XII of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, approved March 31, 1956 (70 Stat. 78; Public Law 84-460; D.C. Code, sec 47-1812.11(c)(3)).

SEC. 107. Appropriations in this Act shall be available for the payment of public assistance without reference to the requirement of section 544 of the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1982, effective April 6, 1982 (D.C. Law 4-101; D.C. Code, sec. 3-205.44), and for the non-Federal share of funds necessary to qualify for Federal assistance under the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, approved July 31, 1968 (82 Stat. 462; Public Law 90-445; 42 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.).

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 109. No funds appropriated in this Act for the District of Columbia government for the operation of educational institutions, the compensation of personnel, or for other educational purposes may be used to permit, encourage, facilitate, or further partisan political activities. Nothing herein is intended to prohibit the availability of school buildings for the use of any community or partisan political group during non-school hours.

SEC. 110. The annual budget for the District of Columbia government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, shall be transmitted to the Congress no later than April 15, 1993.

SEC. 111. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be made available to pay the salary of any employee of the District of Columbia government whose name, title, grade, salary, past work experience, and salary history are not available for inspection by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the Subcommittee on General Services, Federalism, and the District of Columbia of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the Council of the District of Columbia, or their duly authorized representative: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained in this Act shall be made available to pay the salary of any employee of the District of Columbia government whose name and salary are not available for public inspection.

SEC. 112. There are appropriated from the applicable funds of the District of Columbia such sums as may be necessary for making payments authorized by the District of Columbia Revenue Recovery Act of 1977, effective September 23, 1977 (D.C. Law 2-20; D.C. Code, sec. 47-421 et seq.).

SEC. 113. No part of this appropriation shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes or implementation of any policy including boycott designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress or any State legislature.

SEC. 114. None of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

SEC. 115. At the start of the fiscal year, the Mayor shall develop an annual plan, by quarter and by project, for capital outlay borrowings: *Provided*, That within a reasonable time after the close of each quarter, the Mayor shall report to the Council of the District of Columbia and the Congress the actual borrowing and spending progress compared with projections.

SEC. 116. The Mayor shall not borrow any funds for capital projects unless the Mayor has obtained prior approval from the Council of the District of Columbia, by resolution,

identifying the projects and amounts to be financed with such borrowings.

SEC. 117. The Mayor shall not expend any moneys borrowed for capital projects for the operating expenses of the District of Columbia government.

SEC. 118. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended by reprogramming except pursuant to advance approval of the reprogramming granted according to the procedure set forth in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report No. 96-443), which accompanied the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1980, approved October 30, 1979 (93 Stat. 713; Public Law 96-93), as modified in House Report No. 98-265, and in accordance with the Reprogramming Policy Act of 1980, effective September 16, 1980 (D.C. Law 3-100; D.C. Code, sec. 47-361 et seq.).

SEC. 119. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 120. None of the Federal funds provided in this Act shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in the Automobile Fuel Efficiency Act of 1980, approved October 10, 1980 (94 Stat. 1824; Public Law 96-425; 15 U.S.C. 2001(2)), with an Environmental Protection Agency estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to security, emergency rescue, or armored vehicles.

SEC. 121. (a) Notwithstanding section 422(7) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(7)), the City Administrator shall be paid, during any fiscal year, a salary at a rate established by the Mayor, not to exceed the rate established for level IV of the Executive Schedule under 5 U.S.C. 5315.

(b) For purposes of applying any provision of law limiting the availability of funds for payment of salary or pay in any fiscal year, the highest rate of pay established by the Mayor under subsection (a) of this section for any position for any period during the last quarter of calendar year 1992 shall be deemed to be the rate of pay payable for that position for September 30, 1992.

(c) Notwithstanding section 4(a) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 793; Public Law 79-592; D.C. Code, sec. 5-803(a)), the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency shall be paid, during any fiscal year, per diem compensation at a rate established by the Mayor.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the provisions of the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, effective March 3, 1979 (D.C. Law 2-139; D.C. Code, sec. 1-601.1 et seq.), enacted pursuant to section 422(3) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(3)), shall apply with respect to the compensation of District of Columbia employees: *Provided*, That for pay purposes, employees of the District of Columbia government shall not be subject to the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code.

SEC. 123. The Director of the Department of Administrative Services may pay rentals and repair, alter, and improve rented premises, without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the Economy Act of 1932 (Public Law 72-212; 40 U.S.C. 278a), upon a determination by the Director, that by reason of circumstances set forth in such determination, the payment of these rents and the execution of this work, without reference to the limitations of section 322, is advantageous to the District in terms of economy, efficiency, and the District's best interest.

SEC. 124. No later than 30 days after the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Council of the District of Columbia the new fiscal year 1993 revenue estimates as of the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1993. These estimates shall be used in the budget request for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994. The officially revised estimates at midyear shall be used for the midyear report.

SEC. 125. Section 466(b) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 806; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 47-326), as amended, is amended by striking "sold before October 1, 1992" and inserting "sold before October 1, 1993".

SEC. 126. No sole source contract with the District of Columbia government or any agency thereof may be renewed or extended without opening that contract to the competitive bidding process as set forth in section 303 of the District of Columbia Procurement Practices Act of 1985, effective February 21, 1986 (D.C. Law 6-85; D.C. Code, sec. 1-1183.3), except that the District of Columbia Public Schools may renew or extend sole source contracts for which competition is not feasible or practical, provided that the determination as to whether to invoke the competitive bidding process has been made in accordance with duly promulgated Board of Education rules and procedures.

SEC. 127. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize any office, agency or entity to expend funds for programs or functions for which a reorganization plan is required but has not been approved by the Council pursuant to section 422(12) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 790; Public Law 93-198; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(12)) and the Governmental Reorganization Procedures Act of 1981, effective October 17, 1981 (D.C. Law 4-42; D.C. Code, secs. 1-299.1 to 1-299.7). Appropriations made by this Act for such programs or functions are conditioned on the approval by the Council, prior to October 1, 1992, of the required reorganization plans, including but not limited to: the Office of Tourism, the Office of Banking and Financial Institutions, and the transfer of the functions of the Unclaimed Property Unit within the Department of Finance and Revenue to the Office of the Controller.

SEC. 128. For purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, approved December 12, 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended, the term "program, project, and activity" shall be synonymous with and refer specifically to each account appropriating Federal funds in this Act, and any sequestration order shall be applied to each of the accounts rather than to the aggregate total of those accounts: *Provided*, That sequestration orders shall not be applied to any account that is specifically exempted from sequestration by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, approved December 12, 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended.

SEC. 129. In the event a sequestration order is issued pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, approved December 12, 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended, after the amounts appropriated to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year involved have been paid to the District of Columbia, the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall pay to the Secretary of the Treasury, within 15 days after receipt of a request therefor from the Secretary of the Treasury, such amounts as are sequestered by the order: *Provided*, That the sequestration percentage specified in the order shall be applied proportionately to each of the Federal appropriation accounts in this Act that are not specifically exempted from sequestration by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, approved December 12, 1985 (99 Stat. 1037; Public Law 99-177), as amended.

SEC. 130. Section 133(e) of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1990, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1992" and inserting "December 31, 1993".

SEC. 131. For the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, the District of Columbia shall pay interest on its quarterly payments to the United States that are made more than 60 days from the date of receipt of an itemized statement from the Federal Bureau of Prisons of amounts due for housing District of Columbia convicts in Federal penitentiaries for the preceding quarter.

SEC. 132. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to provide for the salaries, expenses, or other costs associated with the offices of United States Senator or United States Representative under section 4(d) of the District of Columbia Statehood Constitutional Convention Initiative of 1979, effective March 10, 1981 (D.C. Law 3-171; D.C. Code, sec. 1-113(d)).

SEC. 133. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to operate, after June 1, 1993, the juvenile detention facility known as the Cedar Knoll Facility. The Mayor shall transmit a plan and timetable for closing the Cedar Knoll Facility to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by January 15, 1993.

SEC. 134. (a) An entity of the District of Columbia government may accept and use a gift or donation during fiscal year 1993 if—

(1) the Mayor approves the acceptance and use of the gift or donation; and

(2) the entity uses the gift or donation to carry out its authorized functions or duties.

(b) Each entity of the District of Columbia government shall keep accurate and detailed records of the acceptance and use of any gift or donation under subsection (a) of this section, and shall make such records available for audit and public inspection.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "entity of the District of Columbia government" includes an independent agency of the District of Columbia.

(d) This section shall not apply to the District of Columbia Board of Education, which may, pursuant to the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, accept and use gifts to the public schools without prior approval by the Mayor.

SEC. 135. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to issue or renew a registration certificate or identification tag for any motor vehicle if unpaid fines, penalties and other costs for traffic violations in the District of Columbia are outstanding against any registered owner of such vehicle or against any authorized user of any vehicle of such registered owner.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to an issuance or renewal if the Director of the Department of Public Works of the District of Columbia—

(1) determines that special circumstances require a waiver of such subsection with respect to such issuance or renewal;

(2) issues such waiver in writing, setting forth such circumstances; and

(3) submits a written notification of such waiver and circumstances to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate and to the governmental agency having authority to approve such issuance or renewal.

SEC. 136. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the District of Columbia to impose, implement, collect, administer, transfer, or enforce a payment in lieu of taxes on the Water and Sewer Utility Administration that would increase payments required of suburban jurisdictions in Maryland or Virginia under the Blue Plains Intermunicipal Agreement of 1985.

SEC. 137. (a) LEGAL DOMICILE.—The first section of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.", approved August 11, 1939 (referred to as "the Act"), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The District of Columbia shall be the legal domicile of the corporation.".

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The corporation shall be licensed and regulated by the District of Columbia in accordance with the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia.".

(2) REPEAL.—The Act is amended by striking section 7.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT OF REGULATORY COSTS BY THE CORPORATION.—The Act (as amended by section (b) of this Act) is amended by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

"SEC. 7. The corporation shall reimburse the District of Columbia for the costs of insurance regulation (including financial and market conduct examinations) of the corporation and its affiliates and subsidiaries by the District of Columbia.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and expire on September 30, 1993, or upon the enactment of specific authorizing legislation.

SEC. 138. Notwithstanding any other law, the District of Columbia Board of Elections and Ethics shall place on the ballot, without alteration, at a general, special, or primary election to be held within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the following initiative:

SHORT TITLE

Mandatory Life Imprisonment or Death Penalty for Murder in the District of Columbia.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

This initiative measure, if passed, would increase the penalty for first degree murder in the District of Columbia.

A person convicted of this crime would be sentenced either to death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

LEGISLATIVE TEXT

The legislative text of the initiative shall read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Electors of the District of Columbia, that this measure be cited as the "Mandatory Life Imprisonment or Death Penalty for Murder in the District of Columbia".

"Section 801 of the Act entitled 'An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia', approved March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code 22-2404(a)), is amended—

"(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) The punishment of murder in the first degree shall be life imprisonment without the possibility of parole, or death.';

"(2) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (b); and

"(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"'(c) PENALTY.—A person who commits an offense under subsection (a) shall be punished by death or life imprisonment. A sentence of death under this subsection may be imposed in accordance with the procedures provided in subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), and (l).

"'(d) MITIGATING FACTORS.—In determining whether to recommend a sentence of death, the jury shall consider whether any aspect of the defendant's character, background, or record or any circumstance of the offense that the defendant may proffer as a mitigating factor exists, including the following factors:

"'(1) MENTAL CAPACITY.—The defendant's mental capacity to appreciate the wrongfulness of his conduct or to conform his conduct to the requirements of law was significantly impaired.

"'(2) DURESS.—The defendant was under unusual and substantial duress.

"'(3) PARTICIPATION IN OFFENSE MINOR.—The defendant is punishable as a principal (pursuant to section 908 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (D.C. Code 22-105)) in the offense, which was committed by another, but the defendant's participation was relatively minor.

"'(e) AGGRAVATING FACTORS.—In determining whether to recommend a sentence of death, the jury shall consider any aggravating factor for which notice has been provided under subsection (f), including the following factors:

"'(1) KILLING IN FURTHERANCE OF DRUG TRAFFICKING.—The defendant engaged in the conduct resulting in death in the course of or in furtherance of drug trafficking activity.

"'(2) KILLING IN THE COURSE OF OTHER SERIOUS VIOLENT CRIMES.—The defendant engaged in the conduct resulting in death in the course of committing or attempting to commit an offense involving robbery, burglary, sexual abuse, kidnapping, or arson.

"'(3) MULTIPLE KILLINGS OR ENDANGERMENT OF OTHERS.—The defendant committed more than one offense under this section, or in committing the offense knowingly created a grave risk of death to one or more persons in addition to the victim of the offense.

"'(4) INVOLVEMENT OF FIREARM.—During and in relation to the commission of the offense, the defendant used or possessed a firearm (as defined in paragraph (6) of D.C. Law 1-85 (D.C. Code 6-2302(6))).

"'(5) PREVIOUS CONVICTION OF VIOLENT FELONY.—The defendant has previously been convicted of an offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of more than 1 year that involved the use or attempted or threatened use of force against a person or that involved sexual abuse.

"'(6) KILLING WHILE INCARCERATED OR UNDER SUPERVISION.—The defendant at the time of the offense was confined in or had escaped from a jail, prison, or other correctional or detention facility, was on pre-trial release, or was on probation, parole, supervised release, or other post-conviction conditional release.

"'(7) HEINOUS, CRUEL OR DEPRAVED MANNER OF COMMISSION.—The defendant committed the offense in an especially heinous, cruel, or depraved manner in that it involved torture or serious physical abuse of the victim.

"'(8) PROCUREMENT OF THE OFFENSE BY PAYMENT.—The defendant procured the commission of the offense by payment, or promise of payment, of anything of pecuniary value.

"'(9) COMMISSION OF THE OFFENSE FOR PECUNIARY GAIN.—The defendant committed the offense as consideration for receiving, or in the expectation of receiving or obtaining, anything of pecuniary value.

"'(10) SUBSTANTIAL PLANNING AND PREMEDITATION.—The defendant committed the offense after substantial planning and premeditation.

"'(11) VULNERABILITY OF VICTIM.—The victim was particularly vulnerable due to old age, youth, or infirmity.

"'(12) KILLING OF PUBLIC SERVANT.—The defendant committed the offense against a public servant—

"'(A) while the public servant was engaged in the performance of his or her official duties;

"'(B) because of the performance of the public servant's official duties; or

"'(C) because of the public servant's status as a public servant.

"'(13) KILLING TO INTERFERE WITH OR RETALIATE AGAINST WITNESS.—The defendant committed the offense in order to prevent or inhibit any person from testifying or providing information concerning an offense, or to retaliate against any person for testifying or providing such information.

"'(f) NOTICE OF INTENT TO SEEK DEATH PENALTY.—If the government intends to seek the death penalty for an offense under this section, the attorney for the government shall file with the court and serve on the defendant a notice of such intent. The notice shall be provided a reasonable time before the trial or acceptance of a guilty plea, or at such later time as the court may permit for good cause. The notice shall set forth the aggravating factor or factors set forth in subsection (e) and any other aggravating factor or factors that the government will seek to prove as the basis for the death penalty. The factors for which notice is provided under this subsection may include factors concerning the effect of the offense on the victim and the victim's family. The court may permit the attorney for the government to amend the notice upon a showing of good cause.

"'(g) JUDGE AND JURY AT CAPITAL SENTENCING HEARING.—A hearing to determine whether the death penalty will be imposed for an offense under this section shall be conducted by the judge who presided at trial or accepted a guilty plea, or by another judge if that judge is not available. The hearing shall be conducted before the jury that determined the defendant's guilt if that jury is available. A new jury shall be impaneled for the purpose of the hearing if the defendant pleaded guilty, the trial of guilt was conducted without a jury, the jury that determined the defendant's guilt was discharged for good cause, or reconsideration of the sentence is necessary after the initial imposition of a sentence of death. A jury impaneled under this subsection shall have 12 members unless the parties stipulate to a lesser number at any time before the conclusion of the hearing with the approval of the court. Upon motion of the defendant, with the approval of the attorney for the government, the hearing shall be carried out before the judge without a jury. If there is no jury, references to "the

jury" in this section, where applicable, shall be understood as referring to the judge.

"'(h) PROOF OF MITIGATING AND AGGRAVATING FACTORS.—No presentence report shall be prepared if a capital sentencing hearing is held under this section. Any information relevant to the existence of mitigating factors, or to the existence of aggravating factors for which notice has been provided under subsection (f), may be presented by either the government or the defendant, regardless of its admissibility under the rules governing the admission of evidence at criminal trials, except that information may be excluded if its probative value is outweighed by the danger of creating unfair prejudice, confusing the issues, or misleading the jury. The information presented may include trial transcripts and exhibits. The attorney for the government and for the defendant shall be permitted to rebut any information received at the hearing, and shall be given fair opportunity to present argument as to the adequacy of the information to establish the existence of any aggravating or mitigating factor, and as to the appropriateness in that case of imposing a sentence of death. The attorney for the government shall open the argument, the defendant shall be permitted to reply, and the government shall then be permitted to reply in rebuttal.

"'(i) FINDINGS OF AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS.—The jury shall return special findings identifying any aggravating factor or factors for which notice has been provided under subsection (f) and which the jury unanimously determines have been established by the government beyond a reasonable doubt. A mitigating factor is established if the defendant has proven its existence by a preponderance of the evidence, and any member of the jury who finds the existence of such a factor may regard it as established for purposes of this section regardless of the number of jurors who concur that the factor has been established.

"'(j) FINDING CONCERNING A SENTENCE OF DEATH.—If the jury specially finds under subsection (i) that 1 or more aggravating factors set forth in subsection (e) exist, and the jury further finds unanimously that there are no mitigating factors or that the aggravating factor or factors specially found under subsection (i) outweigh any mitigating factors, the jury shall recommend a sentence of death. In any other case, the jury shall not recommend a sentence of death. The jury shall be instructed that it must avoid any influence of sympathy, sentiment, passion, prejudice, or other arbitrary factors in its decision, and should make such a recommendation as the information warrants.

"'(k) SPECIAL PRECAUTION TO ASSURE AGAINST DISCRIMINATION.—In a hearing held before a jury, the court, before the return of a finding under subsection (j), shall instruct the jury that, in considering whether to recommend a sentence of death, it shall not consider the race, color, religion, national origin, or sex of the defendant or any victim, and that the jury is not to recommend a sentence of death unless it has concluded that it would recommend a sentence of death for such a crime regardless of the race, color, religion, national origin, or sex of the defendant or any victim. The jury, upon the return of a finding under subsection (j), shall also return to the court a certificate, signed by each juror, that the race, color, religion, national origin, or sex of the defendant or any victim did not affect the juror's individual decision and that the individual juror would have recommended the same sentence for such a crime regardless of the race, color, religion, national origin, or sex of the defendant or any victim.

"'(l) IMPOSITION OF A SENTENCE OF DEATH.—Upon a recommendation under subsection (j) that a sentence of death be imposed, the court shall sentence the defendant to death. Otherwise the court shall impose a sentence of life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

"'(m) REVIEW OF A SENTENCE OF DEATH.—

"'(1) The defendant may appeal a sentence of death under this section by filing a notice of appeal of the sentence within the time provided for filing a notice of appeal of the judgment of conviction. An appeal of a sentence under this subsection may be consolidated within an appeal of the judgment of conviction and shall have priority over all noncapital matters in the court of appeals.

"'(2) The court of appeals shall review the entire record in the case including the evidence submitted at trial and information submitted during the sentencing hearing, the procedures employed in the sentencing hearing, and the special findings returned under subsection (i). The court of appeals shall uphold the sentence if it determines that the sentence of death was not imposed under the influence of passion, prejudice, or any other arbitrary factor, that the evidence and information support the special findings under subsection (i), and that the proceedings were otherwise free of prejudicial error that was properly preserved for review.

"'(3) In any other case, the court of appeals shall remand the case for reconsideration of the sentence or imposition of another authorized sentence as appropriate, except that the court shall not reverse a sentence of death on the ground that an aggravating factor was invalid or was not supported by the evidence and information if at least one aggravating factor described in subsection (e) remains which was found to exist and the court, on the basis of the evidence submitted at trial and the information submitted at the sentencing hearing, finds that the remaining aggravating factor or factors that were found to exist outweigh any mitigating factors. The court of appeals shall state in writing the reasons for its disposition of an appeal of a sentence of death under this section.

"'(n) IMPLEMENTATION OF SENTENCE OF DEATH.—A person sentenced to death under this section shall be committed to the custody of the Attorney General until exhaustion of the procedures for appeal of the judgment of conviction and review of the sentence. When the sentence is to be implemented, the Attorney General shall release the person sentenced to death to the custody of a United States Marshal. The Marshal shall supervise implementation of the sentence in the manner prescribed by the law of a State designated by the court. The Marshal may use State or local facilities, may use the services of an appropriate State or local official or of a person such an official employs, and shall pay the costs thereof in an amount approved by the Attorney General.

"'(o) SPECIAL BAR TO EXECUTION.—A sentence of death shall not be carried out upon a woman while she is pregnant.

"'(p) CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO PARTICIPATION IN EXECUTION.—No employee of the District of Columbia government, and no person providing services to the government under contract shall be required, as a condition of that employment or contractual obligation, to be in attendance at or to participate in any execution carried out under this section if such participation is contrary to the moral or religious convictions of the employee. For purposes of this subsection, the term "participate in any execution" includes personal preparation of the condemned individual and the apparatus used for the execution, and supervision of the activities of other personnel in carrying out such activities.

"'(q) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL FOR INDIGENT CAPITAL DEFENDANTS.—A defendant against whom a sentence of death is sought, or on whom a sentence of death has been imposed, under this section, shall be entitled to appointment of counsel from the commencement of trial proceedings until one of the conditions specified in subsection (v) has occurred, if the defendant is or becomes financially unable to obtain adequate representation. Counsel shall be appointed for trial representation as provided in chapter 26 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code (D.C. Code 11-2601 et seq.), and at least one counsel so appointed shall continue to represent the defendant until the conclusion of direct review of the judgment, unless replaced by the court with other qualified counsel. Except as otherwise provided in this section, chapter 26 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code (D.C. Code 11-2601 et seq.) shall apply to appointments under this section.

"'(r) REPRESENTATION AFTER FINALITY OF JUDGMENT.—When a judgment imposing a sentence of death under this section has become final through affirmance by the Supreme Court on direct review, denial of certiorari by the Supreme Court on direct review, or expiration of the time for seeking direct review in the court of appeals or the Supreme Court, the government shall promptly notify the court that imposed the sentence. The court, within 10 days of receipt of such notice, shall proceed to make determination whether the defendant is eligible for appointment of counsel for subsequent proceedings. The court shall issue an order appointing one or more counsel to represent the defendant upon a finding that the defendant is financially unable to obtain adequate representation and wishes to have counsel appointed or is unable competently to decide whether to accept or reject appointment of counsel. The court shall issue an order denying appointment of counsel upon a finding that the defendant is financially able to obtain adequate representation or that the defendant rejected appointment of counsel with an understanding of the consequences of that decision. Counsel appointed pursuant to this subsection shall be different from the counsel who represented the defendant at trial and on direct review unless the defendant and counsel request a continuation or renewal of the earlier representation.

"'(s) STANDARDS FOR COMPETENCE OF COUNSEL.—In relation to a defendant who is entitled to appointment of counsel under subsection (q) or (r), at least one counsel appointed for trial representation must have been admitted to the bar for at least 5 years and have at least 3 years of experience in the trial of felony cases in the Federal district courts. If new counsel is appointed after judgment, at least one counsel so appointed must have been admitted to the bar for at least 5 years and have at least 3 years of experience in the litigation of felony cases in the Federal courts of appeals or the Supreme Court. The court, for good cause, may appoint counsel who does not meet these standards, but whose background, knowledge, or experience would otherwise enable him or her to properly represent the defendant, with due consideration of the seriousness of the penalty and the nature of the litigation.

"'(t) CLAIMS OF INEFFECTIVENESS OF COUNSEL IN COLLATERAL PROCEEDINGS.—The inef-

fectiveness or incompetence of counsel during proceedings on a motion under section 23–110 of the District of Columbia Code in a case under this section shall not be a ground for relief from the judgment or sentence in any proceeding. This limitation shall not preclude the appointment of different counsel at any stage of the proceedings.

"'(u) TIME FOR COLLATERAL ATTACK ON DEATH SENTENCE.—A motion under section 23–110 of the District of Columbia Code attacking a sentence of death under this section, or the conviction on which it is predicated, shall be filed within 90 days of the issuance of the order under subsection (r) appointing or denying the appointment of counsel for such proceedings. The court in which the motion is filed, for good cause shown, may extend the time for filing for a period not exceeding 60 days. Such a motion shall have priority over all non-capital matters in the district court, and in the court of appeals on review of the district court's decision.

"'(v) STAY OF EXECUTION.—The execution of a sentence of death under this section shall be stayed in the course of direct review of the judgment and during the litigation of an initial motion in the case under section 23–110 of the District of Columbia Code. The stay shall run continuously following imposition of the sentence and shall expire if—

"'(1) the defendant fails to file a motion under section 23–110 of the District of Columbia Code within the time specified in subsection (u), or fails to make a timely application for court of appeals review following the denial of such a motion by a district court;

"'(2) upon completion of district court and court of appeals review under section 23–110 of the District of Columbia Code, the Supreme Court disposes of a petition for certiorari in a manner that leaves the capital sentence undisturbed, or the defendant fails to file a timely petition for certiorari; or

"'(3) before a district court, in the presence of counsel and after having been advised of the consequences of such a decision, the defendant waives the right to file a motion under section 23–110 of the District of Columbia Code.

"'(w) FINALITY OF THE DECISION ON REVIEW.—If one of the conditions specified in subsection (v) has occurred, no court thereafter shall have the authority to enter a stay of execution or grant relief in the case unless—

"'(1) the basis for the stay and request for relief is a claim not presented in earlier proceedings;

"'(2) the failure to raise the claim is the result of governmental action in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, the result of the Supreme Court's recognition of a new Federal right that is retroactively applicable, or the result of the fact that the factual predicate of the claim could not have been discovered through the exercise of reasonable diligence in time to present the claim in earlier proceedings; and

"'(3) the facts underlying the claim would be sufficient, if proven, to undermine the court's confidence in the determination of guilt on the offense or offenses for which the death penalty was imposed.

"'(x) COMMUTATION OF SENTENCE OF DEATH.—The Mayor shall have power to commute a sentence of death under this section to a sentence of life imprisonment, without parole.

"'(y) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"'(1) "State" includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States;

"'(2) "offense", as used in paragraphs (2), (5), and (13) of subsection (e) and in paragraph (5) of this subsection means an offense under the law of the District of Columbia, another State, or the United States;

"'(3) "drug trafficking activity" means a felony punishable under D.C. Law 4–29 (D.C. Code 33–501 et seq.) or a pattern or series of acts involving one or more such felonies;

"'(4) "robbery" means obtaining the property of another by force or threat of force;

"'(5) "burglary" means entering or remaining in a building or structure in violation of the law of the District of Columbia, another State, or the United States, with the intent to commit an offense in the building or structure;

"'(6) "sexual abuse" means any conduct proscribed by chapter 109A of title 18, United States Code, whether or not the conduct occurs in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States;

"'(7) "arson" means damaging or destroying a building or structure through the use of fire or explosives;

"'(8) "kidnapping" means seizing, confining, or abducting a person, or transporting a person without his or her consent;

"'(9) "pre-trial release", "probation", "parole", "supervised release", and "other post-conviction conditional release", as used in subsection (e)(6), mean any such release, imposed in relation to a charge or conviction for an offense under the law of the District of Columbia, another State, or the United States; and

"'(10) "public servant" means an employee, agent, officer, or official of the District of Columbia, another State, or the United States, or an employee, agent, officer, or official of a foreign government who is within the scope of section 1116 of title 18, United States Code.'.".

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1993".

TITLE II

FISCAL YEAR 1992 SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Governmental direction and support", $3,177,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 560), $5,427,000 are rescinded for a net decrease of $2,250,000: *Provided further*, That of the remaining funds, $1,724,000 shall be for the Mayor's youth and crime initiative in the City Administrator's Office, but shall not be obligated or expended until the Mayor submits to the Council a plan for the allocation and use of the funds, and $476,000 shall be for the Office of Personnel to conduct a management audit of personal and nonpersonal services: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there is hereby appropriated from the earnings of the applicable retirement funds an additional $1,694,000 to pay legal, management, investment, and other fees and administrative expenses of the District of Columbia Retirement Board.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Economic development and regulation", $6,361,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 561), $5,094,000 are rescinded for a net increase of $1,267,000.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Public safety and justice", $114,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 561), $22,356,000 are rescinded for a net decrease of $22,242,000: *Provided further*, That of the funds remaining for the personal services of the Metropolitan Police Department, $1,000,000 shall be redirected to non-personal services of the Department for equipment purchases and contractual services: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $700,000 shall be available from this appropriation, and funds under this heading in Public Law 102–111 (105 Stat. 561) for the Chief of Police for the prevention and detection of crime.

PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Public education system", $300,000, of which $260,000 is for the public schools of the District of Columbia and $40,000 is for pay-as-you-go capital projects for the public schools: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 563), $48,000 for the Education Licensure Commission are rescinded for a net increase of $252,000.

HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Human support services", $45,565,000: *Provided*, That $2,196,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 564), $3,405,000 are rescinded for a net increase of $42,160,000.

PUBLIC WORKS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 564), $31,308,000 are rescinded.

WASHINGTON CONVENTION CENTER FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 564), $560,000 are rescinded.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102–111; 105 Stat. 564), $2,544,000 are rescinded.

REPAYMENT OF GENERAL FUND DEFICIT

For an additional amount for "Repayment of general fund deficit", $2,245,000.

RESIZING

For the purpose of funding costs associated with the Temporary Appeals Board, downsizing, and early-outs, $5,510,000, to be apportioned by the Mayor of the District of Columbia within the various appropriation headings in this Act from which costs are properly payable.

FACILITIES RENT/LEASES

For the purpose of funding costs associated with the rental and leasing of facilities for governmental purposes, $16,667,000.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", $11,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading in prior fiscal years for the Law School Facility, $10,000,000 are rescinded for a net increase of $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That $150,000 shall be available for project management and $285,000 for design by the Director of the Department of Public Works or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Mayor.

WATER AND SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For an additional amount for "Water and sewer enterprise fund", $62,327,000, of which $28,287,000 shall be transferred to the general fund to finance general fund operating expenses: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102-111; 105 Stat. 566), $35,820,000 are rescinded for a net increase of $26,507,000: *Provided further*, That $38,834,000 of the amounts available for fiscal year 1992 shall be apportioned and payable to the debt service fund for repayment of loans and interest incurred for capital improvement projects instead of $38,006,000 as provided under this heading in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102-111; 105 Stat. 566).

The following provision under this heading for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992 in the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (Public Law 102-111; 105 Stat. 566) is repealed ": *Provided further*, That $25,608,000 in water and sewer enterprise fund operating revenues shall be available for pay-as-you-go capital projects".

STARPLEX FUND

For the Starplex Fund, an amount necessary for the expenses incurred by the Armory Board in the exercise of its powers granted by An Act To establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes, approved June 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 339; D.C. Code, sec. 2-301 et seq.) and the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957, approved September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 619; Public Law 85-300); D.C. Code, sec. 2-321 et seq.), of which $584,000 shall be transferred to the general fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Section 134 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1992, approved October 1, 1991 (105 Stat. 571) is amended by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) This section shall not apply to the District of Columbia Board of Education, which may, pursuant to the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, accept and use gifts to the public schools without prior approval by the Mayor.".

SEC. 202. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be available for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992.

This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions Act, 1992".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] wil be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House just a few minutes ago received a message from President Bush vetoing H.R. 5517, the first D.C. Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1993. President Bush states that he objects to language in the bill that allows the District of Columbia to use local revenues for abortions. He does not object to the underlying legislation; nor does he object to the level of funding in the bill.

But President Bush does object to allowing the District to use its local tax revenues for abortions.

And he objects even though the Supreme Court has upheld, in every case since the 1973 ruling in Roe versus Wade, the right of women to have abortions.

The most recent Supreme Court decision on June 29, 1992, in the case Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania versus Casey, ruled that States may not outlaw all abortions.

The law of the land makes no difference to President Bush when it comes to allowing the District to pay for abortions for women who do not have the money to pay. President Bush does not interfere with middle class or well-to-do women who want to have an abortion. Instead he picks on the less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, the new bill—H.R. 6056—that is now before the House makes the change demanded by President Bush. Section 114, at the bottom of page 25 and the top of page 26 of the bill, reads:

> None of the funds contained in this act shall be used to perform abortions except when the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term.

The word "Federal" that was in the vetoed bill and was the root of President Bush's objections has been deleted.

That is the only change from the vetoed bill, H.R. 5517. All other general and legislative provisions that were in the vetoed bill are retained in their identical form in this new bill.

And let me emphasize that the total funding in this bill is exactly the same as in H.R. 5517—$688 million in Federal funds, and $3.2 billion in District funds.

Let me point out that there is no separate report accompanying H.R. 6056. Therefore, the executive branch and the District government are directed in their administration of H.R. 6056 to follow precisely the reports of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the joint committee of conference as well as related floor debates on the previous bill—H.R. 5517. I am referring specifically to House Reports 102-638 and 102-906 and Senate Report 102-333. The only exception relates to the restriction on the use of local funds for abortions where it is performed to save the life of the mother.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this new bill so that the District government will have the funds necessary to carry out its responsibilities.

□ 1020

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in support of H.R. 6056, the revised D.C. Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1993.

While I disagree with the premise of the veto, we cannot hold the District of Columbia hostage. As a result, we have addressed the administration's objections, and we now ask for your approval of this bill.

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the District appropriation and the vote on abortion has become something of a ritual for this House. And yet I ask my colleagues to support us on H.R. 6056, and I ask it in this year in particular.

I recognize that this is a sensitive political year. But the fact is that the total inflexibility on this issue has not aided my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. There are many who vote with us on this issue who disagree with us on the question of abortion, but recognize this vote for what it is, a home rule vote and not an abortion vote.

It is perfectly consistent to support us on the basis of the Home Rule Act and yet maintain a position of your own against abortion. I asked the President to do that this year, recognizing his own strictures.

What we asked here was that the District of Columbia be allowed to spend its own money, no Federal money for abortions for poor women. There has not been an ability on the part of the District of Columbia to allow abortions for poor women who may be crack addicts and who in fact bear babies with AIDS. If those women desire an abor-

tion, surely it is criminal to keep them from having one. If there is any doubt, one need only go to the D.C. General Hospital, as I have several times this year, to see babies born in this way, some of them kept alive and appearing to be in pain even as they are kept alive.

There have been so far only two Medicaid abortions in the District of Columbia this year. There was one last year and one the year before. Planned Parenthood has been of some considerable aid to other poor women, but the fact is that a terrible burden has fallen on our hospital system and on the residents of the District of Columbia because we are not able to give to women who are poor in the District of Columbia what is granted to women everywhere else in the United States of America.

My colleagues, in your own jurisdictions what we have is the rule of local control. Some areas allow abortions under some circumstances, and some vary the circumstances. But no other jurisdiction is kept from paying for abortions for poor women. That is the essence of federalist democratic rule under which we now operate.

I ask Members, however, to vote with us on H.R. 6056 to save the appropriation for the 650,000 residents of the District of Columbia.

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

Once again, Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that the only change in this bill relates to the abortion language in section 114 that I have indicated now conforms to the President's desires as it relates to his veto. In all other instances the bill is the same.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 160, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bliley
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Hughes
Hyde
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickle
Porter
Price
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schiff
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—160

Allard
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bereuter
Bevill
Boehlert
Boehner
Brewster
Browder
Bruce
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Chandler
Chapman
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Cox (CA)
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Geren
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Hopkins
Hunter
Hutto
Inhofe
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Markey
Marlenee
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
Meyers
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Olver
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Patterson
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Rhodes
Ritter
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Washington
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—42

Aspin
Baker
Barnard
Bilirakis
Camp
Coleman (TX)
Donnelly
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Engel
Espy
Feighan
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Gilman
Hansen
Hefner
Holloway
Hoyer
Huckaby
Ireland
Jefferson
Kasich
Klug
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
McCrery
McMillan (NC)
Nagle
Olin
Perkins
Rahall
Ray
Riggs
Roberts
Roe
Shaw
Smith (FL)
Solarz
Staggers
Torricelli
Weber

□ 1049

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Hoyer for, with Mr. Barnard against.

Messrs. VOLKMER, OLVER, and SCHUMER, and Mrs. UNSOELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on the bill. H.R. 6056.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5058. An act to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal year 1993; and H.R. 5399. An Act to amend the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983 to provide an authorization of appropriations.

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

H.R. 11. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of tax enterprise zones, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2042. An act to authorize appropriations for activities under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1216) entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of status under the Immigration and Nationality Act of certain nationals of the People's Republic of China unless conditions permit their return in safety to that foreign state".

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 11) "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of tax enterprise zones, and for other purposes" and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. DOLE, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DANFORTH, and Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committees on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Judiciary; and Labor and Human Resources; for the consideration of title VIII of the Senate amendment only: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. GRAMM to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4250) "An act to authorize appropriations for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, and for other purposes" disagreed to by the House and agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. EXON, and Mr. DANFORTH, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 1491. An act to establish a partnership among the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the States, and private organizations and individuals to conserve the entire diverse array of fish and wildlife species in the United States and to provide opportunities for the public to enjoy these fish and wildlife species through nonconsumptive activities; and

S. 1697. An act to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the Act, and for other purposes.

□ 1050

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 553, CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 553) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes. Debate on the joint resolution shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 580 provides for consideration in the House of a 5-day continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 553. In effect, the rule waives all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee. Finally, the rule makes in order one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, the new fiscal year is upon us. While we have worked hard to get 13 fiscally responsibile bills promptly completed, we are not quite there. Here is where we stand. The House has passed all 13 appropriation bills.

Only one bill has been signed by the President. Four others are sitting on his desk. We just now adopted the Interior conference report and three other conference reports has been filed. On two bills, DOD and Labor, HSS, conferees were appointed and the conferences began on Tuesday. The last two bills, legislative branch and foreign operation await Senate action.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 553 provides continuing appropriations in fiscal year 1993 for the projects and activities contained in the 12 appropriation bills not yet enacted. The continuing appropriations will last until October 5, 1992. Any fiscal year 1993 appropriation bill enacted after this continuing resolution but before October 5, will of course supersede the continuing resolution.

Any restrictions on appropriations set in fiscal year 1992 appropriation acts will continue to apply through the fifth or until a new bill is enacted.

If a fiscal year 1993 appropriation bill was passed in both Houses, the funding level for each project or activity is the lower of: First, the level in the fiscal year 1992 appropriation—current rate, or second, the House-passed fiscal year 1993 level, or third, the Senate-passed fiscal year 1993 level. If the project or activity is included in only one House version, the level is that version or current rate, whichever is lower.

A project funded in fiscal year 1992, but not funded in either fiscal year 1993 bill, will be funded at current rate. A project funded in fiscal year 1993 bill, but not funded in fiscal year 1992, must await enactment of the fiscal year 1993 bill.

Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution provides that D.C. government employees: First, may be furloughed in fiscal year 1993, second, may be denied within-grade salary increases, and third, may not count fiscal year 1993 employment toward the waiting period for salary-grade advancement. Finally, the continuing resolution specifically sets FCC salaries and expenses at current rate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule and I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members back in their offices, this may be your last chance to enact a line-item veto for the coming 1993 buget, so listen up.

Mr. Speaker, ordinarily, New Year's Eve is a time of joy and celebration. But I regret that on this fiscal new year's eve I must advise my colleagues to stow away their funny hats and noise makers. We still have much to do before we pop the champagne corks for the fiscal new year starting tomorrow.

Instead of considering a sine die adjournment resolution today, we are being asked in the rule before us to consider a 5-day, stop-gap funding resolution for the Federal Government.

So far, only 5 of the 13 regular appropriations bills have cleared both Houses, but we are making steady progress on the others, as my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has said.

It is my sincere hope that we will not need the full 5 days to complete our work on the remaining spending bills, and that certainly we can avoid a longer term CR.

Instead of heightening the anticipated joy in completing our work, the consideration of the various appropriations conference reports in these final days has only really exacerbated the tensions and conflicts that exist between the authorizing committees and the appropriations committees. We all saw that a few minutes ago when the Interior bill was on the floor.

Once again we are rushing head long and half blindly toward adjournment by approving massive spending bills without the usual 3-day layover period, and any opportunity to fully review all that is contained in those bills.

Mr. Speaker, some of the problems, abuses, and excesses in the form of special projects have come to light and have been dealt with and we have knocked them out of some of these bills. But I fear many others may not be fully known and publicized until after we have adjourned and we face the usual spate of stories about special interest goodies stuck into these bills. We know that is going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleagues that there is a way we can deal with this problem before we leave town, and that is to give the President line-item veto or enhanced rescission authority over these fiscal 1993 appropriations bills.

I am asking my colleagues today, once again, to join me in defeating the previous question on this rule, so that I can amend it to make in order an amendment to give the President that line-item veto authority on a 1-year, trial basis only.

As my colleagues will recall, I have made similar attempts on four other occasions this year. On July 28 we fell just eight votes short of defeating the previous question on the supplemental appropriations bill to make in order just such an amendment.

Since then, the Rules Committee's Subcommittee on the Legislative Process, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], has conducted two hearings on my proposals and related legislative line-item veto bills such as the one sponsored by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

While no recommendations have been made by the subcommittee on any of these proposals, I think it is fair to report that a large number of House Members agree on the need to give the President some special new rescission powers to deal with the abuses that take place in the appropriations process.

The President should not have to veto an entire appropriations bill to get at these special pork projects that comprise only a fraction of the total.

I think there was general agreement among all the witnesses that a legislative line-item veto will not make a substantial dent in the deficit and we all know that. But many argued that it would be a useful tool in reducing unnecessary spending. And most polls today, Mr. Speaker, indicate that 70 percent or more of the American people agree that any President should have that authority.

After all, 43 Governors now have the line-item veto under their State constitutions—including my own State of New York—many dating back a century or more.

So this is not a novel or untested concept. President Bush favors it, and Governor Clinton has it in Arkansas and supports it on the Federal level. Both Presidential candidates support it.

Mr. Speaker, a GAO report issued in January of this year finds that we could have reduced the deficit over the 6-year period between 1984 and 1989 by $70-billion if the President had had the line-item veto. "That ain't chicken feed; but it sure is pig chow."

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there are those who dispute those estimated savings and have doubts that the line-item veto at the Federal level would have the effects we claim.

I would agree that we really do not know for sure, but I would quickly add that we will not know unless we try it.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, this is all I am asking for today: That we give it a try on a 1-year trial basis for fiscal year 1993 appropriations only. Think what a message that would send back home to people: That we really intend to do something about this sea of red ink which is turning our country into a debtor Nation.

Under my amendment, Mr. Speaker, the President would have up to 20 days after the enactment of any fiscal 1993 appropriation bill to send to the Congress a message rescinding all or part of any budget authority for any item in that bill. Congress would then have 20 days of session in which to review it and pass a rescission disapproval bill. The President would then have the constitutional 10 days in which to sign or veto that bill, and if he vetoes it, as he is likely to, Congress would then have another 5 days of session in which to override the veto. If Congress adjourned before that 20-day review period had expired, the rescission would not take effect, but would be resuomitted on the opening day of the new Congress, and the review period would begin anew.

I ask how fair can it be? That takes care of all the concerns that have been expressed in past debates.

Mr. Speaker, some have objected to this approach on the grounds that, while it would take a majority of both Houses to pass a rescission disapproval bill, it would take two-thirds of both Houses to override the expected veto, and that is true.

I would simply point out, however, that in 33 of the 43 States, the same two-thirds majority is needed to override a line-item veto. In only five States is there a simple majority involved; and in the other, four States require a three-fifths override, and one a three-fourths override.

So, there is nothing radical in this approach. Mr. Speaker, let us give it a try. Let us vote down the previous question on this rule so that my amendment for the line-item veto can be made in order.

I say to my colleagues, "If we do that, we're going to send a message back home that we really do intend to get Federal spending under control. This is a great step in the right direction."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], who has been a fighter for the line-item veto for all of the 14 years I have been here, and longer.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me and for his efforts on behalf of the line-item veto here on the floor today. It seems to me that the gentleman once again has targeted exactly the right bill for this effort to come forward.

The continuing resolution concept is basically kind of an extraconstitutional concept in and of itself. It is, in fact, an appropriation, but it is a massive appropriation of virtually all of the spending of the Federal Government, and it seems to me that that is one of the places where a lot of mischief gets done, or at least in years past mischief has been done.

So, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman comes to us with a proposal that in this particular area we ought to also consider line-item veto, which has caused some Members a lot of grief because they believe that it would, in fact, impinge upon the ability of the Congress to do its will. Well, the fact is that Congress doing its will in bills like continuing resolutions has often led to massive deficit spending. One way to make the President of the United States accountable in all of this spending that goes on is to give him specific authority to do something about each line item within the bill. The gentleman proposes that this is the time to discuss it. It seems to me that he is absolutely right.

Mr. Speaker, it would be nice if we could discuss the issues separately, if we could get it reported out of the Committee on Rules, bring it to the floor, and discuss it as a separate item out here, and vote up or down on line-item veto. The fact is we have gone for years and never have been able to get

such a proposal on the floor. The fact is that it does not appear as though we are going to get such a proposal on the floor before the end of this Congress. This may be the last chance that we have to vote on this matter.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is correct that some months ago, or some weeks ago even, he was able to get almost a majority in the House to approve overruling the previous question in order to bring such an amendment to the floor. Here is another opportunity today, as we close out, for those in favor of line-item veto to have their opportunity on the floor today to deal with this issue, and I certainly hope that the House would approve the gentleman's motion so that we can bring up this very important topic and have one more tool for dealing with the deficit matter.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] yielding to me. I just want to ask him a question.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and I do not disagree on the line-item veto, but does the gentleman think that the presence of a line-item veto would alter the deficit that the President requested for next year?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] that I do believe that giving the President accountability for specific spending items would in fact be a device for lowering spending. I say to many audiences that I do not think line-item veto in itself is a silver bullet that absolutely lowers the deficit, but it does hold accountability in government. It ensures that Congress is held accountable for each item of spending; it ensures that the President is held accountable for each item of spending.

Now what happens now is, when the President is given massive bills, he has to veto the whole bill over one or two items in it that he finds objectionable. That is not a way in which we can hold him accountable.

Mr. Speaker, accountability is the name of the game here. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is going to give us a chance to have enhanced accountability.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] yielding this time to me. The reason I wanted the time was to simply amplify, once again, that while I support a line-item veto, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows that I have voted with him on a number of occasions with respect to the line-item veto, I do not want anyone to be led to the belief that the presence of a line-item veto is going to materially affect the deficit. It is not, in my judgment, going to have any major impact on the deficit at all.

Without the line-item veto, Mr. Speaker, President Bush sent to this Congress a budget request beginning October 1 for the coming fiscal year to say, "I would like to spend $350 billion more than we take in during the next fiscal year." That is the budget request from a conservative President.

Now the same President is out across the country saying, You know we've got these awful deficits. Yes, we do. And they are very troublesome to this country, dangerous to our economic future.

The fact is we fail, as a Congress, with these deficits, but the fact is this President recommends them, and our failure is following the recommendations in a budget that, in my judgment, is seriously flawed.

Mr. Speaker, I just want everyone to understand that, while I support a line-item veto for a lot of reasons, it is not a panacea. I do not want to detail my support here, but Governors have it, I think the President ought to have it, Republican or Democrat. I think we ought to, in many instances, on the smaller issues that get tucked in the corner someplace, and we never get a shot at them; there we ought to have an opportunity to speak to those issues on the floor of the House and Senate.

But I just do not want people on the floor of the House to say, "But for a line-item veto we would have this deficit under control."

Nonsense. Nonsense. When the President sends his budget request, he does not have to have a line-item veto to decide what he wants to spend or what he does not want to spend. He says, "Here's what I want to spend money on; here's how much revenue I anticipate we bring in," and this President said for this fiscal year beginning October 1, "I recommend we have a deficit for this country of $350 billion."

Mr. Speaker, that is what the President requested. Without or with a line-item veto, that is the deficit he thought was appropriate.

Now I do not happen to think it is appropriate. I voted against that, and I voted against the Democrat budget.

But I just want people to understand the dimensions of this debate about the line-item veto.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, when this discussion of the line-item veto comes up, it is a little bit like the balanced budget amendment. It gives Members an opportunity to say they have done something to deal with the deficit when in reality they have not.

Let me also just caution some of my colleagues about the danger of some of these line-item veto proposals, and let me be very specific.

Mr. Speaker, this Member spent hundreds of hours trying to find votes to terminate funding for the B-2 bomber program and also to terminate funding for the super collider program, and I would just observe that both of these huge spending programs were actively supported by President George Bush and President Ronald Reagan.

Now if they had the line-item veto authority, as some have proposed; and by the way, Mr. Speaker, I support a modified line-item veto authority; but had they had unlimited line-item veto authority, what they could have done is come to this Member and say, "Congressman SLATTERY, either you back off of your opposition to the B-2 bomber and you back off of your opposition to the super collider I want, or I'm going to go through every appropriation bill that hits my desk in an effort to find every appropriation that is of importance to your State, and I'll line-item that out and veto it."

Now, my colleagues, I contend that, if it is exercised in that way, which we can be assured it will be, the net effect of all this will be that spending will go up in the way the President wants, not down, and I think that there is a real danger to giving the President unlimited line-item veto authority. The much better approach is the enhanced rescission authority, as it has been named, which I call modified line-item veto authority, that will require this body to vote on those individual items in the appropriation bills that some of us would like to have a chance to vote on.

□ 1110

So the President would be given the authority to pull individual items out, send them back to Congress, and ask Congress to vote on those individually.

I contend that if we do that, in fact we would significantly reduce spending, we would accomplish what the American people want, and we would do it in such a way as to not dramatically enhance the power of the President. We should not dramatically shift the balance of power, we have an obligation to this institution to protect the power of the Congress.

So I want to point out that this line-item veto authority, if not structured properly, can be very dangerous and can in fact give the President authority he should not have.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I support what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is doing on the rescission. The gentleman and others have done a lot of excellent work on it. I think it is another approach to a different form of

line-item veto and I commend the gentleman for what he is doing.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all both gentlemen know I have great respect for both of them and have told them so many times.

Mr. Speaker, reasonable men can disagree. We have Members on this side of the aisle that make the same argument they do. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] does not like the line-item veto because he is afraid some President might veto the B-2 bomber, something the gentleman from Oklahoma supports.

Mr. Speaker, that is why my amendment today simply sets up a trial period for just 1 year. Maybe the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is right. If the gentleman is right, we ought to prove it. We ought to prove the point.

Let me just say this: My good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], has voted for my amendment is the past. I appreciate that, and I know the gentleman is sincere. I hope the gentleman wil vote for it today.

I said in my opening remarks that this is not going to, even if we put it in for a 1-year trial period, make a significant major impact, because even over the last 4 years it would have only affected, according to the GAO report, $70 billion. That is not a major impact.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I came out of the private sector. I am a businessman. Most of the economy is affected not by the actions of this Congress. We sometimes build ourselves up to make us think so, but it is confidence. That is what the American people need, that is what American business and industry need.

Mr. Speaker, If we enact this line-item veto for just a 1-year trial period, it is going to make a tremendous difference in the confidence to the American people, that we are going to do something about trying to curtail spending.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me just say that the document that is going to inspire or diminish confidence in this country by far is the document sent to us by the White House, number one, the budget. I just wanted to say again that the President said for this next year, beginning October 1, "I would like a deficit of $350 billion."

The reason I come to the floor again in response is not because the gentleman said this time that this is a panacea for dealing with budget deficits. But it has been said in the past, and I think was alluded to earlier today in a discussion by others, that this would have a substantial impact on the deficit.

What will have a substantial impact on the deficit in my judgment is a fiscal policy created in a budget sent to us by a President that leads in the right direction and the courage here in Congress by both Democrats and Republicans to go along with the fiscal policy that moves us in the right direction. That has not been present in either case from the White House nor Congress, and I want to make that point.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree with everything the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] just said. I would go one step further to suggest that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and I and others have cosponsored an amendment to the Constitution that really deals with the deficit problem that a lot of people are attempting to address with the line-item veto and the balanced budget amendment. Our spending lid amendment would give the President of the United States, the only person elected by all of the people in this great democracy of ours, the authority to set an aggregate spending level for the country. So you would have one person being held accountable for the aggregate spending level of the country.

The Congress, in turn, would have the authority to spend the money in a way that they ultimately chose to do, subject to the President's veto, of course, or signature.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that if we did something like this we would have one person elected by all of the people that would be held accountable for the aggregate spending level of the country. Congress could spend the money differently, but they could not exceed the aggregate limit set by the President.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of constitutional amendment we should enact, and we should do it for a 10-year period and see how it works. Goodness knows, it could not be any worse than we have seen in the last 10 years.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], one of the prime sponsors of the line-item veto measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] in voting down the previous question so that we can once again offer an amendment which would give the President line-item veto and rescission authority in fiscal year 1993.

I think this 1-year experimental period that the gentleman is advocating is exactly the right way to go, will satisfy the largest number of Members in this Congress, and I salute and commend the gentleman for his valiant effort in regard to this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is identical to legislation that I introduced, H.R. 78, which now has over 130 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, except that the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] would apply only to fiscal year 1993.

Those who voted against the line-item veto authority a few weeks ago in this Congress, and it was a very close vote, 207 to 199, said that they did so primarily because they wanted hearings to be held on this issue.

Those hearings were held in front of the Committee on Rules in the past couple of weeks. I would like to thank the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK], who is also one of the cosponsors of my legislation, for scheduling those hearings.

Mr. Speaker, obviously this is not a partisan issue. President Bush has endorsed this legislation. Governor Clinton said in support of the line-item veto:

> I strongly support the line-item veto because I think it is one of the most powerful weapons we could use in our fight against out of control deficit spending.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has pointed out, the Governors of 43 of our States have this authority, and the President should have it, too, whether that President is a Democrat or a Republican.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are disgusted. They are disgusted and fed up with a government that takes so much money from them and gives back so little in return.

The average person today pays 47.2 percent of his or her income tax just to pay his taxes at all levels, State, Federal, and local, counting income taxes, property taxes, sales taxes, Social Security taxes, and all of the other taxes, particularly the taxes they pay in the form of higher prices for all the corporations.

The people are disgusted with a government that is $4 trillion in debt today and which is continuing to lose over $1 billion a day on top of that every day of the year.

Almost every leading economist tells us that the main thing holding back our economy is our tremendous national debt and these continuing out of control deficits. We are hurting the working men and women of this country right where it hurts the most, in the pocketbook.

Earlier this year the Washington Post, at the time of the President's State of the Union speech, had a focus group made up of people all across the Nation, supposedly representative of all of us. They gave them little buttons to push to show whether they were in agreement or disagreement with statements that the President made, which ones they agreed with and which ones they did not agree with.

The one statement they agreed with the most was when the President said

our Federal Government is too big and is costing too much. Ninety-four percent of the people in that Washington Post focus group said they agreed with that statement. There is no other issue on which there is so much agreement among the American people except to try to get our deficits and national debt under control.

The line-item veto power will not do it by itself, but it certainly will help.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], the senior ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, whom we are going to miss dearly around here.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time and for his complimentary remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to defeat the previous question on the rule which would make in order an amendment to give the President the line-item veto authority for 1 year.

□ 1120

In my last questionnaire, which I sent to the people in my district, by a nearly 4-to-1 margin over the next category they said that the Federal deficit is the most serious problem and the biggest problem facing our Nation today, and by a 2-to-1 margin they said yes to giving the President the line-item veto.

We have heard some good ideas from the other side of the aisle as to what we ought to do. I support a constitutional amendment that would provide for the line-item veto. I support a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, but that is not here and now.

Congress has not shown the collective discipline to reduce Federal spending. The line-item veto is something that people understand and they are demanding be done. It is time to consider the line-item veto approach on the Federal level, something that the Governors of 43 States have, including my own State of Ohio. The Governor has that authority to control State spending.

The proposal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to give the President line-item veto for 1 year is nearly identical to that of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN], H.R. 78, of which I am a cosponsor, and it is similar to my own bill, H.R. 28.

We cannot continue to saddle future generations with our debts. The line-item veto is not the only answer to the deficit problem, but it is a step in the right direction. Let us try it for 1 year and see what happens. I will most certainly vote with the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] to defeat the previous question.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER].

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

As we go through this debate today, Mr. Speaker, I find myself encouraged. I am encouraged because of the efforts of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] and others which I think have the potential of coinciding and coming into agreement with the efforts of a number of people on our side, including the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], and myself.

We have worked in some cases separately over the last several years, in some cases jointly, to try to reach agreement on legislation that would compel Congress to vote on rescissions that the President sends to the Congress once he has signed an appropriations bill.

There is a reluctance, I think, on the part of the majority of Congress to give the President line-item veto power which would require a two-thirds vote by the House and Senate to override. I believe there is a majority of support for a proposal, certainly in the House, and my guess is in the other body as well, to require us to vote on Presidential rescissions and to give us the right to override that rescission with a simple majority.

I would hope, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I have discussed and will continue to discuss, the possibility of us reaching final agreement on an approach that will indeed require the Congress to vote on Presidential rescissions for a 2-year period that would not protect from those rescissions unauthorized appropriations, that would limit somewhat the ability of the President to rescind authorized appropriations.

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

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to commend him for the effort that he and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON] and others, Mr. JOHNSON, others on both sides of the aisle have been going about the legislative business over these last several days.

I would point out to our Members that one of our goals, even with the line-item veto, which I, too, have real reservations about a President with one-third plus one on a line-item veto, but have no difficulty at all with a presidential line-item veto with 50 percent plus one. That is the compromise we are working toward.

One of the things we are attempting to achieve in the waning moments of this Congress is to in fact keep the appropriation bills this year within budget and even within the request of the President. We believe that we are achieving that goal. That is a substantial win for many of us on both sides of the aisle.

What we are looking forward to is the 103d Congress. One of the things we would like to see is a vote on the proposal, the compromise that has been worked out on both sides. That is what we are still trying to work out is to see that we are in fact going to get that, we are in fact going to get the opportunity for Members of this body to state their positions before we go home regarding the modified rescission order process.

I hope in the spirit of negotiations, even as we speak, the things that are going on now, that we are going to find that spirit of compromise that will achieve the goal we want for this year, as well as lay the foundation and the groundwork for next year.

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

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me again say that I have great respect for the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CARPER] and for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], both. They are good Members of this House, and I do not doubt their sincerity.

The problem is, this is the last chance we may have. This is a stopgap 5-day continuing resolution. If we get our act together, there may not be a final last-day continuing resolution.

Mr. CARPER. If the gentleman will yield, my understanding is there will be a final opportunity. That would be with respect to a long-term CR. We are operating under the impression that there will be a long-term CR.

Short of that, we are pushing for the opportunity to vote up or down on a variation of our line-item rescission bill on which the gentleman and I have discussed pushing for an up-or-down vote. That is being considered at this time by our leadership.

Mr. SOLOMON. If the gentleman will continue to yield, let me say that we have, on this side of the aisle, 166 Members. There are 67 Members on the other side who signed a letter to the Speaker asking for line-item veto authority for the President.

If the gentleman will add those two numbers up, I think it comes to 233. We only need 218 to make this the law. I am just afraid we are not going to get another opportunity. I would just hope that if the gentleman is right, and we do have a final CR on the last day of this session, and if the gentleman has been unable to bring his bill to the floor, and if he has made some concessions that I can reluctantly agree with and would support him on, I would then hope that the 67 of his Members would come and vote with us so we can at

least have a 1-year trial of Presidential line-item veto authority.

Let us see if it works. Let us see if the gentleman from Kansas is right. If it works, then we have it and we can enact it into permanent law.

Mr. CARPER. If the gentleman will let me reclaim my time, I cannot speak for the other 66 people who have signed the letter to the Speaker. If we are unable to get an up-or-down vote on a variation of our line-item rescission bill that he and I have discussed prior to voting on the long-term continuing resolution, then I will certainly work in a cooperative spirit with the gentleman from New York to compel a vote as an amendment to that long-term CR that again embodies the bill, H.R. 2164, which the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. PATTERSON] and others and I have authored, with the help of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the former Congresswoman from Illinois, Lynn Martin.

Mrs. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentlewoman from South Carolina.

Mrs. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all the good work that has been done on this issue. As many of the Members know, this is something of great concern to me, but one of the things that I think we owe the people back home is to be as up-front as possible.

So often the voters at home are confused when we tack things on other bills. I think something as critical as the rescission, the line-item veto or the rescission, enhanced rescission, should be up-front on a vote on its own, rather than tacked on anything else. For that reason I am pushing for that, and I would like to see that before we go home this week or early next week.

I would just like to say to my colleagues, please let us make it a clear-cut up-or-down vote on that, rather than tacking it onto other important things, important matters that have to be completed before we go home.

Mr. CARPER. Let me thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and also thank her very much for her leadership in pushing this issue and bringing it to the floor.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARPER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to respond to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and his comments, because I, too, want to see something done this year. I realize the difficulty we have in trying to accomplish all of our game plans in the short remaining period of time, but also as one who fought the balanced budget amendment on this floor and lost, and went to work the next day with the Budget Enforcement Act, only to see that referred to two committees and buried, if the gentleman wants to look at a Member that has an extra added incentive of seeing that whatever CR's, short term and long term, are clean, within the spirit of which the leadership on our side is saying to the appropriations, "Keep it below what the President has asked, keep it below the budget."

Also, the message to the other body should be very clear. If we concede at this time and move back from a confrontation on the short term, there are certain things that must be done before we pass a long-term CR, even if we have to stay here until November 3.

□ 1130

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

Mr. CARPER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, now the gentleman is making my point. And so certainly is the gentlewoman from South Carolina, for whom I have the greatest respect; she is a great Member of this House. But what I am afraid of is exactly what she was talking about. If we pass a clean bill, up or down, we already know what is going to happen over in the Senate when Mr. BYRD gets his hands on it. It will be dead on arrival.

That is why we need to attach it to a continuing resolution so that at least we can go to conference. We will not ever even have the chance to sit down and negotiate with them, because it will be dead on arrival. That is why we need to do it on a CR, if we ever expect to be successful.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], the chairman of the Porkbusters Task Force.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and his plans to move to defeat the previous question in regard to the continuing appropriation resolution so that a line-item veto or an enhanced rescission amendment, which will sunset after only 1 year can actually be finally voted upon.

An enhanced rescission authority that would permit presidential rescissions for fiscal year 1993 only over all or part of the appropriations is something that we certainly need. It has to be submitted by the President within 20 days of enactment, and basically the conditions I think have been discussed.

Ross Perot was quoted yesterday in the Post as saying that the national debt is like a crazy aunt we keep down in the basement. All of the neighbors know she is there, but nobody wants to talk about her. I submit that this certainly sounds like and describes Congress' attitude about the $4 trillion debt and the $300 billion we now pay just to pay interest on the debt. We simply ignore it.

Now here we go again. Here we have pablum, and that is what I describe this enhanced rescission authority as, gentle pablum, easy on the political digestive tracts of Congress, not even a real line-item veto authority. The cards here, even if we pass this, are stacked fully in favor of the Congress, and more accurately fully in favor of the majority party. All Congress has to do to defeat a Presidential rescission, if this mild Presidential rescission bill were to pass, is to come up with a simple majority to disapprove, and that is all.

I still hear all kinds of defenses over there, even by my closest friends, "Not now, not now." They talk about the President having caused all of this. I do not defend the President for not having presented balanced budget amendments, but my gosh, the Congress cannot hide behind that fact. If the President jumps off a cliff, we are not going to follow him over the cliff, are we? We have got the responsibility here, and Republicans and Democrats alike should not have to use back alleys, and that is what we have to do all of the time, in order to have something that is gentle, and that is as innocuous as this bill, to be voted upon in the House.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], is to be commended for his being so calm and not shouting here because he is so often beaten down. And he is quite right when he says if we do not attach this enhanced rescission proposal to something important it is not going to get anywhere, and Members know that. And when we had the Presidential rescission bills, which I was sponsoring, my good friends and I discussed the question of the enhanced rescission authority, and even then they said, "No, no. The leadership is going to promise us something and we will have a freestanding bill. We will eventually be able to do something here."

Everyone knows the President's rescission authority right now is a wet noodle. And when he presents it, the Congress does not have to do anything. If Congress does not do anything in x number of days, then that is the end of the Presidential rescission bills, and that is what the leadership wants. They want to keep the President shackled like that.

The time has come to at least give the President a line-item veto, under this enhanced rescission authority with sunset provisions, and at least give the President a chance to suggest what he thinks is pork. And we can at least debate it. But the majority has the majority. I mean a simple majority for instance, is all you need to disapprove, a constitutional majority in order to override the veto.

When in the world are we going to get serious? This of course is not a panacea, and it is not a cure all. Maybe it is a first step in a thousand-mile journey.

But I always hear the reasons why it cannot be done, manana, and tomorrow, and we have to eventually face our crazy aunt down there in the basement. We have to recognize she is there, and at least take a little itsy-bitsy step like this.

Can we not do it? We ought to be able to do it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on this question of a line-item veto and the idicoy of our Founding Fathers by considering it and rejecting it, I think the RECORD ought to show that the elected Federal official who has the greatest number of constituents to please with pork is the President of the United States. And the notion that the politicians who end up in the White House somehow become a paragon of frugality is falsified by fact and event, Democrat and Republican, throughout the history of this country.

I ask: Does the President of the United States need the line-item veto to put out the pork at Olmsted Air Force Base to get reelected? Does the President of the United States need the line-item veto to do the pork of these Navy ports that are suddenly being established in places where electrical votes count? Does the President of the United States need the line-item veto for all of the pork he is passing out in some desperation at the moment in this country?

I say that not to demean this President, because I have seen it with every President. The point is that the Founders were not idiots. They did know what they were doing by giving the President of the United States exactly one-sixth of the legislative power and all of the executive power. That is what the President has.

They talked it over. They did not make stump speeches and talk about how their party's man was some sort of holy angel. Neither party has one. And it does not make any difference, throughout history it has always been the same.

The balance of power in this Government will remain the same or we will get deeper in debt than we already are.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and allow a vote on the line-item veto.

I have been a long-time advocate of the line-item veto. I know that this is not going to make the deficit go away. I know too that it has been an important tool that 43 Governors across this land have, and both President Bush and Governor Clinton want to see it established.

Last year, I can remember after serving for 5 years on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation when we dealt with a $153 billion highway bill. It was 2 o'clock in the morning. We had one copy for the Republicans, there was one copy for the Democrats, and there was one copy for the Speaker. The bill came out in a Xerox box. It was still warm. And all of us were swarming to see exactly what was in that bill. No one was able to read it and give it the kind of attention that we normally would do before a bill of this magnitude came to the House floor.

It passed by a big vote, and lo and behold, several weeks later we found out that there was a courthouse that was stuck in this highway bill for the State of New York that would cost the taxpayers $1 billion. Now Mr. Speaker, that is highway robbery.

The President was given a choice. Do you literally shut down highway projects across this country, eliminating perhaps tens of thousands of jobs, even drunk driving prevention programs, for goodness sake, to save a courthouse in New York? The President was given no choice. He signed the bill into law.

Now here it is virtually almost the eve of this session being over, and we have 12 of the 13 appropriation bills that have not found their way to the President's desk on the last day of the fiscal year. Who knows what is in 12 of those 13 spending bills, whether it is 5 day continuing resolutions, 5 months, or the rest of the year? It is very important that the President have a tool where he can go through and comb through some of these extra-special projects that have not seen the light of day so that he can exercise some judgment. We will in fact have a vote to override later on and decide the merits of each case. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and allow this amendment to be offered and passed.

□ 1140

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time so that I may also add my opposition to the rule and ask for its negative vote.

Here we are, it is September 30 again, and almost every year since I have been here we have reached the end of the fiscal year, and the Congress fails to do its duty. The law that the Congress passed says that we must have a budget fully implemented by September 30, and then we resort to the trickery and gimmickry and deceit that sometimes is enveloped in the continuing resolution, the stopgap appropriations, and then the President of the United States, forced to do so, has to sign a mammoth bill or else the Government of the United States will come to a crashing halt. Even while our young fellow Americans were amassing in Desert Shield just a few years back, this Government came to a grinding halt, and we had no Government for a period of time, a disgraceful event that occurred because we could not do our duty as a Congress by September 30.

On that basis, for several terms now I have introduced legislation to provide for an instant replay to say that if by midnight on September 30 the Congress has failed to enact the appropriations that it is duty bound to do, then an instant replay automatically, last year's appropriations, shall be passed until the Congress has the will and the determination later to pass a budget of its own.

When the gentleman from New York acceded to try in the Committee on Rules to present this very simple and workable plan, it was rejected, so as a pride of authorship, I now cannot abide by the rule that would not permit debate on this easy way to try to control the budget process.

The line-item veto and the instant replay are budget tools that we could utilize to bring this deficit monster somewhere under control.

I urge a negative vote on this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I believe I heard a few minutes ago a comment that we should have a bill that would allow a constitutional amendment to basically make one person accountable for our country's financial affairs.

I believe we should clarify just where the other side stands. We hear from Bill Clinton's camp that one man is responsible right now, and that is President of the United States; he is responsible for the deficit and for the national debt. Yet here we have the Democrat side saying that we should have a constitutional amendment that will make one man, the President, responsible. Clearly, as this proposal suggests, the President, at present, does not have the responsibility authority Bill Clinton credits him with having. The public is being led to believe, because of what is being said by Bill Clinton, that the President is now responsible for every economic problem besetting our society. We should not forget that Congress have no small part in determining how much the Government spends and what it is spent on. I want to take the time to clear up the point that in the future the President alone may be responsible, but today he is not.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will just say to the Members that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Jacobs], my good friend, a former marine like me, asked a series of questions a few minutes ago. One of those questions was: Why does the President of the United States need the line-item veto?

Well, we know why. Back in 1974, the then President tried to impound the money that this Congress, in its infinite wisdom, had appropriated and authorized; and this Congress, in its infinite wisdom, took the President of the United States to the Supreme Court and made him spend the money. There was such a hew and cry from the American people at that time that Congress, in order to save face, enacted very complicated and weak rescission authority for the President.

Today the law says that any President can ask this Congress for permission not to spend money, but under the existing law enacted by this Congress, the Congress does not have to vote on it; by taking no action at all, by taking no action, we can turn it down. That means that not one of us is accountable to the American people. We have chickened out. We hide behind our own rule.

All I want to do is to reverse that procedure, I just want to require simply that Congress be up front and cast a recorded vote on rescission requests, by the President for next year only. That President could be Mr. Clinton, it could be Mr. Bush. But when the President asks for permission not to spend the money on a particular line item, this Congress should have the guts to stand up and vote on it. It is as simple as that, for a 1-year trial period.

Mr. Speaker, here is a statement of administration policy supporting my position today. Bill Clinton just the other day said, "I have that authority in Arkansas, and I want that authority as President of the United States." So let us give whomever our President is going to be, just for 1 year only, that opportunity. Let us see if it works.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, things have changed a lot since 1974. In 1974, if I remember correctly, we had a President from Michigan, Gerald Ford, and Congress passed a tax cut, and he vetoed it and opposed it, because he said you should not have a tax cut when you are already in the red.

So, as I say, things have changed a great deal, and I do not care who wants the line-item veto, people in hell want ice water, and I do not care if it is Clinton or who it is, I think the Founders knew what they were doing.

Semper Fi.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the vote coming up in just a minute is going to be a vote to defeat the previous question. That means that if we vote no, we are going to make my amendment in order to allow an up-or-down vote on the question of 1-year, line-item veto authority for the President, whomever he might be. I would hope the 67 good Democrats on the other side of the aisle who strongly support the line-item veto would come over here and vote no on the previous question. That way they could put their vote where their mouth is along with the 166 Members of this side of the aisle who will vote unanimously for this motion to defeat the previous question. That will give us 234 Members who will send a message to the American people that we really intend to try to take the first step toward eliminating this sea of red ink which is really just ruining the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point in the RECORD the letter I referred to from the Office of the President, the statement of administration policy, and a list of organizations supporting defeat of the previous question.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET, WASHINGTON, DC.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SOLOMON: Thank you for your letter concerning your intention to press for an up or down vote on the line-item veto in the 102nd Congress.

The President's support for a line-item veto amendment to the Constitution is clear. He has also supported legislation to enhance the existing rescission procedures by requiring an up-or-down vote in Congress on Presidential rescission proposals. You can be sure that you have the Administration's full support in your effort.

Sincerely,

DAVID F. TAYLOR,
Associate Director for Legislative Affairs.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

The Administration believes that providing for the operation of the government through continuing resolutions is an undesirable practice. If a continuing resolution is unavoidable, however, the Administration believes that it should be free of extraneous provisions and, consistent with the President's freeze proposal, provide funding at the lower of House, Senate or current rate. H.J. Res. 553 meets this test.

The Administration has no objection to passage of H.J. Res. 553, which would provide for the continuation of normal government operations through October 5, 1992.

The Administration supports Representative Solomon's effort to secure a separate up or down vote on the line-item veto in the 102nd Congress. The President's support for the line-item veto is clear.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING DEFEAT OF PREVIOUS QUESTION ON CR RULE TO PERMIT VOTE ON LINE-ITEM VETO AMENDMENT

Citizens Against Government Waste.
National Taxpayers Union.
Americans for Tax Reform.
Citizens for a Sound Economy.
The United States Business and Industrial Council.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
Washington, DC, September 29, 1992.

Hon. GERALD B. SOLOMON,
Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SOLOMON: I am writing to express our support for your efforts to pass line-item veto legislation this year. Specifically, the Council for Citizens against Government Waste (CCAGW) supports your efforts to defeat the previous question to H. Res. 580, the rule for the continuing appropriations resolution, so that a line-item veto amendment can be ruled in order. I urge all Members to vote to defeat the previous question.

There has never been a better opportunity for enacting line-item veto legislation. Both President Bush and Governor Clinton support it, as do a majority of the American people.

In addition, the line-item veto will significantly reduce wasteful, pork-barrel spending. According to a January, 1992 General Accounting Office report, if the President had had line-item veto authority from FY 1984 through FY 1989, the cumulative six-year savings would have been $70 billion.

A vote to defeat the previous question is a vote for the American taxpayer. Thank you for your continued commitment to restoring fiscal sanity to the federal budgeting process.

Sincerely,

TOM.

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,
Washington, DC, September 29, 1992.

Hon. GERALD SOLOMON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SOLOMON: The 200,000 member National Taxpayers Union supports your effort to make in order and offer a line item veto amendment to H.J. Res. 553, the continuing appropriations resolution.

Perhaps no one put it better than Democratic Presidential Nominee Bill Clinton during the primary season, when he said, "I strongly support the line item veto because I think it's one of the most powerful weapons we could use in our fight against out of control deficit spending."

The all too common Congressional tactic is to attach parochial, pork barrel appropriations to must-pass legislation that the President has little choice but to sign. Since most of these provisions are neither the subject of debate nor vote, many Members of Congress do not realize they exist. Your amendment would allow the President, Republican or Democrat, to draw attention to pork barrel provisions and force their proponents to justify them. Meritorious provisions would stand under Congressional scrutiny, and the rest would be eliminated.

Additionally, the line item veto would make the President more accountable on the issue of wasteful spending. Many Presidents repeatedly criticize Congress on spending. By giving line item veto authority to the President, Congress would be inviting him to work actively rather than rhetorically to trim wasteful spending.

Although the discretionary account of the federal budget is by no means the largest, it is an area of tremendous waste, causing cynicism among taxpayers who see the dollars they send to Washington squandered on blueberry research or bike paths. Our national debt is now over $3.8 trillion, and recent projections for the FY 92 deficit are $333.5 billion. Clearly Congress needs to re-evaluate its spending practices and take strong steps

to restore fiscal discipline. The line item veto is one of those steps, and would be an important sign to taxpayers and voters nation-wide that Congress is finally taking our fiscal crisis seriously.

Again, thank you for your efforts. We strongly urge all Members to help you defeat the previous question on H. Res. 580, and make your amendment in order.

Sincerely,

JAMES DAVIDSON,
Chairman.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM,
Washington, DC, September 26, 1992.

Hon. GERALD SOLOMON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR JERRY: Thank you for all your leadership on the line-item veto issue.

Your efforts thus far have brought us closer to our shared goal of passing a Presidential line-item veto than we have been in ten years.

On behalf of all American taxpayers, I strongly urge your colleagues to join with you in voting 'No' on the previous question for the rule on the continuing appropriations resolution (H.J. Res. 553) on Wednesday so that you can make in order the consideration of a line-item veto rescission authority amendment.

Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

GROVER NORQUIST.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1992.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 250,000 members of Citizens for a Sound Economy, I urge you to vote against the previous question on the rule for H.J. Res. 553, the continuing resolution, and to support all subsequent votes that would lead to passage of a line-item veto.

CSE will count those votes as key votes on the line-item veto to be reported to our members in your district. These key votes will be used to determine your eligibility for our Jefferson Award, to be presented at the conclusion of this Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL BECKNER,
President.

BUSINESS AND INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, September 29, 1992.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SOLOMON: On behalf of the 1500 member CEOs of the United States Business and Industrial Council, I would like to strongly endorse your effort to defeat the previous question on the rule on the continuing resolution, and to require the rule under which the House considers the CR to permit consideration of a Line Item Veto.

We have long supported the Line Item Veto; we consider this upcoming vote to be a definitive show of support for the Line Item Veto in the House of Representatives in the 102nd Congress.

We urge your colleagues to support your effort to secure a vote on Line Item Veto, and praise your effort to bring this about.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN P. CREGAN,
President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to talk about the Solomon amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the Solomon amendment is not germane. The underlying bill is a 5-day continuing resolution covering those fiscal year 1993 appropriation bills not yet enacted.

The Solomon amendment expands the President's authority to rescind full-year funding for all fiscal year 1993 appropriations.

The Solomon amendment enhances the President's power and modifies congressional rules of procedure. When the text of the amendment was introduced as a bill, it was referred to Government Operations and to the Rules Committee, not to Appropriations. This is another indication that the amendment is not germane.

The precedents and traditions of the House are clear. One may not accomplish by indirect means that which is directly prohibited. Even if the previous question is defeated, the Solomon amendment to the rule would not be germane because the Solomon amendment to the bill is not germane.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question and move on to the business at hand. Let us pass the clean, short-term CR and get down to work on the remaining individual appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, we are in the waning days of this session. We all hope, regardless of party, to be finished this weekend.

There is only one group of people in this country that wants us to finish our work more than we do, and that is the American taxpayer.

The line-item veto is a good idea. I support it. Many members of the Democratic leadership and, I am told, over 100 Democrats support the line-item veto.

□ 1150

I had the pleasure of having two hearings on the line-item veto. Excellent testimony came forth in support of a line-item veto. But there is no question that it would effect a substantial change in the balance of power between the Congress and the executive branch.

It is still something that we hope and, I believe, will become a part of our procedure next term. What we need to do now is vote for the previous question because the last thing we need is to put ourselves further behind in our goal of finishing this week. That is exactly what voting against the previous question would do. In my opinion, we would not accomplish anything because if we did vote down the previous question and the Solomon amendment were offered a point of order would be raised. Although I am not the parliamentarian, I believe the point of order would be sustained. We would go through this exercise to no avail.

What we need out of this body is a clean CR and to move ahead and go home.

I think there is a possibility that we might get a vote of some sort on this line-item veto proposal before we get out of here, although I cannot say that definitively. There are discussions going on about that. But right now the issue is whether we vote for or against the previous question. I ask that you vote for it.

FURTHER MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Further messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 553, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1993

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 186, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—231

Abercrombie	Carper	Edwards (CA)
Ackerman	Carr	Edwards (TX)
Anderson	Chapman	Engel
Andrews (ME)	Clay	English
Andrews (NJ)	Clement	Espy
Andrews (TX)	Coleman (TX)	Evans
Annunzio	Collins (IL)	Fascell
Anthony	Collins (MI)	Fazio
Applegate	Conyers	Feighan
Aspin	Cooper	Flake
Atkins	Costello	Foglietta
AuCoin	Cox (IL)	Ford (MI)
Beilenson	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Berman	Cramer	Frost
Bevill	Darden	Gaydos
Bilbray	de la Garza	Gejdenson
Blackwell	DeFazio	Gephardt
Bonior	DeLauro	Gibbons
Borski	Dellums	Glickman
Boucher	Derrick	Gonzalez
Boxer	Dicks	Gordon
Brewster	Dingell	Guarini
Brooks	Dixon	Hall (OH)
Browder	Donnelly	Hamilton
Brown	Dooley	Harris
Bruce	Downey	Hatcher
Bryant	Durbin	Hayes (IL)
Bustamante	Dwyer	Hefner
Byron	Early	Hertel
Cardin	Eckart	Hoagland

Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hutto
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—186

Allard
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Chandler
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Davis
DeLay
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Kasich
Kennedy
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Nichols
Nussle
Orton
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Porter
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stallings
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Alexander
Barnard
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Ford (TN)
Huckaby
Jefferson
Livingston
McCrery
Miller (CA)
Olin
Perkins
Ray
Smith (FL)
Staggers

□ 1214

Mr. PORTER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. PENNY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HAYES of Louisiana changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 204, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

AYES—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Jenkins
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Laughlin
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHugh
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOES—204

Allard
Allen
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Broomfield
Bruce
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Chandler
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Davis
DeLay
Dickinson
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Myers
Nichols
Nussle
Orton
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery

Smith (NJ)	Tallon	Walsh
Smith (OR)	Tanner	Weber
Smith (TX)	Taylor (NC)	Weldon
Snowe	Thomas (CA)	Wilson
Solomon	Thomas (WY)	Wolf
Spence	Upton	Wylie
Stallings	Valentine	Young (AK)
Stearns	Vander Jagt	Young (FL)
Stump	Vucanovich	Zeliff
Sundquist	Walker	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Alexander	Ford (TN)	Olin
Barnard	Huckaby	Perkins
Dellums	Jefferson	Ray
Dymally	Livingston	Smith (FL)
Edwards (OK)	McCrery	Staggers

□ 1237

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of Florida for, with Mr. Ray against.

Messrs. McDADE, JOHNSON of South Dakota, and DAVIS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PICKETT, STENHOLM, PARKER, HARRIS, CARPER, TAUZIN, BROWDER, HALL of Texas, and ROWLAND changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that the votes were switched there a few minutes ago on the basis of a change in the legislative schedule and that now things are going to come to the floor that were not previously scheduled.

Is the Chair prepared to inform the House what the deal was and what the things are that will now come to the floor that were not previously scheduled?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's question is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1993

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 580, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 553) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 553

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1992 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 201 of Public Law 99-64 and section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1993, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993; and

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993:

Provided, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of October 1, 1992, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 1992, pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145: *Provided*, That where an item is included in only one version of an Act as passed by both Houses as of October 1, 1992, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House, but at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House as of October 1, 1992, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the House, at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145: *Provided*, That where an item is funded in applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145 and not included in the version passed by the House as of October 1, 1992, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145, at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate and under the authority and conditions provided in applicable appropriations Acts for the fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1992 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1992 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which is defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1992, except projects, activities, operations, or organizations relating to "Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm": *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quality procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1992.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1992 or in Public Law 102-145, and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable ap-

propriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) October 5, 1992, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in any appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1993 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provisions of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, or any other law, each agency, office, and instrumentality of the District of Columbia government, except the District of Columbia Courts, shall furlough each employee of the respective agency, office, or instrumentality for one day in each month of the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, or a proportional number of hours for part-time employees.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, or any other law, no employee of any agency, office, or instrumentality of the District of Columbia government shall receive within-grade salary increases during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and no time during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, shall accrue toward the waiting period of advancement to the following rate within the grade.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, activities funded in the Federal Communications Commission's Salaries and Expenses account shall be maintained at the current rate of operations.

□ 1240

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include tabular and extraneous material, on House Joint Resolution 553, the legislation now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, tomorrow we will begin a new fiscal year. That portion of the budget submitted to the Congress by the President within the jurisdiction of our committee was divided into 13 parts. We had our 13 appropriation bills, and with the help of everyone in this House on both sides of the aisle, and every member of the Committee on Appropriations, we succeeded in passing all 13 of our appropriation bills through the House by July 30. Only one of our bills has been signed into law. That is the bill that appropriates the money for the Department of Agriculture.

We have now at the White House ready for consideration by the President and for his signature the energy and water development bill, the District of Columbia bill that, with the House action this morning, is now being sent back following the President's veto. Other bills that are ready include the military construction bill, and the VA, HUD and independent agencies bill. House action on the Interior bill this morning makes this bill ready for Senate concurrence prior to presentation to the President.

Mr. Speaker, we also have conference reports filed and pending for House action on the bills that appropriate the money for the Departments of Commerce, State, and Justice; for the Department of Transportation; and for the Department of Treasury and the Post Office.

There are two bills, Mr. Speaker, that are still in conference of the 13 bills that I just mentioned.

We have Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, which goes into conference today at 3 o'clock. The Defense conference started yesterday, Mr. Speaker. It began at 2 o'clock.

We also have the foreign operations and the legislative branch appropriations bills that have not been acted on in the other body.

House Joint Resolution 553, the measure before the House, would continue Government operations through October 5 at rates that would be the lower of the House bill, the Senate bill, or the current rate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean CR. It should be adopted, and we recommend its adoption by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this continuing resolution, which is backed also by the administration. We have a statement of administration policy to that effect.

As my dear friend, the acting chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has explained, the fiscal year begins tomorrow and all the bills are not yet in place. It is our hope and expectation that they soon will be. That is why this CR is cleaner than a hound's tooth and runs only until the fifth. None of us wants to see an extended continuing resolution. We are hopeful that the authorizing committees that are still completing their work product will complete their work product in order that we might complete all the rest of the appropriation bills.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], as he always does, has done an excellent job of informing the House on the content of the resolution. There is no need for me to repeat it. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, fiscal year 1993 begins tomorrow. We have not yet completed action on all 13 appropriations bills.

The Committee on Appropriations began hearings on the fiscal year 1993 appropriations bills on January 23, 1992. Our committee took testimony from over 5,600 witnesses on 254 hearing days, which was printed in 90 hearing volumes, over 99,500 pages.

All 13 bills passed the House by July 30 by substantial margins. These bills were all within the committee's allocation pursuant to the current budget resolution. The Senate has passed all but two bills.

The committee's action continues to result in reduced spending. Since 1945, the committee has held the total of all appropriations bills $188.8 billion below the total requested by Presidents.

One bill has been signed into law. Conferees have concluded action on eight other bills. Two other bills are in conference, and the final two are awaiting initiation of conference pending completion of Senate action. We will not be able to complete work on these last four bills before tomorrow.

We need a short-term continuing resolution to keep the Government operating until action on the remaining bills is completed. House Joint Resolution 553 keeps the Government operating through October 5. It continues programs under 1992 terms and conditions at: First, the lower of House or current rate for bills passed only by the House; or second, the lower of House, Senate, or current rate for bills passed by both the House and the Senate.

No extraneous issues are included in this resolution. The provisions of this continuing resolution apply only until October 5, 1992, or until the regular annual appropriations bills are enacted into law, whichever one comes first.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to compliment the members of the committee for the work done this year and for the way they have done it. I also want to thank the staff of the committee—each and every one—all who have worked hard and well all year long—those who do the typing as well as those who talk with us and their Senate counterparts throughout the process.

I recommend the adoption of this resolution so that the Government does not have to close. We need the additional time provided by this CR to complete our few remaining appropriations bills.

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, we urge adoption of the resolution. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 300, nays 104, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—300

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Ballenger
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McDermott
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Sabo
Sanders
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schiff
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—104

Allard
Allen
Archer
Armey
Baker
Barrett
Barton
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Boehner
Broomfield
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Coble
Costello
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Gekas
Gillmor
Goss
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Henry
Herger
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Hubbard
Hunter
Inhofe
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Lagomarsino
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Marlenee
McCandless
McEwen
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Nichols
Nussle
Packard
Pallone
Paxon
Pease
Penny
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Russo
Sangmeister
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander
Barnard
Boucher
Brown
Chandler
DeFazio
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Ford (TN)
Gilman
Gingrich
Hatcher
Huckaby
Ireland
Livingston
Manton
Martin
McCrery
McCurdy
Olin
Perkins
Rose
Smith (FL)
Staggers
Tallon
Tauzin
Washington
Yatron

□ 1304

Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. MILLER of Washington changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11, REVENUE ACT OF 1992

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of tax enterprise zones, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARCHER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 11, be instructed to disagree to sections 3102 and 3103 of the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

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

Mr. Speaker, my motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 11 is an attempt on the part of Republicans in the House to increase the possibility that the conference report on H.R. 11 will result in a bill the President can sign into law.

I must admit that the motion provides no guarantee, only an improved

chance for success. None of us know at this point what the final conference product might contain which could prompt a veto. I am confident, however that a veto will occur if the Senate's extension of the personal exemption phaseout and cut in itemized deductions remain in the bill.

When this process started in the wake of the Los Angeles riots, it was viewed by proponents as an urban relief package designed to stimulate economic activity in depressed areas in order to reduce pressures that contribute to urban unrest.

The centerpiece of that effort was the enactment of the President's $2½ billion enterprise zone initiative, but that was just the starting point.

By the time the Ways and Means Committee finished its work, the House bill contained a series of other popular items.

Extension of expiring tax provisions, repeal of the so-called luxury tax, changes in the passive-loss rules for real estate, modification of corporate alternative minimum tax provisions, additional spending on welfare and the JOBS program, a credit for employers to offset FICA taxes paid on tips, and other provisions which enjoy broad bipartisan support in this Chamber.

But those provisions did not come without a price. All that added up to some $19.6 billion in spending and tax reductions which was mostly offset by some $19.1 billion in tax increases and other revenue raisers.

By the time the Senate finished its work, the cost of the bill had skyrocketed to $36.6 billion, mostly offset by $36.1 billion in tax increases and other revenues. Christmas arrived a bit early in the other body, and the tax-and-spend policies of its majority were resoundingly reaffirmed.

Even without the onerous cuts in personal exemptions and itemized deductions in the final conference report, there is no certainty that conferees will be able to develop a bill that can be signed into law.

The size of the overall package certainly will have a bearing on the President's decision, as well as whether the conference report contains other tax increases the President cannot endorse.

Much will depend upon how the conference will proceed. The chances of its success may hinge upon the extent to which the majority leadership decides to involve House and Senate Republicans and the administration in shaping a compromise.

We are certainly willing to help make the attempt, if we are allowed to do so, and given a voice in a sincere attempt to send the President a bill he can sign.

I would sound a word of caution on that note. We Republicans have no interest in merely providing political cover in some grand scheme designed to embarrass the President. Hopefully, that is not what this exercise is all about.

Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI has expressed his personal interest in sending the President a bill he can sign. I respect that position, I appreciate it, and I hope that other conferees will share that commitment.

Based on the Senate vote to phaseout personal exemptions and cut itemized deductions last week, I have my doubts. The majority in the Senate seems far less inclined to achieve that worthy goal. That is why this motion to instruct is an important step in the direction of crafting a signable bill.

It underscores the clear House position which calls for no extension whatsoever, permanent or temporary, of the personal exemption phaseout and cut-in itemized deductions.

We should maintain that clear position and insist upon it adamantly in conference. I urge adoption of the motion to instruct conferees.

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

□ 1310

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the House passed H.R. 11 by 300 votes last July, without these two provisions in it. I have only 1 objective in conference—and that is to get a bill to the President that he can sign. If passage of this motion will facilitate that goal, I have no objection to the motion.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees and reserves the right to appoint additional conferees and to specify terms of their appointment: From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of the House bill, and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference; Messrs. ROSTENKOWSKI, GIBBONS, PICKLE, RANGEL, STARK, ARCHER, VANDER JAGT, and CRANE. Provided, that solely for consideration of sections 6211–14 and 7101–62 of the House bill, and sections 6211–14, 7101–77, and 7180–81 of the Senate amendment, Mr. DOWNEY is appointed in lieu of Mr. STARK and Mr. SHAW is appointed in lieu of Mr. CRANE; that solely for consideration of sections 6201 and 7001–14 of the House bill and sections 6201, 7001–06, 7178, and 7179 of the Senate amendment, Mr. JACOBS is appointed in lieu of Mr. STARK and Mr. BUNNING is appointed in lieu of Mr. CRANE; that solely for consideration of sections 2171–85, 6220–51, and titles XIV–XVI of the Senate amendment, Mr. GRADISON is appointed in lieu of Mr. CRANE; and that solely for consideration of title V of the House bill, and title V of the Senate amendment, Mr. SCHULZE is appointed in lieu of Mr. CRANE.

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES–CHINA ACT OF 1992—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto of the President on the bill (H.R. 5318) regarding the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to the products of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes.

The question is, will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to allocate the time to his membership.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the President's veto of H.R. 5318.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to override the President's veto of H.R. 5318, the China most-favored-nation conditionality bill. As all Americans know, the hard-line leadership of China brutally suppressed a peaceful demonstration for democracy in June 1989. Since then, the House has voted numerous times for legislation to in-

crease pressure on the Chinese Government to improve its behavior in the areas of human rights, trade, and weapons nonproliferation. At each stage, the administration said that such legislation was unnecessary. They said the Chinese hard-liners would be won over by diplomatic persuasion, rather than by hard and fast legislative requirements. They are still saying the same thing, as is evidenced by the President's most recent veto of H.R. 5318.

Let me make it clear that I do not want to isolate China from the positive influences of Western democracies, nor undermine the influence of the growing moderate, free-market forces within China. For that reason, H.R. 5318 has been carefully crafted to establish objectives that the Government of China can reasonably meet, in order to retain its most-favored-nation status. Indeed, this bill provides for less sweeping sanctions and greater Presidential flexibility than did a similar bill vetoed by the President earlier this year.

In this regard, H.R. 5318 establishes a number of new but reasonable human rights, trade, and weapons nonproliferation conditions—in addition to those contained in current law—which China must meet in order for the President to recommend a continuation of China's most-favored-nation status in 1993. However, if China fails to satisfy these conditions, most-favored-nation treatment will only be withdrawn for those Chinese exports to the United States that are produced or exported by Chinese state-owned enterprises. Exports from businesses or joint ventures that are not state-owned would continue to receive most-favored-nation treatment.

Mr. Speaker, those opposed to this bill have argued that the behavior of China's leaders has improved recently and that enactment of this bill will be counterproductive. I do not agree that the administration's current policies are working. Too many Tiananmen Square demonstrators remain unaccounted for. Negotiations to open China's restrictive trade practices have not made significant progress. Reports continue to surface about possible sales of Chinese missiles to volatile regimes around the world.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives approved H.R. 5318 by a vote of 339–62 on July 21, 1992. This bill was drafted in a way that constructively takes into account objections of the administration to past congressional initiatives in this area. For that reason, I am disappointed that the President still saw fit to veto the bill. However, I believe now, more than ever, that enactment of this bill will send the right message to China's leadership—that the United States wants and expects more responsible behavior in the areas of human rights, trade, and weapons nonproliferation, in return for continued free access to the United States market.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of H.R. 5318.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the debate on this measure has been endless. The question is whether the Congress will dictate to an unwilling President the content of United States foreign and economic relations with China. I believe the answer should be a resounding "no."

The confrontation between the President and the Congress over H.R. 5318—which would impose stringent new conditions on trade with China and likely bring the trading relationship to a halt—serves only to undermine United States influence over that vast and strategically important country. It demonstrates that Congress only wants to dictate and refuses to work with the President to achieve a unified and effective China policy.

The Framers of our Constitution clearly recognized that the President must be the leader of foreign policy. They gave Congress the lead on foreign trade. However, in our complicated world these two objectives cannot be achieved independently. To be effective, United States policy toward China must not only be coherent at home but coordinated with our major allies abroad.

Under the leadership of President Bush—whose experience in dealing with China is unmatched—the United States has made a tremendous impact on China.

Through trade and the pursuit of clear foreign policy objectives, we continue to have an important influence on China's behavior toward its citizens, the direction of its economy, and its cooperation in international organizations.

□ 1320

H.R. 5318 ignores those successes in favor of focusing only on areas needing improvement. It punishes United States businesses that have risked much to penetrate the Chinese market and to become a part of that emerging economy. The President is right to veto this legislation.

Our goal as a Congress should be to work with the President to develop a unified policy toward China that is realistic and effective—one that reinforces our own economic and foreign policy interests. We have worked at cross-purposes long enough.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the question of repassing H.R. 5318, the objections of the President notwithstanding. The responsible thing to do is to stand beside the President and sustain his veto of this destructive legislation.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I also want to commend him for bringing this legislation to the floor, giving us this opportunity for the veto override. His speech today spelled it all out very well. I just want to add some additional comments to it, as well as speaking for some of our colleagues who will not be able to have time on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the override of the President's veto of H.R. 5318, legislation authored by our esteemed colleague, Representative PEASE, to condition most-favored-nation [MFN] trading status for China. Unfortunately, this House is once again faced with a Presidential veto of a China bill that has received overwhelming bipartisan support in this Chamber.

The President should have signed this bill for two reasons, I believe. First, the bill was carefully crafted to strengthen China's growing private sector. It focuses economic pressure directly on the Chinese regime by conditioning MFN for state enterprises only.

This is a difference in the bill from previous attempts to condition MFN. It responds to the concerns of businesses who have said that we might stifle the growth of private sector business and joint ventures there and exempts them from any action of this bill.

The second reason I believe the President should have signed this bill is that it responds to a Chinese regime that has been emboldened by its political successes since the Tiananmen Square massacre. At that time when we objected to their actions, the Chinese regime said the United States is a paper tiger. We will do whatever we want and they will respond to us because of business.

This month, China announced it would sell a nuclear reactor to Iran. In response to the administration's sale of F–16's to Taiwan, it also pulled out of U.N. arms talks aimed at stopping nuclear proliferation. To appease the Chinese, the administration then responded to these dangerous developments by approving a sale of satellite technology long desired by the Chinese regime, which has military applications.

Then, on September 25, China conducted an underground nuclear explosive test at their Lop Nor test site. The explosion was apparently of a relatively low yield, about 1–20 kilotons TNT—the nuclear bomb dropped on Hiroshima had a yield of 12 kilotons TNT. Some experts believe that the test was either part of an ongoing effort to modernize China's weaponry, or was related to the design and reliability of the fission triggers to China's

thermonuclear weaponry. If the initial reports were correct, the testing configuration was also suitable for conducting experiments on the effects of nuclear explosives on military equipment.

I take the time to mention this, Mr. Speaker, because this vote, I mentioned there were two reasons why the President should have signed it, one, that the bill is more focused, and two, that the conditions in China have worsened because of the arrogance of the Chinese regime. Every Member who says they want to vote with the President on this has to remember that he or she must answer for his or her own vote when we are talking about nuclear proliferation.

I am just mentioning that these are just a few examples of how China is escalating regional and global tensions.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will submit into the RECORD a more comprehensive list of China's nuclear and missile proliferation activities over the past 18 months.

CHINESE NUCLEAR AND MISSILE PROLIFERATION

(Compiled by Jon B. Wolfsthal, Arms Control Association)

September 11, 1992.—Bush grants export waivers allowing China to launch six U.S. satellites (or satellites with U.S. components). Certification includes a determination that China is obeying the guidelines of the Missile Technology Control Regime (see November 1991). State Department briefing.

September 11, 1992.—PRC to build 300 megawatt nuclear reactor for Iran. Would improve Iranian nuclear know-how that could indirectly aid in the development of nuclear weapons. The New York Times, 9/11/92, Elaine Sciolino.

May 10, 1992.—Installation of a Chinese-supplied 300 megawatt reactor in Pakistan had begun and the reactor was expected to begin operation in 1998. Pakistan is not a member of the NPT and is suspected of having nuclear weapons. JPRS Proliferation Issues.

April 10, 1992.—China has agreed to sell Syria a nuclear research reactor. JPRS Proliferation Issues.

March 10, 1992.—China accedes to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Obligates China not to assist non-nuclear-weapon states acquire nuclear weapons. IAEA Press Release.

July 30, 1992.—China is negotiating the sale of nuclear power plants to Iran, Egypt, and Bangladesh. United Press International.

March 1992.—China reportedly sold India at least 130 tons of heavy water between 1982 and 1987. Nuclear Fuel, 2/17/92.

February 1992.—It was reported that China shipped at least 60 metric tonnes of unsafeguarded heavy water, useful in the production of plutonium, to Argentina between 1981 and 1985. Nucleonics Week, 2/13/92 and the Christian Science Monitor, James Tyson, 3/10/92.

January 31, 1992.—U.S. intelligence reports indicate China, in violation of its pledge to abide by the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) has exported to Syria 30 tons of chemical used in the production of solid-rocket motors for missiles. The New York Times, 1/31/92.

January 22, 1992.—Defense Intelligence Agency Director, General James Clapper, reports to SASC "China is currently assisting many of the nations that we estimate will acquire a ballistic missile capability by the end of the decade."

January 1, 1992.—China announced that it will sell Pakistan a 300 Megawatt nuclear reactor. China is believed to assisted Pakistan in its nuclear weapons development program. The deal was signed in November, 1989. The Washington Post, January 1, 1992, Steve Coll and Nucleonics Week, November 23, 1989.

November 14, 1991.—The Bush Administration acknowledged the Iranian-Chinese nuclear link even though it had assured congress earlier that no such link existed. Aviation Week and Space technology, November 4, 1991. (Richard Soloman Ass't. Sec of State and Carl Ford, Dep. Ass't Sec. Defense before SFRC, Oct. 30, 1991.)

November 5, 1991.—China admits to nuclear deal with Iran. Foreign Ministry statement: "Chinese and Iranian companies signed commercial contracts * * * in 1989 and 1991" for China to provide the Iranians "with a electromagnetic separator [calutron] for producing isotopes and a mini-type reactor * * *" While neither piece of equipment could be directly used in a nuclear weapon program, the technology could be adapted for such use. This admission contradicts press statement of August 2, 1991 (see below). Philadelphia Inquirer, November 5, 1991.

November 1991.—China verbally agrees to abide by the terms of the MTCR in exchange for the U.S. dropping sanctions against the Chinese launch of U.S. satellites. Sanctions were imposed by the U.S. over China's missile proliferation activities.

September 30, 1991.—PRC is accused of aiding India nuclear weapons development program. PRC is also believed to have given India heavy water, which could have aided in India's nuclear weapons program. The Washington Post, September 30, 1991.

August 2, 1991.—In a letter to the Washington Post, the Chinese Press Counselor to the PRC embassy in Washington states "China has struck no nuclear deals with Iran." The Washington Post, 7/2/91.

May 5, 1991.—Iraq reportedly acquired 1.8 metric tonnes of low-enriched uranium from China. Such material could have significantly decreased the time Iraq would have needed to develop nuclear weapons.

May 2, 1991.—Up to 15 Iranian nuclear scientists have undergone training on nuclear reactor design and research in China under a secret Iranian-PRC nuclear cooperation agreement. Nucleonics Week, May 2, 1991, Mark Hibbs.

April 1991.—China denied it had supplied Algeria with a 10 megawatt nuclear research reactor and then, later, admitted to the sale. The reactor will be put under IAEA safeguards. Nucleonics Week, April 18, 1991, Mark Hibbs.

China has made little progress on human rights, a fact which even the President admits. He continues to argue, however, that his failed policy is working. But look at the reality. Last month, China's rulers promised that Chinese scholars studying abroad could return home without fear of arrest. Two weeks later, the regime arrested Shen Tong, a prominent prodemocracy activist who returned home to Beijing in order to promote democratic reform from within. They also arrested two other dissidents along with Shen Tong and we have reliable reports that at least three of the people who met with Shen Tong in South China have also been arrested.

No information has been released on the whereabouts and condition of the arrested dissidents.

For the RECORD, I will submit some of the actions Shen Tong's mother has taken for his release. Basically it comes down to the regime saying "so what," to her.

In August, just weeks after China signed an agreement with the administration promising to stop the use of prison labor to make goods for export, Asia Watch released documents proving that labor camps in Lingyuan Province were not only producing exports, but also brutally torturing prodemocracy activists. There is also growing concern about the failing health of and the lack of medical attention to the prodemocracy activists.

As the administration struggles at the negotiating table to get the Chinese to lower tariff barriers to American products, China's trade surplus with the United States continues to grow. It is already 64 percent higher than last year, and may reach $20 billion by the end of 1992, while America's workers face layoffs here at home.

Even if you could forget, Mr. Speaker, which I doubt we can, the human rights violations, and even if we could ignore the nuclear proliferation, to your own peril, how can we explain to American workers how this Congress of the United States can allow China to block our products going into their market?

As I mentioned, it could go to $20 billion this year. That is going in the wrong direction; $6 billion in 1989, $9 billion in 1990, $12 billion in 1991, and perhaps up to $20 billion this year, while America's workers face layoffs here at home.

It is clear that, despite the President's much-acclaimed personal relationships with China's leaders, diplomatic efforts have not produced significant results since Tiananmen Square. The Chinese hard-liners know that although MFN gives them the hard currency they need to stay in power, this administration will not use it as leverage. As long as this situation continues, the regime has little incentive or reason to respond to U.S. concerns about nuclear proliferation, unfair trade practices, and the denial of basic freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to defend a vote in support of the President when the evidence is so clear that because of China, the world is a more dangerous place, American workers are losing their jobs and those struggling for freedom and democracy in China are being suppressed.

Yesterday, I had the honor of meeting with Han Dongfang, a leading China labor leader and prodemocracy activist, and I will submit for the RECORD in the interest of time the conversation that I had with him.

H.R. 5318 is the right approach to our diplomatic impasse with China.

The gentleman from Texas mentioned that Congress is trying to take some of the President's jurisdiction by helping to make foreign policy, but in fact issues of trade are the jurisdiction of this Congress of the United States, and I do not believe we should abdicate our jurisdiction in that regard.

The bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] demonstrates our strengthened resolve to use our economic leverage for a safer world, fairer trade, and a freer political climate in China.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to override the President's veto and make this bill become law.

I again thank the chairman of the committee and commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] for their leadership on this important legislation. It is smart legislation.

I urge my colleagues again to make this law of the land.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for yielding time to me on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, once again we face the President's veto of a thoroughly objectionable bill designed to abolish all reasonable trade relations with China. The President has consistently opposed such short-sighted, if well-intentioned, legislation. Last year a similar bill also was vetoed and the veto was sustained. This year the same outcome is expected.

What have we gained by this process of confrontation? The battle perhaps has intensified the spotlight on unacceptable Chinese practices, but it has done little to affect them. On the other hand, the President's policy of employing targeted sanctions, trade law actions, and concerted joint efforts with our allies has resulted in measurable success.

Taiwan's membership in the GATT is now moving forward with Chinese cooperation. China has acceded to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and other technology control guidelines. The United States is confronting China, under a section 301 case, on China's restrictive trade practices. China has supported United States positions in the United Nations and has aided peace efforts in Cambodia.

As recently as this week, China has announced that it will slash output quotas and redirect its central planning toward market principles, under the leadership of pro-reformists. United States businesses continue to be active in the Chinese market and provide an unparalleled example of the benefits of free market principles and respect for human rights.

All these examples demonstrate what the United States can achieve through concerted and coordinated efforts. They also show what the United States stands to lose if we remove MFN and retreat from all trade with that country. The specter of an isolated China, intensified human rights abuses, and a crushed Hong Kong economy is real.

If we pass H.R. 5318 over the President's veto, we will reverse all our hard-fought efforts to bring China into the mainstream of world economic, foreign policy, and human rights practices. We will be turning our backs on Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the coastal regions of China where market forces have thrived.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5318 is misguided legislation that will imperil the relationship between the United States and China. The President was right to veto it. Congress should instead work with the President to develop a unified policy toward that important nation and to stand together in holding China responsible for its actions.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does nothing to force China to be responsible for the leadership position it has taken in the world. It only undermines our own interests. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the question on the question of passing H.R. 5318 over the objections of the President.

□ 1330

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE], the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of the United States-China Act of 1992. This legislation does use trade as leverage to bring about positive change in China's human rights and weapons nonproliferation policies. The bill also links MFN to China's dispensing with unfair trade practices such as transshipment.

There are those who argue that in utilizing such linkage, the United States Government runs the risk of provoking a hard-line retaliatory reaction from Beijing. In my view, this assertion does not hold water.

I view United States-China trade relations as somewhat akin to a game of commercial chicken between two national players. Consider, if you will, the relative bargaining power of each, that is, what each stands to win and what each stands to lose.

China stands to gain 1 more year of preferential trading rights with the market that will generate as much as $20 billion in hard currency this year.

The People's Republic of China stands to lose a good portion of this money, since retaliatory action against the United States would result in the reimposition of significantly higher, non-MFN tariff rates.

If the United States wins this game, we look forward to a commercial alliance with the Chinese based on fair, rather than unfair trading practices. Also, if China moves in the direction of political and social reform as suggested by this bill, Washington will most certainly see a surge in entrepreneurial activity similar to what we are witnessing in the south provinces.

Finally, if China were persuaded to honor its commitments to nonproliferation of weapons, the United States would gain the peace of mind that comes with containment of lethal nuclear technology.

It is hard to pinpoint a down side for the United States to the passage of this bill. The conditions in this measure are reasonable and achievable and the President is given more than adequate wiggle room in determining whether they have been met.

In sum, if I were a betting man, I would be placing my wager on the United States to win. Vote to support passage of H.R. 5318.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress has the opportunity to override the President's veto of H.R. 5318, a bill to place conditions on most-favored-nation [MFN] status for China. A vote to override the veto is a bipartisan vote for democracy and the nonproliferation of illegal missile and nuclear weapons.

Contrary to the President's claims, H.R. 5318, would ensure that China make overall significant progress in three specific areas of human rights, trade, and weapons nonproliferation.

I have always firmly believed that United States must take a stand with the octogenarian leaders of China. Now more than ever, I stress the importance of this legislation. Recently, prodemocracy activist Shen Tong, a graduate of Brandeis University and a resident of my district, was arrested by the Chinese Government. He returned to China only after Chinese officials had promised that prodemocracy activists would not be prosecuted for their participation in the Tiananmen Square democracy movement. But shortly after he arrived, Shen Tong was arrested and was thrown in prison. Is this the so-called progress in human rights that has taken place in China?

How about in the area of missile and nuclear weapons proliferation? What progress has China made in preventing the spread of these weapons of mass destruction? Let's review China's record:

Provided nuclear facility design information and nuclear technical training to Iran, including a recent sale of a 300-megawatt nuclear reactor;

Supplied Syria with a nuclear research reactor;

Negotiated the sale of nuclear power plants to Egypt and Bangladesh;

Exported to Syria 30 tons of chemicals used in the production of solid-rocket motors for missiles, violating the missile technology control regime;

Continued to aid Pakistan's covert nuclear weapons program, including providing nuclear materials, nuclear weapons design information, and critical information about nuclear reactor technology;

Aided India's nuclear weapons development program, and transferred unsafeguarded heavy water;

Sold enriched uranium to both Iraq—significantly decreasing the time Iraq would have needed to develop nuclear weapons—and Brazil;

Trained up to 15 Iranian nuclear scientists on nuclear reactor design and research in China under a secret Iranian-People's Republic of China nuclear cooperation agreement;

Supplied nuclear reprocessing technology to North Korea;

Obtained highly sensitive nuclear weapons secrets from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and;

Announced that they will not take part in the next session of nonproliferation talks with the United States, Russia, Britain, and France.

The United States has given China every opportunity to improve their record—including allowing China to accrue a favorable trade surplus of over $20 billion in 1992—a surplus that many argue is the result of prison labor and other illegal trade practices.

It is time for the United States to send China a clear message that it will not tolerate their antidemocratic and reckless behavior. By placing conditions on MFN, we can demonstrate not only our commitment to human rights and open emigration, but renewed American leadership in halting the spread of nuclear weapons.

Once again, I urge you to vote to override the President's veto of H.R. 5318. This legislation will help to ensure the safety and future of all our constituents from the tyranny of the Butchers of Beijing.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, with his veto of H.R. 5318 in the waning hours of September 28, the President again placed America on the wrong side of history and in opposition to our founding principles. Let us send the message once again that the vast majority in this House stand with those who are fighting for freedom in China and in Tibet.

For the third time Congress has passed a bill which would condition the renewal of most-favored-nation trade status for China on the curtailing of human rights abuses by the Beijing Government. It allows them time to take a few limited steps to avoid an interruption of normal trade ties. It is designed to use the leverage created by our sizable trade deficit—expected to reach $20 billion this year—to bring about positive change.

Those of us who believe in fighting for human rights will not give up. If we fail this week, NANCY PELOSI and others will be back to lead this battle again in 1993. Hopefully, we will have a new occupant in the White House, someone who doesn't just pay lipservice to a new world order but seeks to build one.

It saddens me when the President of the United States does nothing as a group of aging despots trample upon the fundamental rights of one quarter of the world's population. The principles of freedom and justice are universal and should not be sacrificed at the cynical and outdated altar of balance-of-power politics. Neither should they be sacrificed to guard an export market for grain or airplanes or to protect the importation of cheap clothing. That is not an appropriate way to celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Bill of Rights.

We all need to listen to our own rhetoric from the last few years. Freedom really is busting out all over the place. It has been a part of the American ethos that democracy and freedom will ultimately triumph in this world, and in our time more than in any other our faith in freedom and human nature has been proven correct. Now, at the brink of this remarkable moment in world history, are we suddenly to cower and shrink away? That is what we will be doing if we turn our backs on the brave men and women in China and Tibet who risked their lives for freedom.

When freedom comes to China and Tibet, and it will come, will those who have fought for it say they were strengthened during their years of struggle by the knowledge that America stood with them? Or will they tell their children the United States cannot be trusted to stand up for principle? Vote for the future. Vote for freedom and principle. Vote to override the President's veto.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 345, nays 74, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—345

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Ballenger
Barton
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Camp
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—74

Allard
Anderson
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baker
Barrett
Bateman
Boehner
Broomfield
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Clinger
Crane
Davis
DeLay
Dickinson
Dreier
Ewing
Fawell
Gaydos
Gekas
Gillmor
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hastert
Johnson (CT)

Johnson (SD)	Miller (OH)	Shays
Kolbe	Montgomery	Shuster
Kopetski	Myers	Smith (IA)
Leach	Nichols	Smith (OR)
Lent	Nussle	Stump
Lewis (CA)	Oxley	Sundquist
Lightfoot	Packard	Thomas (CA)
Livingston	Peterson (MN)	Thornton
Lowery (CA)	Pickett	Vander Jagt
Marlenee	Pursell	Vucanovich
Martin	Quillen	Weber
Matsui	Roberts	Williams
McCandless	Roe	Wylie
McDade	Roemer	Young (AK)
Michel	Roth	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Traficant

NOT VOTING—12

Alexander	Edwards (OK)	Ireland
Barnard	Ford (TN)	McCrery
Coughlin	Gephardt	McCurdy
Dymally	Huckaby	Staggers

□ 1359

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. KASICH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

□ 1400

PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ASSASSINATION RECORDS COLLECTION ACT OF 1992

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3006) to provide for the expeditious disclosure of records relevant to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], to explain the provisions of S. 3006.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this unanimous-consent request is to take up the Senate version of legislation to permit the expeditious disclosure of records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, adopt this Senate version, and send it to the President. The Members will recall that the House passed its version of this legislation, House Joint Resolution 454, on August 12, 1992.

Mr. Speaker, the principal difference between the House and Senate versions of this legislation relates to the method of appointment of the Board which would be established to review documents related to the JFK assassination. The House bill was drafted to deal with the cloud cast over the initial presidentially appointed Warren Commission by establishing an independent panel, appointed by the Federal judiciary, in order to remove any possible political taint. The Senate bill, on the other hand, included a provision, which is supported by the administration, permitting the President to appoint the members of the Review Board, with Senate confirmation.

Mr. Speaker, I am making this request to adopt the Senate bill with some misgivings. I certainly would not be making this request if I thought that in doing so the House was lending any credence to the spurious arguments of the administration, calling into question the constitutionality of the appointment process which was contained in the House bill. This matter has been laid to rest by the Supreme Court, and the arguments are rebutted in the Judiciary Committee's report on House Joint Resolution 454 (H. Rept. 102-625, Pt. 2). While I think it is unwise to replicate the very appointment procedure which has unleashed the public outcry for the JFK records, I will not permit petty posturing to deflect us from the higher goal of securing public access and official accountability.

Mr. Speaker, other Members of the House who have played a part in fashioning this legislation including Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. CONYERS, also have some concerns about specific provisions in the Senate bill. But, like me, they are committed to achieving an enacted law before the end of this Congress. I commend them for their cooperative attitude in moving this legislation along.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Government Operations.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3006, the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992, which establishes procedures for the release of assassination records. This bill is virtually identical to legislation which was originally passed by the Committee on Government Operations, on which I served as the ranking minority member.

I want to take this occasion to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], for his indulgences and for holding the hearings, and for expeditiously moving this bill out of the Committee on Government Operations. He asked me in his absence today to indicate his support for this legislation.

It has been almost 30 years since that tragic day in Dallas. I was serving my freshman term in the House of Representatives that year. I could not have guessed that 30 years later—in my final term in the House—we would still be debating the circumstances surrounding that assassination.

Thirty years has become the more or less standard timeframe to release Government records. But more important, the continuing controversy circling this tragedy—promoted by the release of the movie "JFK"—requires that all appropriate records be released.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to specifically thank the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, my good friend JACK BROOKS, for his cooperation in moving this bill. Chairman BROOKS had some legitimate concerns, as we have heard over the appointment procedures of the review board, which I fully appreciate, and he should be commended for his spirit of cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include for the RECORD, a letter from the Department of Justice dated August 10, addressed to the Speaker, in which it says that:

> I am writing to express the views of the Department of Justice on Senate 3006, the "President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992," as passed by the Senate * * *. We are pleased to report that we would recommend that the President sign this bill.

Then it continues in the final paragraph, "The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to this report from the standpoint of the administration's program."

I would also like to point out that during 3 days of hearings in our Committee on Government Operations no one person, including administration witnesses, objected to the purposes of this bill. In fact, the administration has specifically supported the bill. After 30 years, I hope this matter can finally be put to rest.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, August 10, 1992.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing to express the views of the Department of Justice on S. 3006, the "President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992," as passed by the Senate on July 27, 1992. We are pleased to report that we would recommend that the President sign this bill.

As you may know, the Department expressed serious concerns about earlier versions of this legislation, including H.J. Res. 454. We have worked closely with congres-

sional staff in an effort to address those concerns so that materials relating to the assassination of President Kennedy could be released in a constitutionally appropriate manner. As a result of that process, S. 3006 is a substantial improvement on those earlier versions of the legislation. In particular, we note that the provisions concerning appointment of the Review Board are much improved. In light of this appointment process and other revisions, we urge the House to pass S. 3006.

If you have questions regarding this or any other matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

W. LEE RAWLS,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the driving force and the prime sponsor of House Joint Resolution 454, the legislation that brings us to the floor today.

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say that I would like to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], for the great leadership he has given in the passage of this legislation, and also to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for their leadership on this matter.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am pleased that this body today is taking up S. 3006, the Senate-passed version of legislation designed to facilitate prompt disclosure of materials relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Although major investigations over the years have added volumes of documentation to the public record, the fact that extensive materials remain publicly unavailable leads millions of Americans to ask whether important information is being concealed. Public cynicism toward government can only be tempered by disclosure. We need to resolve doubts about the integrity of our governmental institutions and shed new light—if possible—on the circumstances that led to the commission of a heinous crime.

By accepting the Senate version of this legislation, we endorse an appointment process for members of the Assassination Records Review Board that will avoid a serious potential legal challenge. Judicial appointment of board members—a feature of House Joint Resolution 454—raises significant constitutional concerns. S. 3006's provision for appointment by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, by contrast, clearly is consistent with the Constitution's allocations of authority to the different branches of our National Government. I believe we act prudently in relying on an appointment process that we can be confident will pass constitutional muster. The safeguards inherent in the involvement of both the executive and legislative branches in the appointment process—which have served our country so well for 200 years—will work well in the context of this legislation.

I am pleased to express my support for final passage of S. 3006.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in passing the Assassinations Materials Disclosure Act of 1992, today the Congress has taken an important first step in restoring the public's tarnished perception of this institution. By releasing nearly 1 million pages of documents relating to the assassination from the files of the FBI, CIA, Rockefeller and Warren Commissions, and the House Assassinations Committee, the American people will now have the means in their grasp to lift the fog of controversy which has surrounded that tragic day in Dallas, nearly 30 years ago.

At long last, the U.S. Government has come to realize that denying its citizens access to all the facts for fear that they may be unable to handle the truth is a policy which can only breed distrust and suspicion. It is imperative that the people of the America have the opportunity to decide for themselves because ever since the Warren Commission issued its findings on the Kennedy assassination, doubt and confusion have gnawed at the conscience of the American people.

The opening of the assassination files serve two separate, but equally important objectives. First, to restore the American public's faith in their Government to be forthcoming and open about the information they have obtained regarding the circumstances surrounding the death of President Kennedy. Second, by providing access to the facts, to put to an end the ever-increasing theories and speculations about the assassination which have for so long overshadowed a Presidency filled with vision and hope cut short.

The loss of John F. Kennedy's inspired leadership haunts America today, as his vision of common sacrifice for the common good is now far too often displaced by the cynical politics of self-interest and greed. Now, if the President signs this bill, the files will be open, and together as a Nation we can move forward.

I would like to commend my colleagues on their efforts on behalf of this bill. In particular, Mr. HORTON, MR. STOKES, AND MR. BROOKS all deserve recognition for their hard work to make sure this bill becomes law.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Resolution 3006, the Assassination Materials Disclosures Act of 1992, the conference report on legislation I introduced earlier this year to expedite release of files pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. We would not be here today, acting on this initiative, had it not been for the leadership of certain individuals whose determination to enact this bill this year has been steadfast. Several of my colleagues in the House are deserving of special mention.

First, I want to recognize the distinguished gentleman from Michigan and chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, JOHN CONYERS, for the tireless efforts his committee undertook in deliberating this legislation. I also want to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for the tremendous work put forth to guide this legislation through his committee. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration are also to be complimented for their efforts in assisting in the enactment of this measure. I want to thank these individuals for the many courtesies each of them extended to me throughout this process. I also want to express my sincere appreciation to Speaker FOLEY who, from the very beginning, supported my desire to prepare and to introduce this bill, and whose office helped guide our efforts during the most critical moments.

I want to also recognize the work of our Senate colleagues, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Government Affairs Committee and my personal friend from Ohio, Senator GLENN, for the leadership he showed in guiding this bill through the Senate and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator DAVID BOREN, who cosponsored this measure in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to express my deep gratitude to Prof. G. Robert Blakey of the Notre Dame University Law School, the former counsel of the House Select Committee on Assassinations, who worked closely with all parties involved in these deliberations. Let the record show that he graciously contributed his services pro bono.

I also want to express my heartfelt appreciation to the staffs of the House Committee on Government Operations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Rules, the Committee on House Administration, the Senate Government Affairs Committee, and the Senate Intelligence Committee, who along with Leslie Atkinson, Joyce Larkin, and other members of my staff diligently reviewed thousands of documents and deftly reached a compromise on this important piece of legislation we bring before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, it is no small feat that I stand before this body in support of a measure that I began to draft over 9 months ago. Since the first of the year, when this issue resurfaced in the public eye, countless hours have been devoted to hearings, meetings, and negotiations by Members of Congress, staff and Federal agencies. This is not to mention the numerous obstacles that we had to overcome. My office alone has handled over 3,000 letters and at various times been totally inundated with telephone calls on this issue. Who would have imagined that, after nearly 30 years, one issue could continue to generate so much controversy and demand so much time and effort? These sentiments have been echoed by numerous individuals who have been involved in the deliberations of this measure.

And while this measure represents the culmination of many months of intense debate for most of the parties involved, for me it is the culmination of work that I began nearly 16 years ago when I chaired the House Select Committee on Assassinations.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House Select Committee on Assassinations, after months of deliberations released a comprehensive 12-volume report that detailed its investigation into the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. After completing its investigation on March 29, 1979, the committee filed its final report with the House of Representatives. Our committee released everything that it had the time and the resources to release, and all other records were placed in the National Archives under a House of Representatives rule—rule XXXVI—Requiring that all unpublished records routinely by sealed for 30 to 50 years.

Although, the select committee provided the American people with a significant amount of previously unreleased data, agencies and organizations such as the CIA, FBI, Secretary Service, the State Department, and the Department of Justice, continued to maintain hundreds of thousands of unreleased documents. Because the public's search for knowledge and truth concerning information on the Kennedy assassination remained unabated after the release of the select committee's report, I deemed it in our national interest to produce the bill that we are deliberating today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not completely satisfy all the concerns relative to the release of these documents. However, I am proud that we have developed a good piece of legislation forged with the best interests of all concerned parties in mind. The true value and merit of their legislation is that it will open up to the American public historic documents relating to the assassination of an American President heretofore unreleased. They are entitled to judge for themselves the question of conspiracy and complicity. Above all, they must be satisfied that there was no coverup by their government. By our action today we restore confidence in the phrase, government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. Speaker, the action taken by this body today will bring to a close another chapter in American History. I am pleased that it was my legislation that guided our Nation in the right direction 30 years after the tragic assassination of a great American President.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of [Mr. BROOKS] the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3006

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS, DECLARATIONS, AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) all Government records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy should be preserved for historical and governmental purposes;

(2) all government records concerning the assassination of President John F. Kennedy should carry a presumption of immediate disclosure, and all records should be eventually disclosed to enable the public to become fully informed about the history surrounding the assassination;

(3) legislation is necessary to create an enforceable, independent, and accountable process for the public disclosure of such records;

(4) legislation is necessary because congressional records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy would not otherwise be subject to public disclosure until at least the year 2029;

(5) legislation is necessary because the Freedom of Information Act, as implemented by the executive branch, has prevented the timely public disclosure of records relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

(6) legislation is necessary because Executive Order No. 12356, entitled "National Security Information" has eliminated the declassification and downgrading schedules relating to classified information across government and has prevented the timely public disclosure of records relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; and

(7) most of the records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy are almost 30 years old, and only in the rarest cases is there any legitimate need for continued protection of such records.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to provide for the creation of the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection at the National Archives and Records Administration; and

(2) to require the expeditious public transmission to the Archivist and public disclosure of such records.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) "Archivist" means the Archivist of the United States.

(2) "Assassination record" means a record that is related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, that was created or made available for use by, obtained by, or otherwise came into the possession of—

(A) the Commission to Investigate the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy (the "Warren Commission");

(B) the Commission on Central Intelligence Agency Activities Within the United States (the "Rockefeller Commission");

(C) the Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities (the "Church Committee");

(D) the Select Committee on Intelligence (the "Pike Committee") of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Select Committee on Assassinations (the "House Assassinations Committee") of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Library of Congress;

(G) the National Archives and Records Administration;

(H) any Presidential library;

(I) any Executive agency;

(J) any independent agency;

(K) any other office of the Federal Government; and

(L) any State or local law enforcement office that provided support or assistance or performed work in connection with a Federal inquiry into the assassination of President John F. Kennedy,

but does not include the autopsy records donated by the Kennedy family to the National Archives pursuant to a deed of gift regulating access to those records, or copies and reproductions made from such records.

(3) "Collection" means the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection established under section 4.

(4) "Executive agency" means an Executive agency as defined in subsection 552(f) of title 5, United States Code, and includes any Executive department, military department, Government corporation, Government controlled corporation, or other establishment in the executive branch of the Government, including the Executive Office of the President, or any independent regulatory agency.

(5) "Government office" means any office of the Federal Government that has possession or control of assassination records, including—

(A) the House Committee on Administration with regard to the Select Committee on Assassinations of the records of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate with regard to records of the Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities and other assassination records;

(C) the Library of Congress;

(D) the National Archives as custodian of assassination records that it has obtained or possesses, including the Commission to Investigate the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the Commission on Central Intelligence Agency Activities in the United States; and

(E) any other executive branch office or agency, and any independent agency.

(6) "Identification aid" means the written description prepared for each record as required in section 4.

(7) "National Archives" means the National Archives and Records Administration and all components thereof, including Presidential archival depositories established under section 2112 of title 44, United States Code.

(8) "Official investigation" means the reviews of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy conducted by any Presidential commission, any authorized congressional committee, and any Government agency either independently, at the request of any Presidential commission or congressional committee, or at the request of any Government official.

(9) "Originating body" means the Executive agency, government commission, congressional committee, or other governmental entity that created a record or particular information within a record.

(10) "Public interest" means the compelling interest in the prompt public disclosure of assassination records for historical and governmental purposes and for the purpose of fully informing the American people about the history surrounding the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

(11) "Record" includes a book, paper, map, photograph, sound or video recording, machine readable material, computerized, digitized, or electronic information, regardless of the medium on which it is stored, or other documentary material, regardless of its physical form or characteristics.

(12) "Review Board" means the Assassination Records Review Board established by section 7.

(13) "Third agency" means a Government agency that originated an assassination record that is in the possession of another agency.

SEC. 4. PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY ASSASSINATION RECORDS COLLECTION AT THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Archives and Records Administration shall commence establishment of a collection of records to be known as the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection. In so doing, the Archivist shall ensure the physical integrity and original provenance of all records. The Collection shall consist of record copies of all Government records relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, which shall be transmitted to the National Archives in accordance with section 2107 of title 44, United States Code. The Archivist shall prepare and publish a subject guidebook and index to the collection.

(2) The Collection shall include—

(A) all assassination records—

(i) that have been transmitted to the National Archives or disclosed to the public in an unredacted form prior to the date of enactment of this Act;

(ii) that are required to be transmitted to the National Archives; or

(iii) the disclosure of which is postponed under this Act;

(B) a central directory comprised of identification aids created for each record transmitted to the Archivist the under section 5; and

(C) all Review Board records as required by this Act.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS.—All assassination records transmitted to the National Archives for disclosure to the public shall be included in the Collection and shall be available to the public for inspection and copying at the National Archives within 30 days after their transmission to the National Archives.

(c) FEES FOR COPYING.—The Archivist shall—

(1) charge fees for copying assassination records; and

(2) grant waivers of such fees pursuant to the standards established by section 552(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The Collection shall be preserved, protected, archived, and made available to the public at the National Archives using appropriations authorized, specified, and restricted for use under the terms of this Act.

(2) The National Archives, in consultation with the Information Security Oversight Office, shall ensure the security of the postponed assassination records in the Collection.

(e) OVERSIGHT.—The Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall have continuing oversight jurisdiction with respect to the Collection.

SEC. 5. REVIEW, IDENTIFICATION, TRANSMISSION TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES, AND PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF ASSASSINATION RECORDS BY GOVERNMENT OFFICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, each Government office shall identify and organize its records relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and prepare them for transmission to the Archivist for inclusion in the Collection.

(2) No assassination record shall be destroyed, altered, or mutilated in any way.

(3) No assassination record made available or disclosed to the public prior to the date of enactment of this Act may be withheld, redacted, postponed for public disclosure, or reclassified.

(4) No assassination record created by a person or entity outside government (excluding names or identities consistent with the requirements of section 6) shall be withheld, redacted, postponed for public disclosure, or reclassified.

(b) CUSTODY OF ASSASSINATION RECORDS PENDING REVIEW.—During the review by Government offices and pending review activity by the Review Board, each Government office shall retain custody of its assassination records for purposes of preservation, security, and efficiency, unless—

(1) the Review Board requires the physical transfer of records for purposes of conducting an independent and impartial review;

(2) transfer is necessary for an administrative hearing or other Review Board function; or

(3) it is a third agency record described in subsection (c)(2)(C).

(c) REVIEW.—(1) Not later than 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each Government office shall review, identify and organize each assassination record in its custody or possession for disclosure to the public, review by the Review Board, and transmission to the Archivist.

(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), a Government office shall—

(A) determine which of its records are assassination records;

(B) determine which of its assassination records have been officially disclosed or publicly available in a complete and unredacted form;

(C)(i) determine which of its assassination records, or particular information contained in such a record, was created by a third agency or by another Government office; and

(ii) transmit to a third agency or other government office those records, or particular information contained in those records, or complete and accurate copies thereof;

(D)(i) determine whether its assassination records or particular information in assassination records are covered by the standards for postponement of public disclosure under this Act; and

(ii) specify on the identification aid required by subsection (d) the applicable postponement provision contained in section 6;

(E) organize and make available to the Review Board all assassination records identified under subparagraph (D) the public disclosure of which in whole or in part may be postponed under this Act;

(F) organize and make available to the Review Board any record concerning which the office has any uncertainty as to whether the record is an assassination record governed by this Act;

(G) give priority to—

(i) the identification, review, and transmission of all assassination records publicly available or disclosed as of the date of enactment of this Act in a redacted or edited form; and

(ii) the identification, review, and transmission, under the standards for postponement set forth in this Act, of assassination records that on the date of enactment of this Act are the subject of litigation under section 552 of title 5, United States Code; and

(H) make available to the Review Board any additional information and records that the Review Board has reason to believe it requires for conducting a review under this Act.

(3) The Director of each archival depository established under section 2112 of title 44, United States Code, shall have as a priority the expedited review for public disclosure of assassination records in the possession and custody of the depository, and shall make such records available to the Review Board as required by this Act.

(d) IDENTIFICATION AIDS.—(1)(A) Not later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Archivist, in consultation with the appropriate Government offices, shall prepare and make available to all Government offices a standard form of identification or finding aid for use with each assassination record subject to review under this Act.

(B) The Archivist shall ensure that the identification aid program is established in such a manner as to result in the creation of a uniform system of electronic records by Government offices that are compatible with each other.

(2) Upon completion of an identification aid, a Government office shall—

(A) attach a printed copy to the record it describes;

(B) transmit to the Review Board a printed copy; and

(C) attach a printed copy to each assassination record it describes when it is transmitted to the Archivist.

(3) Assassination records which are in the possession of the National Archives on the date of enactment of this Act, and which have been publicly available in their entirety without redaction, shall be made available in the Collection without any additional review by the Review Board or another authorized office under this Act, and shall not be required to have such an identification aid unless required by the Archivist.

(e) TRANSMISSION TO THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES.—Each Government office shall—

(1) transmit to the Archivist, and make immediately available to the public, all assassination records that can be publicly disclosed, including those that are publicly available on the date of enactment of this Act, without any redaction, adjustment, or withholding under the standards of this Act; and

(2) transmit to the Archivist upon approval for postponement by the Review Board or upon completion of other action authorized by this Act, all assassination records the public disclosure of which has been postponed, in whole or in part, under the standards of this Act, to become part of the protected Collection.

(f) CUSTODY OF POSTPONED ASSASSINATION RECORDS.—An assassination record the public disclosure of which has been postponed shall, pending transmission to the Archivist, be held for reasons of security and preservation by the originating body until such time as the information security program has been established at the National Archives as required in section 4(e)(2).

(g) PERIODIC REVIEW OF POSTPONED ASSASSINATION RECORDS.—(1) All postponed or redacted records shall be reviewed periodically by the originating agency and the Archivist consistent with the recommendations of the Review Board under section 9(c)(3)(B).

(2)(A) A periodic review shall address the public disclosure of additional assassination records in the Collection under the standards of this Act.

(B) All postponed assassination records determined to require continued postponement shall require an unclassified written description of the reason for such continued postponement. Such description shall be pro-

vided to the Archivist and published in the Federal Register upon determination.

(C) The periodic review of postponed assassination records shall serve to downgrade and declassify security classified information.

(D) Each assassination record shall be publicly disclosed in full, and available in the Collection no later than the date that is 25 years after the date of enactment of this Act, unless the President certifies, as required by this Act, that—

(i) continued postponement is made necessary by an identifiable harm to the military defense, intelligence operations, law enforcement, or conduct of foreign relations; and

(ii) the identifiable harm is of such gravity that it outweighs the public interest in disclosure.

(h) FEES FOR COPYING.—Executive branch agencies shall—

(1) charge fees for copying assassination records; and

(2) grant waivers of such fees pursuant to the standards established by section 552(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 6. GROUNDS FOR POSTPONEMENT OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF RECORDS.

Disclosure of assassination records or particular information in assassination records to the public may be postponed subject to the limitations of this Act if there is clear and convincing evidence that—

(1) the threat to the military defense, intelligence operations, or conduct of foreign relations of the United States posed by the public disclosure of the assassination is of such gravity that it outweighs the public interest, and such public disclosure would reveal—

(A) an intelligence agent whose identity currently requires protection;

(B) an intelligence source or method which is currently utilized, or reasonably expected to be utilized, by the United States Government and which has not been officially disclosed, the disclosure of which would interfere with the conduct of intelligence activities; or

(C) any other matter currently relating to the military defense, intelligence operations or conduct of foreign relations of the United States, the disclosure of which would demonstrably impair the national security of the United States;

(2) the public disclosure of the assassination record would reveal the name or identity of a living person who provided confidential information to the United States and would pose a substantial risk of harm to that person;

(3) the public disclosure of the assassination record could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and that invasion of privacy is so substantial that it outweighs the public interest;

(4) the public disclosure of the assassination record would compromise the existence of an understanding of confidentiality currently requiring protection between a Government agent and a cooperating individual or a foreign government, and public disclosure would be so harmful that it outweighs the public interest; or

(5) the public disclosure of the assassination record would reveal a security or protective procedure currently utilized, or reasonably expected to be utilized, by the Secret Service or another Government agency responsible for protecting Government officials, and public disclosure would be so harmful that it outweighs the public interest.

SEC. 7. ESTABLISHMENT AND POWERS OF THE ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established as an independent agency a board to be known as the Assassination Records Review Board.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—(1) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint, without regard to political affiliation, 5 citizens to serve as members of the Review Board to ensure and facilitate the review, transmission to the Archivist, and public disclosure of government records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

(2) The President shall make nominations to the Review Board not later than 90 calendar days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) If the Senate votes not to confirm a nomination to the Review Board, the President shall make an additional nomination not later than 30 days thereafter.

(4)(A) The President shall make nominations to the Review Board after considering persons recommended by the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, the Society of American Archivists, and the American Bar Association.

(B) If an organization described in subparagraph (A) does not recommend at least 2 nominees meeting the qualifications stated in paragraph (5) by the date that is 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall consider for nomination the persons recommended by the other organizations described in subparagraph (A).

(C) The President may request an organization described in subparagraph (A) to submit additional nominations.

(5) Persons nominated to the Review Board—

(A) shall be impartial private citizens, none of whom is presently employed by any branch of the Government, and none of whom shall have had any previous involvement with any official investigation or inquiry conducted by a Federal, State, or local government, relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

(B) shall be distinguished persons of high national professional reputation in their respective fields who are capable of exercising the independent and objective judgment necessary to the fulfillment of their role in ensuring and facilitating the review, transmission to the public, and public disclosure of records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and who possess an appreciation of the value of such material to the public, scholars, and government; and

(C) shall include at least 1 professional historian and 1 attorney.

(c) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—(1) All Review Board nominees shall be granted the necessary security clearances in an accelerated manner subject to the standard procedures for granting such clearances.

(2) All nominees shall qualify for the necessary security clearance prior to being considered for confirmation by the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(d) CONFIRMATION HEARINGS.—(1) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall hold confirmation hearings within 30 days in which the Senate is in session after the nomination of 3 Review Board members.

(2) The Committee on Governmental Affairs shall vote on the nominations within 14 days in which the Senate is in session after the confirmation hearings, and shall report its results to the full Senate immediately.

(3) The Senate shall vote on each nominee to confirm or reject within 14 days in which the Senate is in session after reported by the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

(e) VACANCY.—A vacancy on the Review Board shall be filled in the same manner as specified for original appointment within 30 days of the occurrence of the vacancy.

(f) CHAIRPERSON.—The Members of the Review Board shall elect one of its members as chairperson at its initial meeting.

(g) REMOVAL OF REVIEW BOARD MEMBER.—(1) No member of the Review Board shall be removed from office, other than—

(A) by impeachment and conviction; or

(B) by the action of the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, physical disability, mental incapacity, or any other condition that substantially impairs the performance of the member's duties.

(2)(A) If a member of the Review Board is removed from office, and that removal is by the President, not later than 10 days after the removal the President shall submit to the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report specifying the facts found and the grounds for the removal.

(B) The President shall publish in the Federal Register a report submitted under paragraph (2)(A), except that the President may, if necessary to protect the rights of a person named in the report or to prevent undue interference with any pending prosecution, postpone or refrain from publishing any or all of the report until the completion of such pending cases or pursuant to privacy protection requirements in law.

(3)(A) A member of the Review Board removed from office may obtain judicial review of the removal in a civil action commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(B) The member may be reinstated or granted other appropriate relief by order of the court.

(h) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—(1) A member of the Review Board shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which the member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Review Board.

(2) A member of the Review Board shall be allowed reasonable travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the member's home or regular place of business in the performance of services for the Review Board.

(i) DUTIES OF THE REVIEW BOARD.—(1) The Review Board shall consider and render decisions on a determination by a Government office to seek to postpone the disclosure of assassination records.

(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Review Board shall consider and render decisions—

(A) whether a record constitutes an assassination record; and

(B) whether an assassination record or particular information in a record qualifies for postponement of disclosure under this Act.

(j) POWERS.—(1) The Review Board shall have the authority to act in a manner prescribed under this Act including authority to—

(A) direct Government offices to complete identification aids and organize assassination records;

(B) direct Government offices to transmit to the Archivist assassination records as required under this Act, including segregable portions of assassination records, and substitutes and summaries of assassination records that can be publicly disclosed to the fullest extent;

(C)(i) obtain access to assassination records that have been identified and organized by a Government office;

(ii) direct a Government office to make available to the Review Board, and if necessary investigate the facts surrounding, additional information, records, or testimony from individuals, which the Review Board has reason to believe is required to fulfill its functions and responsibilities under this Act; and

(iii) request the Attorney General to subpoena private persons to compel testimony, records, and other information relevant to its responsibilities under this Act;

(D) require any Government office to account in writing for the destruction of any records relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy;

(E) receive information from the public regarding the identification and public disclosure of assassination records; and

(F) hold hearings, administer oaths, and subpoena witnesses and documents.

(2) A subpoena issued under paragraph (1)(C)(iii) may be enforced by any appropriate Federal court acting pursuant to a lawful request of the Review Board.

(k) WITNESS IMMUNITY.—The Review Board shall be considered to be an agency of the United States for purposes of section 6001 of title 18, United States Code.

(l) OVERSIGHT.—(1) The Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall have continuing oversight jurisdiction with respect to the official conduct of the Review Board and the disposition of postponed records after termination of the Review Board, and shall have access to any records held or created by the Review Board.

(2) The Review Board shall have the duty to cooperate with the exercise of such oversight jurisdiction.

(m) SUPPORT SERVICES.—The Administrator of the General Services Administration shall provide administrative services for the Review Board on a reimbursable basis.

(n) INTERPRETIVE REGULATIONS.—The Review Board may issue interpretive regulations.

(o) TERMINATION AND WINDING UP.—(1) The Review Board and the terms of its members shall terminate not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, except that the Review Board may, by majority vote, extend its term for an additional 1-year period if it has not completed its work within that 2-year period.

(2) Upon its termination, the Review Board shall submit reports to the President and the Congress including a complete and accurate accounting of expenditures during its existence, and shall complete all other reporting requirements under this Act.

(3) Upon termination and winding up, the Review Board shall transfer all of its records to the Archivist for inclusion in the Collection, and no record of the Review Board shall be destroyed.

SEC. 8. ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD PERSONNEL.

(a) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—(1) Not later than 45 days after the initial meeting of the Review Board, the Review Board shall appoint one citizen, without regard to political affiliation, to the position of Executive Director.

(2) The person appointed as Executive Director shall be a private citizen of integrity and impartiality who is a distinguished professional and who is not a present employee of any branch of the Government and has had no previous involvement with any official investigation or inquiry relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

(3)(A) A candidate for Executive Director shall be granted the necessary security clearances in an accelerated manner subject to the standard procedures for granting such clearances.

(B) A candidate shall qualify for the necessary security clearance prior to being approved by the Review Board.

(4) The Executive Director shall—

(A) serve as principal liaison to Government offices;

(B) be responsible for the administration and coordination of the Review Board's review of records;

(C) be responsible for the administration of all official activities conducted by the Review Board; and

(D) have no authority to decide or determine whether any record should be disclosed to the public or postponed for disclosure.

(5) The Executive Director shall not be removed for reasons other than by a majority vote of the Review Board for cause on the grounds of inefficiency, neglect of duty, malfeasance in office, physical disability, mental incapacity, or any other condition that substantially impairs the performance of the responsibilities of the Executive Director or the staff of the Review Board.

(b) STAFF.—(1) The Review Board may, in accordance with the civil service laws but without regard to civil service law and regulation for competitive service as defined in subchapter 1, chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, appoint and terminate additional personnel as are necessary to enable the Review Board and its Executive Director to perform its duties.

(2) A person appointed to the staff of the Review Board shall be a private citizen of integrity and impartiality who is not a present employee of any branch of the Government and who has had no previous involvement with any official investigation or inquiry relating to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

(3)(A) A candidate for staff shall be granted the necessary security clearances in an accelerated manner subject to the standard procedures for granting such clearances.

(B) A candidate for the staff shall qualify for the necessary security clearance prior to being approved by the Review Board.

(c) COMPENSATION.—The Review Board shall fix the compensation of the Executive Director and other personnel in accordance with title 5, United States Code, except that the rate of pay for the Executive Director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of that title.

(d) ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—(1) The Review Board shall have the authority to create advisory committees to assist in fulfilling the responsibilities of the Review Board under this Act.

(2) Any advisory committee created by the Review Board shall be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 9. REVIEW OF RECORDS BY THE ASSASSINATION RECORDS REVIEW BOARD.

(a) CUSTODY OF RECORDS REVIEWED BY BOARD.—Pending the outcome of the Review Board's review activity, a Government office shall retain custody of its assassination records for purposes of preservation, security, and efficiency, unless—

(1) the Review Board requires the physical transfer of records for reasons of conducting an independent and impartial review; or

(2) such transfer is necessary for an administrative hearing or other official Review Board function.

(b) STARTUP REQUIREMENTS.—The Review Board shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of its appointment, publish a schedule for review of all assassination records in the Federal Register; and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, begin its review of assassination records under this Act.

(c) DETERMINATIONS OF THE REVIEW BOARD.—(1) The Review Board shall direct that all assassination records be transmitted to the Archivist and disclosed to the public in the Collection in the absence of clear and convincing evidence that—

(A) a Government record is not an assassination record; or

(B) a Government record or particular information within an assassination record qualifies for postponement of public disclosure under this Act.

(2) In approving postponement of public disclosure of an assassination record, the Review Board shall seek to—

(A) provide for the disclosure of segregable parts, substitutes, or summaries of such a record; and

(B) determine, in consultation with the originating body and consistent with the standards for postponement under this Act, which of the following alternative forms of disclosure shall be made by the originating body:

(i) Any reasonably segregable particular information in an assassination record.

(ii) A substitute record for that information which is postponed.

(iii) A summary of an assassination record.

(3) With respect to each assassination record or particular information in assassination records the public disclosure of which is postponed pursuant to section 6, or for which only substitutions or summaries have been disclosed to the public, the Review Board shall create and transmit to the Archivist a report containing—

(A) a description of actions by the Review Board, the originating body, the President, or any Government office (including a justification of any such action to postpone disclosure of any record or part of any record) and of any official proceedings conducted by the Review Board with regard to specific assassination records; and

(B) a statement, based on a review of the proceedings and in conformity with the decisions reflected therein, designating a recommended specified time at which or a specified occurrence following which the material may be appropriately disclosed to the public under this Act.

(4)(A) Following its review and a determination that an assassination record shall be publicly disclosed in the Collection or postponed for disclosure and held in the protected Collection, the Review Board shall notify the head of the originating body of its determination and publish a copy of the determination in the Federal Register within 14 days after the determination is made.

(B) Contemporaneous notice shall be made to the President for Review Board determinations regarding executive branch assassination records, and to the oversight committees designated in this Act in the case of

legislative branch records. Such notice shall contain a written unclassified justification for public disclosure or postponement of disclosure, including an explanation of the application of any standards contained in section 6.

(d) PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY OVER REVIEW BOARD DETERMINATION.—

(1) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OR POSTPONEMENT OF DISCLOSURE.—After the Review Board has made a formal determination concerning the public disclosure or postponement of disclosure of an executive branch assassination record or information within such a record, or of any information contained in an assassination record, obtained or developed solely within the executive branch, the President shall have the sole and nondelegable authority to require the disclosure or postponement of such record or information under the standards set forth in section 6, and the President shall provide the Review Board with an unclassified written certification specifying the President's decision within 30 days after the Review Board's determination and notice to the executive branch agency as required under this Act, stating the justification for the President's decision, including the applicable grounds for postponement under section 6, accompanied by a copy of the identification aid required under section 4.

(2) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Any executive branch assassination record postponed by the President shall be subject to the requirements of periodic review, downgrading and declassification of classified information, and public disclosure in the collection set forth in section 4.

(3) RECORD OF PRESIDENTIAL POSTPONEMENT.—The Review Board shall, upon its receipt, publish in the Federal Register a copy of any unclassified written certification, statement, and other materials transmitted by or on behalf of the President with regard to postponement of assassination records.

(e) NOTICE TO PUBLIC.—Every 30 calendar days, beginning on the date that is 60 calendar days after the date on which the Review Board first approves the postponement of disclosure of an assassination record, the Review Board shall publish in the Federal Register a notice that summarizes the postponements approved by the Review Board or initiated by the President, the House of Representatives, or the Senate, including a description of the subject, originating agency, length or other physical description, and each ground for postponement that is relied upon.

(f) REPORTS BY THE REVIEW BOARD.—(1) The Review Board shall report its activities to the leadership of the Congress, the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the President, the Archivist, and the head of any Government office whose records have been the subject of Review Board activity.

(2) The first report shall be issued on the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and subsequent reports every 12 months thereafter until termination of the Review Board.

(3) A report under paragraph (1) shall include the following information:

(A) A financial report of the expenses for all official activities and requirements of the Review Board and its personnel.

(B) The progress made on review, transmission to the Archivist, and public disclosure of assassination records.

(C) The estimated time and volume of assassination records involved in the completion of the Review Board's performance under this Act.

(D) Any special problems, including requests and the level of cooperation of government offices, with regard to the ability of the Review Board to operate as required by this Act.

(E) A record of review activities, including a record of postponement decisions by the Review Board or other related actions authorized by this Act, and a record of the volume of records reviewed and postponed.

(F) Suggestions and requests to Congress for additional legislative authority needs.

(G) An appendix containing copies of reports of postponed records to the Archivist required under section 9(c)(3) made since the date of the preceding report under this subsection.

(4) At least 90 calendar days before completing its work, the Review Board shall provide written notice to the President and Congress of its intention to terminate its operations at a specified date.

SEC. 10. DISCLOSURE OF OTHER MATERIALS AND ADDITIONAL STUDY.

(a) MATERIALS UNDER SEAL OF COURT.—

(1) The Review Board may request the Attorney General to petition any court in the United States or abroad to release any information relevant to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that is held under seal of the court.

(2)(A) The Review Board may request the Attorney General to petition any court in the United States to release any information relevant to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that is held under the injunction of secrecy of a grand jury.

(B) A request for disclosure of assassination materials under this Act shall be deemed to constitute a showing of particularized need under Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Attorney General should assist the Review Board in good faith to unseal any records that the Review Board determines to be relevant and held under seal by a court or under the injunction of secrecy of a grand jury;

(2) the Secretary of State should contact the Government of the Republic of Russia and seek the disclosure of all records of the government of the former Soviet Union, including the records of the Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (KGB) and the Glaynoye Razvedyvatelnoye Upravleniye (GRU), relevant to the assassination of President Kennedy, and contact any other foreign government that may hold information relevant to the assassination of President Kennedy and seek disclosure of such information; and

(3) all Executive agencies should cooperate in full with the Review Board to seek the disclosure of all information relevant to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy consistent with the public interest.

SEC. 11. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) PRECEDENCE OVER OTHER LAW.—When this Act requires transmission of a record to the Archivist or public disclosure, it shall take precedence over any other law (except section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code), judicial decision construing such law, or common law doctrine that would otherwise prohibit such transmission or disclosure, with the exception of deeds governing access to or transfer or release of gifts and donations of records to the United States Government.

(b) FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to eliminate or limit any right to file requests with any Executive agency or seek judicial review of the decisions pursuant to section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to preclude judicial review, under chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, of final actions taken or required to be taken under this Act.

(d) EXISTING AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act revokes or limits the existing authority of the President, any executive agency, the Senate, or the House of Representatives, or any other entity of the Government to publicly disclose records in its possession.

(e) RULES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—To the extent that any provision of this Act establishes a procedure to be followed in the Senate or the House of Representatives, such provision is adopted—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House, and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 12. TERMINATION OF EFFECT OF ACT.

(a) PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO THE REVIEW BOARD.—The provisions of this Act that pertain to the appointment and operation of the Review Board shall cease to be effective when the Review Board and the terms of its members have terminated pursuant to section 7(o).

(b) OTHER PROVISIONS.—The remaining provisions of this Act shall continue in effect until such time as the Archivist certifies to the President and the Congress that all assassination records have been made available to the public in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 13. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act, to remain available until expended.

(b) INTERIM FUNDING.—Until such time as funds are appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), the President may use such sums as are available for discretionary use to carry out this Act.

SEC. 14. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of that provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected by the invalidation.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO RETURN H.R. 3379, WITH RESPECT TO AUTHORITIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE, AND PROVIDING FOR ITS REENROLLMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 366) requesting the President to return the enrolled bill (H.R. 3379) with respect to the authorities of the Administrative Conference, and providing for its reenrollment with technical corrections, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 366

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H.R. 3379) with respect to the authorities of the Administrative Conference. The Clerk of the House is authorized to receive such bill if it is returned when the House is not in session. Upon the return of such bill, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate in signing it shall be deemed rescinded and the Clerk of the House shall reenroll the bill with the following corrections:

Strike "574" and insert "594".

In the title of the bill, strike "574" and insert "594".

Mr. BROOKS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

□ 1410

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the committee, to explain the technical corrections.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], that the purpose of this resolution is to correct a technical error in the bill, H.R. 3379, relating to the Administrative Conference of the United States. It makes no substantive change in the bill; it just resolves a difficulty that occurred in the other body.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2, NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 2) to promote the achievement of national education goals, to measure progress toward such goals, to develop national education standards and voluntary assessments in accordance with such standards, and to encourage the comprehensive improvement of America's neighborhood public schools to improve student achievement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Friday, September 25, 1992, at page 27736.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time of the majority for control to the chairman of the subcommittee and the author of the bill, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is a compromise between the House and Senate bills.

It retains the House emphasis on systemwide reform recognizing that sustained improvements will not occur without coordinated changes in all parts of the education system.

At the same time, it includes provisions from the Senate bill directing most of the funds to local schools once reform plans have been developed at the State and school district levels.

As in the House bill, systemic reform proposals would be developed at the State and local levels by panels made up of representatives of the many entities which have a stake in improving schools.

These stakeholders include Governors, State legislators, parents, and representatives of education, business, and other community leaders.

However, the plan requirements have been significantly streamlined to focus primarily on the key elements of systemic reform.

These elements include identifying high goals for student achievement and ensuring that State and local curricula, assessments, and teacher-training programs support the attainment of those goals.

At the school district level, funds may be used for developing and carrying out districtwide reform plans including school restructuring.

As I mentioned earlier, once the systemwide reform plan has been developed, the majority of the funds go to support reform activities in local schools.

The conference agreement contains an illustrative list of the types of activities that can be included in a school district's systemic reform package.

As in the House bill, this list is illustrative, not exclusive.

The activities include: Early childhood education; school-based decision-making; activities which maximize parental involvement; expanded use of technology; and professional development for teachers and local administrators.

The conference agreement approaches the issue of national education standards and testing in a cautious way.

It authorizes the development of voluntary national content standards and voluntary national school delivery standards.

The national education content standards will set high goals toward which all students can strive and can serve as a focal point for reform efforts throughout the Nation.

The voluntary national school delivery standards will provide a tool that can be used to determine whether students have an opportunity to learn the material in the content standards.

Additionally, the bill formally establishes the National Education Goals Panel to oversee the development of these voluntary national standards.

Again, as in the House bill, all the standards would be voluntary.

With regard to testing, the conference agreement supports research in new forms of assessment and provides funds for the development of different types of model assessments tied to the national standards for mathematics developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics and any science standards that may be developed.

The development of model assessments is limited to these subject areas because math is the only area where standards currently exist and science is the only other area where standards

may be completed within the 2-year authorization provided in the conference agreement.

The conference agreement also includes a demonstration program which authorizes the waiver of certain Federal requirements at the preschool, elementary school, and secondary school levels so that schools can experiment with new approaches to meeting the multiple education needs of disadvantaged children.

However, where the House bill had authorized such waivers in 300 schools, the conference agreement expands the number of schools that can participate to 750.

The regulatory flexibility provisions do not change the money flowing to schools but allows flexibility within schools regarding its use.

The conference agreement dropped many of the extraneous provisions in both bills.

However, it does retain authority for a commission to look at ways for teaching values in schools.

It also authorizes a review of the evaluations of the Parents as Teachers Program that will provide useful guidance for future Federal action in this area.

When H.R. 4323 was considered on the House floor in August, I pointed out that this legislation represents a major departure from the way that the Federal Government has assisted education in the past.

It is the first effort to use limited Federal funds as an incentive for public school districts and schools to undertake broad reform.

It also is the first piece of a two-part process for helping to improve our Nation's schools.

The second part of the strategy will take place in the next Congress when all the major Federal elementary and secondary education programs come up for reauthorization.

Building on the framework provided for in this conference agreement, the subcommittee will review and revise existing Federal education programs with an eye toward making them more effective as part of a coordinated Federal approach to improving the instruction and achievement of all students.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the conference agreement has the support of the National Alliance of Business.

To my knowledge, this is the first time the Alliance has gone on record in support of an education conference report.

I quote from the letter I received from William H. Kolbert, president of the National Alliance of Business: "We view this bill as one important step in the bipartisan effort to improve American education."

Mr. Speaker, the neighborhood schools improvement bills were approved in the House by a vote of 279 to 124 and in the Senate by a vote of 92 to 6.

I urge the adoption of the conference agreement.

□ 1420

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

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

Mr. Speaker, a funny thing happened on the way to the national election, and that funny thing is than in 18 years we have always came to the floor from this committee with an education bill that everybody was jumping up and down wanting to take credit for. Everybody wanted pride of authorship. I have not found anybody this time, although I was happy to learn who the author was just a few minutes ago.

Unfortunately, we started out with the idea that we would do something to bring about systemic change in the way education is run in this country. If all the reports are true, we thought that something must be done, and something big had to be done.

Unfortunately, at this time, nothing has changed. First of all, we create a national body, and we suggest how every local school provides an education including national criteria for curriculm, teacher training, books, materials, and all other local school policies, and this is counter, of course, to the American tradition of local control of schools.

Then someone might say, "but are not the delivery standards voluntary?" Yes, it says they are voluntary in one section of the bill, but under the neighborhood schools program, each State must, and I underline must, develop school delivery standards. Putting these two provisions together makes it less than a voluntary activity.

Well, we do get to the neighborhood schools, and we say that we will not provide any sound foundation for any kind of reform. Innovation, according to S. 2, is early childhood education, dropout prevention, staff development, and parent involvement. Are they not something new on the horizon? All of those at the present time are common practice. All of them are provided for in existing education law. Truly innovative reform measures that were contained in the House and Senate bills such as Charter Schools, Merit Schools, New American Schools, et cetera, were removed in conference.

I would like to point out how easy it will be to get this grant. I mean, it is a very simple procedure. All you have to do is look at the bureaucracy that is set up, and you will find out how easy it is. For example, at the State level, the SEA and the State panel consults on the plan. Then the chief State school officer develops a plan. Then the panel develops the plan. Then the panel submits the plan to the SEA, who can modify the plan. Then the panel reviews the plan, and their comments are attached to the final plan submitted to the Department of Education.

At the local level, the LEA obtains funds for planning. The local committee develops the plan, which can be totally revised by the LEA. At the same time, schools would develop their own plans, individual schools, and they would submit them to the LEA. The LEA then would choose school plans for funding, and then send the LEA plan and the school plans chosen for funding to the State for consideration.

By that time, they have thrown up their hands and decided it is not worth it to go through all of that.

Now, does it really provide for education reform? Because that is what we started out to do. That is what we had hoped we could accomplish. Well, we have the local program focused on chapter 1, and we have had chapter 1 for 25 years. We do not seem to have any studies that show that we have made much progress with chapter 1 as far as improving the education of children, and so this entire system of education must be reformed, not just a part of it. You cannot reform just Head Start, and you cannot just reform chapter 1, you have to reform the whole system.

But the way it is written, very little money will get to very many Members in the Congress of the United States, and if any gets there, it will be extremely limited, so here we have a bill that just does more of the same over and over and over again, and that is not what we set out to do.

Then we got to flexibility. We have had hearing after hearing after hearing, year after year after year. Local and State educators tell us that if they had a little more flexibility they could get the end result we seek, but they could do it for better than they are presently doing it. Well, we have a great part in here that deals with flexibility. In a sense this creates but one more categorical program for disadvantaged students and could actually work against them. This is a far cry from the orginal idea behind flexibility, which was allowing schools to design innovative programs to help raise the academic achievements of all students, while at the same time striving for the same goals. An example: It could result in funds going to the school, being combined to serve disadvantaged; however, in fear of audit problems, it is possible that disadvantaged students could be placed in separate classrooms, isolated from their more advantaged peers, and then unfairly labeled. This is certainly not what we should be doing.

Again, I hope the election, let us see, that is November 3, and that would be my hope that we really get serious about trying to reform the way schools operate in this country. We possibly could do that before whenever we are getting out on Monday or whatever,

but I doubt that, but I agree with my chairman of the subcommittee, but I do not agree with him when he said this is a bipartisan effort, and I almost choked on that, but I do agree with him on the fact that after the election perhaps we can get serious and really do something in the reauthorizing programs next year and really come up with something that will change the direction our schools are presently going in.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that it was the National Alliance of Businesses that characterized this as a bipartisan bill, probably because they watched all the work that we have put into this bill for many, many months, and felt that while it is not a perfect bill, and the only perfect law I am ever aware of being written was written on Mount Sinai, but this is Capitol Hill, but it is a good bill. I think it is a very good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], who has worked hard on this bill.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

I want to express my profound admiration for my subcommittee chairman, DALE KILDEE, and his staff, who have successfully guided this proposal through a perilous political minefield.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is easy to forget the fact that when we talk about making fundamental changes in our Nation's schools, we are talking about altering that institution in the lives of most Americans that is second only to their families in importance.

The two most enduring organizing principles of our system of public education are that schools provide educational opportunities equally to all American children and that its governance is the primary concern of local communities.

That has not changed.

But the world has changed and so too has the mission of our schools. We are asking schools to produce more at a time when financial resources are declining.

What has been conspicuously absent in education reform proposals of the past—on the State and Federal level—is a clear sense of national purpose and direction.

That is exactly what the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act has to offer—purpose and direction.

The national message we are sending is that the education of our elementary and secondary school students is the responsibility of entire communities. We have created a mechanism that will encourage the business, civic, and volunteer communities to work side by side with educators and administrators to confront the problems of the present and plan for the challenges of the future.

Second, by authorizing the creation of national content standards—in math, science, english, geography, history, and others—we are finally acknowledging that there is a body of knowledge in each subject matter that students should know. By and large the decline in American achievement levels is associated with how students learn. For far too long most instruction has been grounded in the memorizing of isolated facts and data, devoid of any meaningful context. Everything we now know about learning tells us that real knowledge is based on the ability to understand concepts and to develop the ability to build bridges between concepts.

Once these national content standards are approved and certified, curriculum will begin to change to reflect these standards. This is crucial—it is the blueprint that teachers will use to develop, and guide, the way their students learn.

Third, in this bill we are recognizing that the current array of tests, or assessments, are totally inadequate. Currently, we have no real idea what we are measuring when we test and it is the exception, rather than the rule that information distilled from tests are used for the purpose of diagnosis and remediation. We have taken a first step by authorizing the development of model assessment in math and science. To measure what students have learned and to hold schools and teachers accountable for how well students achieve. The way we test must develop to reflect the way we learn.

Fourth, we are calling for the development of school delivery standards which will help determine whether the student is failing at school or whether the school is failing the student. National content standards, and even the best tests in the world will not mean a thing in those schools whose textbooks are 10 years out of date and who are unable to attract qualified teachers. We don't know what those standards will look like and I suspect it will be the hardest of those things we call for in this bill—but we have to make a start.

Mr. Speaker, this bill contains no gimmicks or magic, painless solutions. We will continue the work we begin here in the next Congress when we reauthorize the core Federal elementary and secondary programs.

But we can now place ourselves firmly on the side of progress. I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this conference report and I hope the President will sign it.

Again, I thank my subcommittee chair for his peerless work and determination.

□ 1430

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds only to say to my chairman that I realize we could not climb Mount Sinai because our collective age is against us, but I had hoped we could at least walk in the Garden of Academe.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, let me begin by saying a special "thank you," and I mean this sincerely, to my leaders on both sides of the aisle of this committee because I think everybody ought to know, regardless of where you are on this bill, that in a bipartisan basis, I think, and I do believe, that these gentlemen and their staffs really, really do want a bipartisan education reform package.

I would hope that they would admit, and others would admit who have followed this debate, that second to them the gentleman in the well wants education reform on a bipartisan basis as much as anybody in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we have aggressively pursued the issue of education reform in my district, and I have a number of schools and communities who are involved in this process. And all along I have told them what I anticipated the Federal legislation would be. It is no secret that because of that I have tried to go the extra mile throughout this process to support passage of an education reform bill and, very frankly, some on my side of the aisle, including the Secretary of Education, were not very happy with me when I voted for the Democratic bill that left this House a few weeks ago.

Having said all that, I have to tell you that I have come to the regrettable conclusion that we would all be better if we would start again next session, that the bill that is in front of us, through no fault of the House members on that conference committee, is so fundamentally different from the concepts of education reform and the premise for which that reform should exist and operate, that I think we have to simply say this bill should not pass; it should either go back to conference and we start over or we start over in the next session.

The basic problem with this conference report is that it is trying to create concentration grants, No. 2.

I am all for chapter 1; it is the very best part of education at the Federal level, to our local schools. I supported, in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act, the concept of concentration grants to direct more money to those schools with a high percentage or a high number of educationally disadvantaged students within their school system.

But, ladies and gentlemen, that is fundamentally different from the con-

cept of education reform for all, being premised on a formula based on the number or the percent of educationally disadvantaged within your local education agency.

Worse than that concept is the fact that this bill, by nature of that formula, guarantees a paperwork, a reporting, and a bureaucratic structure that will so limit the amount of funds for the majority of schools in our States that they will not participate in the process.

I believe I have 40 different communities in my congressional district alone that are at some point involved in educational reform. And, unfortunately, I have to stand here today and tell you I do not believe one of those schools would qualify for funding under this bill for their education reform program because they are not going to be qualified by virtue of having over half, in terms of numbers. These are small, rural school districts, and they are not going to qualify in terms of percentage because, very frankly, most of them are simply middle America.

Now, to their credit, they are trying to design programs that early intervention and children at risk in making sure we achieve goal No. 1, which is that the kids start school ready to learn. But unfortunately this bill tells them that they are not going to participate in that process.

Second, I want you to understand the bureaucracy that is involved in this bill. Let me take it simply at the local education level: First, you have to create a 15-member local council to do the reform and develop the plan. They then submit the plan to the local education agency, which is obviously the school board.

The school board then indicates that they are going to seek a grant, so they must hold public hearings on that proposal, modify it, send it back, or change it totally and send it up to the State.

But before they ask for a grant from the State, they have to turn around and tell every school in their local education agency that, "If you want some of the money from this grant, we are going to have a competitive subgrant here in our school district for which you can apply for those funds."

Then that local school board will review those different plans from the school buildings that apply, and they will submit those along with their plan to the State. The State will establish a peer review process to look at it and allocate the grants and awards to the local LEA's, and they will refer those back to those schools.

Interestingly enough, during the review and monitoring process that the local planning council, whose plan may have been totally rejected by the school board, still must report to the State the progress that is made, perhaps even on a plan on which they were totally rejected.

Now, there are a couple of other points here that I think are very important as well. Many of us in this Congress on both sides of the aisle have advocated the concept of education flexibility. The problem with the education flexibility in the bill before you is that the only people who can have educational flexibility are the disadvantaged programs.

On page 87, line 19, it says, "You can only waive statutory requirements if the requirements well impede the delivery of services to disadvantaged students."

□ 1440

If the concept of eliminating Federal and State regulations has merit to allow and to provide incentives for that local school to do what works there in new, bold, innovative ideas to enhance the quality of education in that community, you cannot limit it only to those programs directed to the disadvantaged.

To be honest with you, I hope there is not a regulation in effect today that impedes programs for the disadvantaged. So by its very nature, that means there can be no flexibility because there is no rule today that impedes that program, so there is no rule or regulation that can be eliminated for the concept of flexibility.

Now, there is one other thing in here that I think every Member of Congress ought to understand, and in particular my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle and those who are very concerned about the mix between public and private schools.

I want to tell everyone that, to my knowledge, in a phone call received just before I came to the well of the floor to speak, the National Education Association has not made a decision on whether they will or will not consider this a pro- or an anti-education vote.

My guess is that part of the reason they have not made that decision is because there is a provision on page 74 of this bill that simply says:

> Any local education agency which uses funds under this part for teacher and administrator training—

And I am quoting now—

> shall provide in its plan for the training of teachers and administrators in private schools located in a geographical area served by such agency.

Let me tell you what the possible implications of this are. I am going to take either the LaCrosse or the Eau Claire school districts, the largest city school districts in my congressional district. Each of them has two public high schools. Each of them has a series of elementary schools. Under this plan as it exists today, the LaCrosse School District cannot have a districtwide educational reform program. The reason they cannot is because this bill mandates that every school has to compete with every other school building in LaCrosse for those funds. So the net effect of that is LaCrosse Central might get the funds and LaCrosse Logan might not. One high school gets them, the other does not, and the same at the elementary level.

But worse than that, if LaCrosse Central uses those funds for teacher training, retraining, and upgrading their skills, then the LaCrosse School Board must make sure that those funds also have to go to LaCrosse Aquinas High School teachers and the administrators, even though they might not go to LaCrosse Logan teachers in the other public school.

I do not enjoy saying what I am saying here this afternoon, because I know that no Member of Congress more wanted to vote for it, to speak for this bill than I did. Those of you who know me know that I have worked my heart out back home to try to get education reform, not to beat up on education, but to lift up education all over this country. I have spoken around my State. I have had the privilege of speaking around the country on this whole concept of what works and what does not work.

I think next year we are going to reauthorize the elementary and secondary education programs, and I have come to the conclusion that we ought to figure out at that time what are we going to do to better assist the disadvantaged under chapter 1 and other such programs, and what are we going to do to promote educational reform? But we cannot do both those things under the same formula.

So unfortunately, I ask you to vote yes on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] to return this bill to the conference committee to have it revised, and if that fails, I regrettably ask you to vote "no" on final passage.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I am really very grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], because he certainly has labored hard on this bill. I regret that he differs with us on the conference report, but that does not detract from the fact that he has been a great contributor to the bill.

I would just like to respond to one thing. He referred to a provision in the bill saying that maybe it was the reason the NEA has not decided yet whether to support the bill or call it as one of their educational bills, I want to point out to the gentleman that language is really ancient language. It dates back about 30 years. The same language is found in chapter 1. The same language is found in the Eisenhower science and math bill, so it is nothing new. The NEA is very familiar with the language and they supported both those bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am pained to see the members of my committee one after another explain how painfully they are progressing toward killing this bill.

I would simply like to observe that everybody seems to be dancing around the paternity question here. I think I could suggest the paternity of this legislation. It was initiated by the White House. It was much ballyhooed across the country by the White House and the Secretary. It was considered by the Committee of the House and of the Senate and considered in joint action by the Committee of the House and of the Senate, and it comes here in this form.

Now, people who were wildly enthusiastic about it a year-and-a-half ago are not so sure of it anymore, and I would like to join that long list of people who say, "I am really sad to see a bill that has as little support for it come to the floor as the conference report."

But I think it should be made clear that nobody ought to be pointing the finger at anyone else on the paternity of this thing. Everybody, as you have noticed, will get up here and critically say it is somebody else's fault, but everybody has had a part of the action, and that is what happens when a willful administration injects itself between the Members of Congress on the committee from both parties and proceeds to try to write legislation in their own image.

If you need further proof of that, look at the letter that was sent to our leaders today by the Secretary of Education in which he says that he is going to recommend that the President veto this. This is what he says, and this comes on the heels of the gentleman from Wisconsin from the other party being concerned about how the NEA is going to feel about this. I quote the Secretary.

This bill epitomizes what is wrong with American education today. It evidences the cozy relationship between the majority members of the Education Committees and the entrenched education special interests who are most responsible for the current state of American schools and who have a vested interest in preventing any real and legitimate change.

He then goes on to criticize this bill for sending 90 percent of the money directly to local school districts and to local school buildings for every single decision. No other bill that we have ever passed here for education has sent so much of its resources to the local school district to make the decision. That does not fit the pattern of the administration's original idea of national testing, national standards, a national system of education, and for that reason I think this is a vast improvement over the original bill as introduced and should be adopted.

The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is the first significant school reform bill the Congress has considered. The funds authorized for the first year are modest, only $800 million. Far too little money in my opinion. But the bill is still very symbolic.

All prior education bills have focused on individual groups of children or on particular problems. This bill, by contrast, calls for sweeping restructuring in the education of all children.

Let me briefly describe the five characteristics of the conference report which make it so different from the programs we have considered in the past.

First, S. 2 calls for the development of voluntary national standards for education. Never in our two-century history as a Nation have we had standards to describe what children should know and be able to do. Educators tell us that we must have these standards now in order to have a focal point for national education reform.

Second, S. 2 creates a framework to improve the education of all children. Not since the Federal Government set aside land to create public schools in the 18th and 19th centuries have we at the national level been concerned with the education of all children.

Third, S. 2 calls for systemwide reform in education. As I have already mentioned, current Federal programs now focus on one population of students or another, or on one problem or another. None seek broadbased improvement of the entire system of public education.

Fourth, S. 2 calls for school delivery standards. This means that this legislation not only makes the students accountable but also provides the mechanism which insures that schools be held accountable by providing adequate resources, qualified school personnel, a proper environment, and all of the other necessary elements which must be provided in order to promote maximum learning opportunities.

Fifth, S. 2 emphasizes educational achievement instead of concentrating on the educational process. The conference report permits a sample of 750 schools to ease Federal and State rules and regulations in exchange for students achieving higher grades.

The Congress has never been concerned before about achieving such broadbased school reform and, therefore, we have had to think differently as we have crafted this legislation. As I already mentioned, the major disappointment I have is that the bill calls for spending only $800 million in the first year.

The Neighborhood Schools Act is the first step of a two-part process at the Federal level to improve education. S. 2 will establish the general framework for school reform but then next year we will have an opportunity to refashion the array of Federal programs to fit within this framework.

Ten billion dollars of current Federal aid expires next year and must be reauthorized. This will be our chance to update Federal programs and hone them to achieve broad reform.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter from the Secretary of Education, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
THE SECRETARY,
September 30, 1992.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: The President will have signed 10 major education bills during the 102nd Congress. I have strongly recommended that he veto S. 2, the Kennedy-Ford bill.

This bill epitomizes what is wrong with American education today. It evidences the cozy relationship between the majority members of the Education Committees and the entrenched education special interests who are most responsible for the current state of American schools and who have a vested interest in preventing any real and legitimate change.

First, the Kennedy-Ford bill pokes the Federal government's nose too far into local decisions. It creates at least the beginnings of a national school board that could make day-to-day school decisions on curriculum, discipline, teacher training, textbooks, and classroom materials. Such decisions belong with communities, parents, teachers and local school boards. A federal recipe book dictating how to operate a local school does not make schools better.

Second, this legislation gives money to bureaucrats and their entrenched bureaucracies, not children. It even adds new layers of unworkable bureaucracy. In the first year, 100 percent of the money goes to administrative costs instead of classrooms. After that, 30 percent is set aside for similar purposes.

Third, and perhaps most critically, this bill fails to help change our schools. Five-hundred days ago the President asked Congress to appropriate nearly $700 million dollars for AMERICA 2000 legislation. Communities, teachers and families have literally reinvented education and want the best schools in the world. The President asked to cut red tape in all 110,000 schools . . . to get federal regulations out of the way so teachers are free to teach. The Kennedy-Ford bill gives them minimal freedom in less than one percent of those schools. The President asked to move rapidly ahead with higher standards and a voluntary national examination system; Congress has slowed the process down.

The President also asked Congress to give middle and low-income families more choices of all schools. Choice is absolutely necessary to give consumer power to parents to change our schools. The Kennedy-Ford bill fails to give parents greater choice even of public schools.

The President asked Congress for a half billion dollars to help communities create New American Schools. Today, more than 2000 communities are rethinking the way their schools educate their children and 686 design teams are in place to help them do that, with businesses raising $200 million to fund the effort. Yet Congress has refused to appropriate any money for New American Schools.

Congress has delayed so long, it now has not one penny left this year for this bill or any K–12 education bill. For all of these reasons, I am recommending that the President reject such cynical end-of-the-session high jinks. This is not an education bill; it is a monument to business-as-usual thinking.

Sincerely,

LAMAR ALEXANDER.

Mr. Speaker, I also include the following response:

ALEXANDER'S VETO THREAT: A RESPONSE

First, the bill "pokes the Federal Government's nose too far into local decisions."

An odd complaint since Bush recommended a national education test. We rejected that idea.

Second, the bill "gives money to bureaucrats."

S. 2 is the first Federal bill that will require at least 90% of local grants to be used in individual schools under the control of teachers and principals. Bush did not ask for that; it was Senator KENNEDY's idea and we adopted it.

Third, the bill "fails to help change our schools."

The National Alliance of Business endorses this conference report because it is a "constructive effort to legislate the education reform agenda initiated by the President and the Governors" and because it is an "important effort to improve American education."

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], who has worked very hard on this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report. I want to congratulate my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the committee chairman, for their outstanding work in moving this bill through the process.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report.

In a year consumed with partisan squabbling and Presidential politics, it is not surprising that this legislation gets mixed reviews.

But that does not change the facts: Amidst all the talk about fundamental change, this bill is quietly delivering real change.

We all know that the traditional Federal role in education has been restricted to the area of special needs. But as the evidence of a national education crisis mounts, it is clear that we must go further: The Federal Government must be a leader in education reform.

This legislation begins that landmark change. For the first time in our Nation's history, it gives the Federal Government a leading role in education policy.

But this innovative proposal goes much further. Recognizing that the failure of school reform over the past 15 years can be attributed primarily to its piecemeal nature, this bill supports comprehensive, systemic reform. It calls on States and local communities to join in sweeping plans to transform all schools for all students.

That means every family in America can be a part of this process, not just one-half of 1 percent of the schools in America, as the President proposed. No other plan envisions reform on this ambitious scale.

This conference report contains a vision that is based on the knowledge that we are capable of excellence.

It contains a strategy for achieving that vision by reaching all of our communities.

And it supports innovative reform techniques that will make a real difference in our children's lives.

The naysayers can snipe away at some details, but they will leave the broad picture unchanged: This is one small step for Congress, and one giant leap for education reform.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes.

□ 1450

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2, NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] for yielding this time to me, and let me say at the outset that I am imploring the Members of this body to do the responsible thing and vote for the Goodling motion to recommit. Should that fail, then I would ask the Members of the body to vote against this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more serious business that any civilization or culture can undertake than the education of their young people, and the American people take this business very, very seriously. We spend over $400 billion a year, at the State and local level, and even at the national level, on education for our young people. The least amount of that spending is done at the Federal level, less than 8 percent. The American people quite readily understand that local control, local administration, of their schools is in the best interests of their children. If in fact this legislation should put more control of the schools in the hands of the Federal Government, it would do exactly the wrong thing with respect to the preference and the desires of the American people.

This legislative reform effort began over 500 days ago when the President initiated America 2000 on behalf of the school children of America. Any relationship of this work product to that effort by the President to provide incentive for real educational innovations is purely accidental. The fact of the matter is the President's recommendations met a rigorous hostility in the committees. The Democrat chairmen of both the House and the Senate committees worked hand in hand with the National Education Association, the largest union in America, to see to it that the spending under this bill met the needs of that large union's special interest in total disregard of the needs of the children of America. They were, in fact, offended by the President's proposal to the extent that the chairman of the House committee pulled all the work product of any participation in the committee from his side or ours and unilaterally submitted the National Education Association's bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this conference report was written by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and Chairman KENNEDY of the other body in conjunction with the National Education Association in total disregard to the mission of education on behalf of the children of this Nation, in total disregard to the efforts of the President and totally on behalf of the largest union in America.

I implore the people of this country, when given a choice between voting for the families and the children of this country and the National Education Association, to vote for the children. Let us take this snake back into its hole, and let us start over again with a legitimate, serious bill in the next Congress that concerns itself with the children of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report, legislation that the Secretary of Education has called "worse than worse than awful." This report—more aptly called "Christmas comes early for the NEA" is dead on arrival. The President is going to veto this bill precisely because it is simply another manifestation of the chronic disease afflicting much of what we do here. Since coming to Washington, I've observed this sickness. The majority in this Chamber consistently responds to problems in one fashion, they recognize a problem and then they throw money at it. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what has been done with this conference report. I don't deny that there is a problem in our Nation's schools. I deny that this bill will be able to address it.

This legislation will not help children, it will not make our Nation more competitive, it will not empower parents. It will only enrich education bureaucrats. Even the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee has admitted as much.

From the beginning when President Bush first introduced the America 2000 proposal, it was clear that the American people wanted the Federal Government to spur initiative and reform. It was also clear that the American people did not want the Federal Government to micromanage or take over our communities' schools. This report rejects that consensus. It won't spur reform and it takes us down the path to federally run schools, both public and private. Adopting this bill will lead us to a na-

tional curriculum and who knows what in the day-to-day operations of local schools.

The conference report would also make bureaucrat funding its primary emphasis. The first year 100 percent—that's $800 million—goes for administrative costs outside the classroom. This is supposed to be reform.

The President's package—which I can say unabashedly I support—was submitted to this Congress more than 500 days ago. We have communities all across the Nation working on a mostly volunteer basis to reform and reinvigorate our community's schools in anticipation of this bill. Unfortunately, it was for nought. Not only has this Congress prevented America 2000 from receiving any funding, but the majority in this Congress has also failed to even allow the regulatory waiver that the President sought. Out of 110,000 schools which would have been eligible for regulatory relief, the Kennedy-Ford bill allows 75. That's right, a maximum of 75 schools. This is called reform.

Perhaps even more critical than any other reason why the President will veto this bill is the fact that it bans school choice—public or private. Despite being recognized as the most innovative reform to be considered in education, the majority on this committee has banned. Sadly, the majority replaced competition and improvement with bureaucratic ineptitude and failure. I will say that the majority did include one cost-savings measure in this conference report. Remarkably, there is a provision allowing public schools to use their Federal dollars to publicize their successes to private schools. Since I don't expect to see these successes or interest on the part of private schools of adopting these so-called successes, I assume that it is a cost-saving measure.

Also I am particularly concerned about the potential that H.R. 4323 authorizes Federal support for school-based clinics that provide birth control and abortion counseling services. I might add that this could be done without parental consent or any age limit. Such a move would be significant change in Federal education policy and should not be considered in this legislative vehicle. The administration has outlined their concerns about this, and we have sought a clear ban in the bill. Unfortunately, the majority could not make such commitment, apparently because the education bureaucracy supports this measure. This is supposed to be reform.

The House Committee on Education and Labor was given an opportunity to be the catalyst for education reform in this Nation. President Bush in conjunction with the Nation's Governors promulgated a sweeping plan to revitalize our schools, seeking such goals as achieving a 90-percent high school graduation rate; adopting voluntary national examinations; accomplishing universal literacy among others.

Instead of drafting and adopting language which would accomplish this objective, the committee has chosen to respond to the concerns of entrenched bureaucratic interests. Innovations such as choice and competition are the most important reforms capable of turning our schools around. Rather than create incentives for excellence in education utilizing these components, the Kennedy-Ford bill gives its approval to a new block grant authorizing federally funded field trips, movies, school clinics, and other activities either not directly related to or counterproductive to the mission of education. This is unfortunate, perhaps even more so now that it is becoming increasingly clear that the opposition to reform is predicated on partisanship.

Today we spend 33 percent more per pupil than we did just 10 years ago, and yet we've not seen 33 percent improvement in educational achievement. In fact, just the opposite has been the case. For instance, in 1983, our students scored among the lowest in average science achievement when compared with 17 other countries. Less than 1 in 10 American students demonstrate basic knowledge of our Government and its operations.

In conclusion, despite near universal acclaim for the efficacy of reforms like school choice as an agent for competition and improvement of our schools, the Kennedy-Ford bill will instead reward the majority's supporters from the education bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying that I don't believe that the conference report is at all likely to stimulate the major changes in our communities vital for our country as it heads into the 21st century. It is for the sake of our young people that we insist that we do better. I urge Members to vote for children and against this bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act because it recognizes that our children cannot achieve world-class standards if they are condemned to attend Third World-class schools.

This legislation authorizes assistance for the development of content standards in science, history, English, and other subject areas which would set out what our children should know to compete effectively in the national and world economy and to participate successfully in our society. This is an important activity which I fully support. Parents, policymakers, school administrators, teachers, and students themselves will find this kind of information very useful. But our schools need more. They also must know what our policymakers must do to assure that our children have the means and resources to master the knowledge set out in the content standards. For this reason, H.R. 4323 also authorizes the development of school delivery standards which would set out criteria for the quality of the education a school must deliver every child to provide that child with a fair opportunity to attain the knowledge and skills outlined in the content standards. These standards will encompass the qualifications of teachers, the kinds of resources provided to support learning in and out of the classroom, the quality of the instructional materials, and other elements of the school environment.

Just as the content standards will provide us with a benchmark against which to evaluate the performance of our children in school, telling us whether our students are meeting world-class standards, school delivery standards will provide us with a benchmark we can use to evaluate the performance of Governors, mayors, legislators, school board members, and others in meeting our children's educational needs, telling us whether our policymakers are providing our students with world-class schools. They promise to become a critical instrument for holding policymakers accountable for the way they treat our schools and a vital lever to drive greater equity and opportunity into an educational system which now cheats so many poor and minority children of a fair opportunity to learn.

Addressing these inequities is essential to meaningful educational reform. Here is the richest and most educated nation in the world, we have in our midst schools whose squalor rivals that of the worst Bantu schools in South Africa. In his book "Savage Inequalities," Jonathan Kozol has graphically cataloged the daily atrocities committed against the children who today attend schools which are starved of the most basic resources: Classes conducted in closets; hallways flooded with raw sewage; science labs without any equipment; bathrooms without running water; history textbooks two decades old; untrained teachers; unheated, dirty classrooms. The list of abuses perpetrated against the children of the American Bantu schools is literally endless. As the Chicago Tribune put it in its shocking series of articles about the Chicago public schools, the conditions in these schools amount to institutionalized child neglect.

These dysfunctional, destructive schools are not a random occurrence. South Africa's Bantu schools are for the children of poor and minority families—the most powerless members of the society—and so are ours. America's Bantu schools proliferate in inner cities and rural communities and wherever else there are concentrations of low-income families, African-Americans, Hispanics, and others with limited political and economic power to fight back.

The school delivery standards which will be developed through this bill will provide parents, teachers, and others in these communities with a valuable new tool with which they can confront and combat the indifference and contempt of the politicians who permit America's Bantu schools to thrive. It is for this very reason that the President and congressional Republicans oppose school delivery standards. The same administration experts who pound the podium demanding that our children be held accountable for their work in school, the same people who want to test our kids until their fingers bleed, run screaming from the room at the

suggestion that policymakers, too, should be held accountable for their actions. Insisting our children meet world-class standards, apparently, is one thing. Insisting our politicians provide our children with world-class schools is another. What hypocritical nonsense that is.

Opponents of school delivery standards have worried aloud that these standards might force Federal, State, and local governments to increase their spending on education and jettison inequitable funding formulas. Let us hope for the sake of our children and our Nation that they are right. Far-reaching reform is urgently needed throughout our education system if we are to meet the national education goals promulgated by the President and the Governors and ratified here in this legislation. But our first task must be to ensure that our schools are adequately and equitably funded. The Bantu schools must go. Without this, reform and restructuring is doomed to failure.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report. With its support for the development of school delivery standards and other provisions, the legislation will move us forward to assuring that every child in America is given a world-class education.

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the minority will be offering a motion to recommit with instructions, and, reading over that proposed recommittal, it seems that they are striking national standards for schools, but, in effect, keeping national standards for kids.

Does that sound reasonable to the gentleman from New York? If we are going to hold kids to a certain national standard, should we not hold the schools to a certain national standard?

□ 1500

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the motion to recommit singles out delivery standards plays out the drama of hypocrisy to the fullest. In America 2000, the President's proposal for reforming schools, there is not a single statement about standards and the resources necessary to make those resources possible. It is an attempt to sell the American people reform without putting anything behind it in terms of resources.

Opponents of school delivery standards are worried that these standards might force some Federal, State, and local governments to increase their spending on education, and this is exactly what we need. We need these school delivery standards because these school delivery standards tell us where we have to place the resources.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot have world-class schools, you cannot have world-class students, unless you provide them with world-class schools. And world-class schools mean the right amount of equipment, books, laboratory equipment, and qualified teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this conference report and provide for the school delivery standards necessary to go forward to make America's schools world-class schools.

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking Republican for granting the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating the ranking Republican, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]. The work these gentlemen have put into an earlier version of this bill in subcommittee was truly done in a bipartisan way in response to the President's introduction of America 2000 and in response to the crisis that is affecting all of our children across America.

Unfortunately, their efforts all along the way have been dismantled, and what we have before us is another charade. It is a bill that has been brought to this floor so that we cannot be criticized for not dealing with the education problem in this country.

It is not going to drive any real reform through the system. It is not going to empower parents and communities to involve themselves in our schools, because that is where the real effort needs to be done if we are going to have structural change in those institutions so that our children have an education where they can go on as productive members of our society once they are out of school. It really is unfortunate, given the work of both sides of the aisle, given the commitment from Members that we ought to have real structural reform, that throwing more money at the system is not the answer without real change in the system.

Mr. Speaker, today I think it is time to vote for the Goodling recommittal motion, and, if that does not pass, it is time to say no, let us not play another charade across the American people. Let us try to do something that is real and significant. Unfortunately, this bill before us today is not.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

This act is the first step toward nationwide systemic school reform guided and supported by national resources. This bill provides critical assistance to States, local districts, and schools to plan and undertake systemwide reform. With broad public participation, schools would be able to establish new education standards, innovative curricula, assessment systems, and teacher and administrator training programs.

But while the funds available to local school districts must be spent to implement reforms, the bill does not prescribe or mandate the specifics of a local reform program.

This legislation codifies the national education goals and establishes Federal objectives to help meet the goals. This legislation also establishes a National Education Goals Panel and the National Education Standards and Assessment Council to determine national education standards for both student performance and school accountability, and provides for research on the impact and content of these standards.

I believe this bill marries Federal resources with local know-how, a key component of education reform. It's a small step in assisting local schools, but it's a step forward and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the conference report. The Committee on Education and Labor was before this body several months ago urging support for the Higher Education Assistance Act. Members will recall that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the ranking Republican from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and any number of us from both sides of the aisle, had concluded that that was worthy, constructive, and helpful legislation, even though at the time the administration had expressed reservation and objection to the legislation. On a bipartisan basis, we urge support of that bill.

The situation is quite different today. In fact, when this bill left the Committee on Education and Labor, the chairman of the committee protested the legislation, acknowledging that it made no revolutionary changes and was of no great consequence relative to the educational reform agenda.

The ranking Republican, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], said essentially the same thing.

Now, if the Democratic chairman does not want to defend the bill, and if the ranking Republican does not want to defend the bill, why in the world are we being asked to vote for it today?

There are $800 million of public funds at issue. Not one penny, not one penny in the first year, reaches into any of your local school districts, or into any particular classroom, or to help any particualr teacher get professional development.

I heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] when he was talking about Jonathan Kozol's book, "Savage Inequalities." It is a good book. I

recomnend it to my colleagues. I just finished reading it myself several weeks ago.

Why not, if we have $800 million, simply put the money into chapter 1 and address some of those inequalities? Why not, given the fact that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is up for reauthorization next year, hold back and save that money so we can do something substantive by way of millage equalization, or chapter 1, chapter 2, and get that money into the schools to help the kids and the teachers in the classroom.

None of that is true of this legislation. Every single penny of the $800 million in the first year goes into planning committees, your local, your intermediate, and at your State level, planning and talking and coordinating. But not one penny goes into the action of doing. And that is what my colleagues have to understand.

There is nothing, and I am going to stress that, nothing of the President's initiatives here, nothing by way of new American schools funding. Nothing by way of innovation in educational choice, even for public schools. Put private schools aside. The entire America 2000 agenda is stripped from this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most important elements of this conference report and of the House bill is national delivery standards. We fought very long and very hard to retain national delivery standards during the progress of this bill.

Now, if we abandon national delivery standards and let a State or a consortia of States develop their own State delivery standards, we could find that a State or two States with the lowest per pupil expenditure and perhaps the lowest achievement could set delivery standards which reflect the poor educational standards already existing in that State or States.

That is why I think it is very important that we retain national delivery standards. We are competing in a global economy.

□ 1510

While education is a local function, and we certainly strengthen the levels of local function in this bill while it is a State responsibility, and we certainly recognize that State responsibility in this bill, it is a very, very important Federal concern, a deep Federal concern for two reasons.

First of all, we are in a very mobile society. The person educated in Mississippi may end up living in Michigan or vice versa. Plus we are competing in a global economy. We have certain national interests in education, and that is why we feel it is important to retain and maintain in this bill certain national delivery standards if we are going to recognize the mobility of our society and the fact that we are competing in a global economy.

That national delivery standards section of this bill is very important. It is essential. It will help move this country along the path of real school reform. Any attempt to strike national delivery standards should be fought very, very hard by this body.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, when I came to this Congress, the first bill I introduced was one to assist in the education of people in this country. At that time I was more or less restricted in my thinking by the fact that the Constitution did not provide for education being a function of the Federal Government.

Today times have changed considerably, and we have a national interest that is very paramount to getting ahead in the field of education.

The bill before us, it seems to me, this conference report, addresses this and addresses it well. There may be too much bureaucracy in it. There may be things in it we would like to change in future years. But the thrust forward to acknowledge the fact that today our educational system must be improved and made available to everybody is something which I think everybody can agree upon.

We thank very much the committee for bringing this before us. I hope it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. I do not think we should have any illusions about this legislation.

It is a modest attempt to move the debate on school reform forward. It contains some very valuable elements: specifically, a more firmer grasp on the issues of standard setting throughout the Nation; specifically, again, the issue of school delivery standards. And these are something that I think will be a very valuable precursor to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act next Congress.

But I am a little bit amazed at some of the discussion I have heard from the opponents of this bill, flailing away at the issues of school choice, talking about new American schools.

I find it a little bit difficult to accept Members who are talking about choice but are unwilling to support school delivery standards. How can a parent go about choosing a school if there is no independent evaluation of how that school is doing?

The whole issue of school delivery standards attempts to establish that independent evaluation.

Also, we have talked about choice. It has been bandied about back and forth. We started with the President's proposal for choice among every type of school, public or private. It has been narrowed down to public school choice. But nowhere in the conference, in the debate, did we focus in on what we are talking about. Is this intradistrict choice? That is being done already by many school districts throughout the country.

That issue, I think, has become more a slogan than a real message of reform.

With respect to the issue of new American schools, unlike some of the other proposals that we have heard in our committee meetings, charter schools, the new American schools is really, I think, an approach that can be simply dissolved to a simple mathematical equation.

As the President proposed it, new American schools equals one school equals $1 million. The $1 million is no longer there, and what the new American schools have become is simply a slogan.

I do not think we should waste our time in the last few moments of this Congress debating about slogans. I think we should pass this legislation, take a step forward in terms of establishing national standards, including school delivery standards, and use this as a solid basis to go forward into the next Congress and to reauthorize in a systematic and comprehensive way the Elementary and Secondary Act.

For that reason, I urge passage of this important legislation.

[Mr. GOODLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

□ 1520

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are on the road to a new departure on Federal aid for education. I think for the first time we are giving local school districts and States the opportunity to really look at their school systems and look at systemic reform. In the past we have addressed special populations and special programs. Very often school districts and States are strapped for money, just for those specific programs, and they do not have the resources, particularly at the local level, to look at systemic reform.

I believe we should take this step, start this process. I do look forward to next year, working with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] to reauthorize all of the K-12 programs as part of the next step.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, our national education reform bill.

It is no secret that America's future is at risk because we are falling short in our responsibility to give our children the education that they need. The Children's Defense Fund has re-

vealed that, in 1988, American 13-year-olds ranked last in their ability to solve math problems. They were behind their peers in the United Kingdom, Spain, Ireland, Korea, and three Canadian provinces.

Almost 29 percent of our students who entered the ninth grade in 1984 failed to graduate from high school by 1988. And fewer than half of them can understand, summarize and explain the kind of material that is found in encyclopedias or high school texts. Over a quarter of our 13-year-olds cannot add, subtract, multiply and divide using whole numbers, and only 40 percent of our students are able to solve abstract math problems or those requiring at least two steps. Only half of our 17-year-olds who are still in school can compute using decimals, fractions and percents. Educational reform in America is long overdue.

In response to our educational crisis, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act provides the systemwide education reform that we need so badly here in America today. It supports a broad-based effort of support for States and local school districts so that they can, in turn, provide our elementary and secondary level students with the skills and knowledge that they need to compete in today's changing world. S. 2 will improve the quality of education for all American students.

Educators—from both my district and throughout the State of California and the Nation—have stressed the importance of resources and flexibility if they are to do their jobs and do them well. This bill provides both.

First, S. 2 establishes a national education goals panel to coordinate the development of voluntary national education standards—content standards that describe what students should know and what they should be able to do, and school delivery standards that describe the kinds of resources that any school should have in order to provide the kind of instruction that will enable students to acquire the knowledge and skills described in the content standards.

Second, the bill specifies six education goals for the year 2000: That all children start school ready to learn; that the high school graduation rate increase to at least 90 percent; that students leave grades 4, 8, and 12 with demonstrated competency in challenging subjects, including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, history, and geography; that our students become the first in the world in mathematics and science achievement; that every American be literate; and that every school be drug free and violence free and offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

S. 2 then sets up a new program of grants to States to support systemwide education reform, fund innovative activities, and provide technical assistance to school districts so that the national education goals can be met. A State can apply for 5 years of funding at one time, and the Federal Government will, in turn, pay all of the costs in each of the first 3 years of the grant. The State is then required to match proportionately greater amounts of its Federal funding during the remaining years of its program.

Also, during the first year of a grant, although a State may choose to pass some of its funds on to local school districts, S. 2 provides that all of a State's funds can be retained at the State level to help develop the statewide system reform plan. However, in the second and succeeding years, a State may keep only 20 percent of its allocation, and 80 percent must go to its school districts for developing and implementing local reform plans. In turn, during the second year of the grant, a school district must turn over 85 percent of its allocation directly to its individual schools and, during succeeding years, the district must pass on 90 percent of its funding to them.

Each State also has to establish a panel to coordinate the development of a State reform plan—a plan which must include a competitive process for awarding funds to school districts. School districts must also establish broadly representative local committees to develop and oversee the implementation of local plans. These local committees will include representatives from among local government, the school district, and the business community, and may also involve parents, principals, teachers, curriculum experts, and representatives from local higher learning institutions. S. 2 will thereby facilitate Federal and State government working in conjunction with local communities to effect much-needed change in our educational system.

American's economic health depends on our ability to adequately educate all of our children, and we have always relied on our public education system to prepare them for the future. If we are to continue to place that kind of trust in the system—as we should—we cannot shirk our responsibility to support it with the resources that it needs to do its job.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today we have an opportunity to better this country's school system for our children and for future generations.

I come to the floor today in the hope that we will bring legislation that will reform our current system. However, the other party continues to reward a system that has fallen to the bottom of the world standings. A system that has left our children among the world's poorest in math and science. A system that does not hold schools accountable for their quality of academics, and a system that does not reward teaching excellence.

Unfortunately, the Democrats feel it is important to keep rewarding this system. S. 2, the conference report on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, does not come close to reform and does not meet the standard we should set for our children. It also appears that they feel that this system is not in need of reform.

However, I disagree with them. We cannot continue to accept the system we have now. We must make sure that our children receive the highest degree of academic excellence. I do not believe the conference report meets this goal.

I favor the alternative legislation put forward by my colleague Congressman GOODLING when the House first considered this legislation in August. The Goodling substitute included many of the reform alternatives which were included as part of the America 2000 proposal. This proposal was developed as part of the discussion the President had with the Nation's Governors.

The Goodling alternative put forth new and creative ideas which sought to transform our Nation's schools. For example, the Goodling substitute provided funding for break the mold schools. These are schools which challenge conventional wisdom and look to new and creative ideas which will propel our schools out of the old world system. Most importantly, these new schools will look to meet world class standards and put American children at the forefront of education in the world. Unfortunately, this conference agreement does not include incentives for break the mold schools.

In addition, the Goodling substitute would have set the standards for excellence in education. It would have put forth a voluntary national examination system which will give educators an indication of how our students are progressing. Most of all, it would have given students something to strive for, something which would challenge them and a goal which they can focus on to better prepare them for continued education and the work force. It also would have recognized students who excel by rewarding and recognizing excellence. It would give students the confidence they need to compete in our ever-changing global economy.

The Goodling substitute also looked to bring fairness and equality to the current system by giving parents a choice in where their children may strive for their educational future. We know that the haves already have a choice in where to send their children, while the have nots must leave that decision up to local bureaucrats. The Senate-passed bill included a choice provision, but unfortunately the conferees decided not to give parents a choice and did not include and choice provisions in this conference agreement.

However, I realize there are problems that have to be worked out in this area, but if we are looking to reform our schools we must at the very least look to choice as a bright alternative.

Choice promotes the family by allowing parents to get involved with decisions affecting their children. It creates a competitive environment where schools will have to strive to be the best in order to attract students.

Finally, this bill comes dangerously close to creating a national school board. The legislation provides funds to establish a council which would set national school delivery standards prescribing conditions at each level of the education system. I believe that this tramples the fundamental and traditional role of States and localities in developing our Nation's education system.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, we have an opportunity today to reform a system that needs fixing. We have an opportunity to invest in the future of this country, and to invest in the future of our children. Unfortunately, this conference report has let this opportunity slide right by.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this conference report. When the House Education and Labor Committee first began work on education reform proposals, it was a truly bipartisan effort. An earlier version of this legislation, H.R. 3320, reflected much of the testimony received at hearings on the President's "America 2000" proposal, which is designed to improve education, raise aca-

demic achievement, and provide the systematic reform necessary for our Nation's students to meet the national education goals. In October of last year, the committee approved H.R. 3320 with strong bipartisan support.

However, this spring, under pressure from special interest groups, Representative BILL FORD, chairman of the committee, recalled H.R. 3320 and substituted his own measure, H.R. 4323. In drafting the new bill, Congressman FORD removed or watered down many of the innovative approaches to educational reform including the President's new American schools initiative, merit schools, and regulatory waiver program.

Some of my colleagues have lambasted this bill as a do nothing bill and business as usual. While the bill is only a shell of the original bipartisan version, I believe it is somewhat better than this. The conference report would establish and fund local community panels, formed for the sole purpose of reforming the education system. While it is true that the school board would have final authority over the plan and that many activities unrelated to reform could be funded under the "guise of reform," communities truly committed to reform would, to some degree, be empowered under this bill.

I recently had the opportunity to meet with Dr. Len Sirotzski, the project director of the new American school design team in Bensenville, IL. In February 1991, residents of Bensenville began meeting on a regular basis to discuss what must be done to bring their students to world class standards in education. These meetings culminated in the development of the 1 of 11 break the mold designs selected by the New American Schools Development Corp., a privately funded corporation formed to invent and establish a new generation of American schools. The Bensenville plan calls for the entire community to take part in the educational process. Students from kindergarten through the 12th grade will study subject matter not only in the classroom, but also in banks, technology centers, libraries, news rooms and government offices. The Bensenville school will operate on a year-round basis and will be open to students from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. During our meeting, Dr. Sirotzski indicated that the Bensenville community is committed to reform and would have proceeded with their plans even if they had not received the grant.

I mention the Bensenville community not only to applaud what is being done in Illinois, but to contrast it with what we have been doing here in Congress. More than 500 days after the President sent his education reform proposal to Congress, we are asked to approve a bill which neither the majority nor the minority are particularly excited about. Even Congressman FORD, the bill's sponsor, has stated that the bill will do nothing to revolutionize education. Furthermore, while Congress, in its usual manner, has been endlessly debating education reform, we failed to include any appropriation for education reform in this year's appropriation bill. Even the $100 million set aside last year for reform has dried up since Congress took no definitive action by June 1.

Usually, members of the committee work closely in a bipartisan matter on education matters. The administration is strongly opposed to this bill and Secretary Alexander has recommended that the President veto the measure. House and Senate Democrats repeatedly rejected attempts of congressional Republicans to develop a compromise bill. This conference report was produced with virtually no Republican input. It is apparent that those pushing this bill would rather have a political issue, than legislation to truly reform our education system. Next year, we will be reauthorizing all Federal elementary and secondary education programs. I believe that in a less political environment, we can do better than this and urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4323, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act. The issue on the topmost list of priorities for Americans today is education, and with good reason. That is certainly true in my district. However, the recession has taken a real toll on many communities, as they look for resources, to fund books, supplies, busing, extracurricular activities, and teachers salaries. Many school districts have been forced to make drastic cut backs in their budgets, thus depriving our children of an adequate education. The Neighborhood Schools Act will provide our schools with funds to help implement systemwide reform and allow our students to learn in a conducive learning environment. This legislation will encourage schools to create innovative curriculums and make educational resources more accessible. In addition, the bill includes a provision that will create a values in school commission, which will work to develop ways of promoting values, ethics, and democratic principles in the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, education is the key to opportunity, especially in today's competitive and global marketplace. Our schools must prepare children now for doing business throughout the world tomorrow. In order to accomplish that objective, we need to ensure that each child comes to school ready to learn with access to up-to-date educational resources and information. The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is a step in the right direction. This bill incorporates the six education goals established by the Nation's Governors, and focuses on academic achievement of all children through a strong emphasis on results. Improvement in our educational system is only possible by working toward clear goals. Education is an essential investment in our Nation's future. We will all benefit by making a commitment to education reform.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. GOODLING. I certainly am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODLING moves to recommit the conference report with instructions that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, insist that the conferees report the following provisions:

In section 8104 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by Section 201(a)(2), in subsection (a)(1) strike "and the voluntary national school delivery standards"; in subsection (a)(2) strike ", voluntary National school delivery standards,"; and in subsection (a)(3) strike "and the voluntary national school delivery standards".

Strike section 8111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by section 201(a)(2), and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 8111. DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY NATIONAL SCHOOL DELIVERY STANDARDS.

"The Secretary shall make grants to the Governor of a State or consortia of such Governors in order for the State or consortia of States to develop school delivery standards that meet the needs of the State or consortia with respect to providing each student with an opportunity to learn."

Strike section 8114(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by Section 201(a)(2) and renumber accordingly.

In section 8307 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by Section 201(a)(2), in subsection (c)(1)(G) strike "and" the second time it appears; in subsection (c)(1)(H) strike the period and insert: "; and (I) provide support for local school reform such as Merit Schools."

In section 8309 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by Section 201(a)(2), in subsection (c)(6) strike "and" and in subsection (c)(7) strike the period and insert: "; and (8) New American Schools."

In Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by Section 201(a)(2) the House should recede to the Senate on the number of local educational agencies eligible for participation in the demonstration program and the Senate should recede to the House with respect to the specific program activities allowable for inclusion in the demonstration project.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, under the precedents, "a motion to recommit a conference report generally may not include instructions which would be inadmissible if offered as an amendment in the House." I quote Deschler's Procedure, chapter 33, section 26.6. Similarly, the instructions may not instruct the conferees to do something which is beyond their power under the Rules of the House, such as add new matter, which would be in violation of clause 3 of rule XXVIII—beyond the scope.

The pending motion instructs the conferees to go beyond the scope of conference and, therefore, is not in order.

Specifically, the motion to recommit is outside the scope of conference on this ground: It writes in a new use of

funds which appears in neither bill in their sections authorizing use of funds at the State level; namely, funding merit schools at the State level. It is the amendment called for in section 8307.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the Chair put the question already before the point of order was raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]. I do not believe that is the way we proceed in the House. The Chair had already put the question before us on my motion.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman was already on his feet to make the point of order.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was not there, or at least, the Chair did not recognize him beforehand.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I claim my rights. I was on my feet.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman did not address the Chair at all. I addressed the Chair.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet well before the motion was made.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, he did not address the Chair. The Chair put the question on my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair observed the gentleman standing seeking recognition as the Chair put the question, so the gentleman was on his feet.

Is the gentleman from Michigan finished addressing his point of order?

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I had made my point of order in accordance with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] wish to be heard on this point of order?

Mr. GOODLING. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

Mr. Speaker, I would indicate that everything that was in the motion to recommit was discussed and debated. It was part of either the House bill or the Senate bill. At all times we were debating back and forth whether it would be local, whether it would be State. Therefore, I see nothing in the motion to recommit, as revised, that would in any way be beyond the scope of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania in this case if either the House or Senate passed versions, provided for State financed plans for merit schools. That would be the question. The Chair is aware of a House passed provision on local funding for merit schools.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, neither one provided it. As I said, the debate was back and forth, State and local, State and local. Both were discussed. It was part of the discussion during the entire conference, so it must have been conferenceable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The Chair can only go by what was in the House and Senate passed bills at this point. The Chair would rule at this time for the reason stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], the point of order with respect to inclusion of State plans for merit schools must be sustained.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] be permitted to substitute a new amendment that meets the requirements of the rules for the amendment just ruled out of order.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate it, but I do not think it is necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODLING moves to recommit the conference report with instructions that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the House to the bill S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, insist that the conferees report the following provisions:

In section 8104 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by section 201(a)(2), in subsection (a)(1) strike "and the voluntary national school delivery standards"; in subsection (a)(2) strike ", voluntary national school delivery standards,"; and in subsection (a)(3) strike "and the voluntary national school delivery standards".

Strike section 8111 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by section 201(a)(2), and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 8111. DEVELOPMENT OF VOLUNTARY NATIONAL SCHOOL DELIVERY STANDARDS.

"The Secretary shall make grants to the Governor of a State or consortia of such Governors in order for the State or consortia of States to develop school delivery standards that meet the needs of the State or consortia with respect to providing each student with an opportunity to learn."

Strike section 8114(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by section 201(a)(2) and renumber accordingly.

In section 8309 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by section 201(a)(2), in subsection (c)(6) strike "and" and in subsection (c)(7) strike the period and insert: "; and (8) New American Schools."

In part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as added by section 201(a)(2) the House should recede to the Senate on the number of local educational agencies eligible for participation in the demonstration program and the Senate should recede to the House with respect to the specific program activities allowable for inclusion in the demonstration project.

Mr. GOODLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appear to have it.

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

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

The Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 166, nays 254, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 442]

YEAS—166

Allard	Gillmor	McEwen
Allen	Gingrich	McGrath
Archer	Goodling	McMillan (NC)
Armey	Goss	Meyers
Baker	Gradison	Michel
Ballenger	Grandy	Miller (OH)
Barrett	Green	Miller (WA)
Barton	Gunderson	Molinari
Bateman	Hall (TX)	Moorhead
Bentley	Hammerschmidt	Morella
Bereuter	Hancock	Morrison
Billirakis	Hansen	Myers
Bliley	Hastert	Nichols
Boehlert	Hefley	Nussle
Boehner	Henry	Oxley
Broomfield	Herger	Packard
Bunning	Hobson	Paxon
Burton	Holloway	Petri
Byron	Hopkins	Porter
Callahan	Horton	Pursell
Camp	Houghton	Quillen
Campbell (CA)	Hubbard	Ramstad
Clinger	Hunter	Ravenel
Coble	Hutto	Regula
Coleman (MO)	Hyde	Rhodes
Combest	Inhofe	Ridge
Coughlin	Ireland	Riggs
Cox (CA)	James	Rinaldo
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Ritter
Cunningham	Johnson (TX)	Roberts
Dannemeyer	Kasich	Rogers
Davis	Klug	Rohrabacher
DeLay	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Dickinson	Kyl	Roth
Doolittle	Lagomarsino	Roukema
Dornan (CA)	Leach	Santorum
Dreier	Lent	Saxton
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Schaefer
Emerson	Lewis (FL)	Schiff
Ewing	Lightfoot	Schulze
Fawell	Livingston	Sensenbrenner
Fields	Lowery (CA)	Shaw
Fish	Machtley	Shays
Franks (CT)	Marlenee	Shuster
Gallegly	Martin	Skeen
Gallo	McCandless	Smith (NJ)
Gekas	McCollum	Smith (OR)
Gilchrest	McDade	Smith (TX)

Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weber
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—254

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reed
Richardson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Stallings
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—12

Barnard
Chandler
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
Ford (TN)
Gibbons
Guarini
Huckaby
Lehman (FL)
McCrery
Staggers
Stark

□ 1550

Mrs. BOXER, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that without objection the House will insist on its amendment to the title.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet asking for a record vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would rule that the gentleman was too late on that.

CONTINUATION OF HAITIAN EMERGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the FEDERAL REGISTER and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Haitian emergency is to continue in effect beyond October 4, 1992, to the FEDERAL REGISTER for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Haiti that led to the declaration on October 4, 1991, of a national emergency has not been resolved. The assault on Haiti's democracy represented by the military's forced exile of President Aristide continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The United States remains committed to a multilateral resolution of this crisis through its actions implementing the resolutions of the Organization of American States with respect to Haiti. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the de facto regime in Haiti.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1992.*

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

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

There was no objection.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT OF 1992—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the Senate bill (S. 5) to grant employees family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

The question is: Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], pending which I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, today we are going to find out in this veto override who is for kids and who is just kidding. We are going to find out who is for families and who is just faking.

And no matter what you hear, no matter what arguments come before you today regarding the fact that business will be burdened, the truth is if you are for kids and if you are for families, you will join with the majority in this House and override this President.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I did not make a point of order against the debate by my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I want to serve notice that the bill before us is not the bill that was just discussed by the previous speaker. The rules of the House require the debate to be on the bill or matters relevant thereto, even matters, as a matter of fact, that would be germane amendments if offered to the bill. The gentleman described something that was neither.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD], a Member who has worked for many years on this legislation.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Madam Speaker, amidst the crossfire of statistics about this bill, we should not forget that the Family and Medical Leave Act would make a real difference for real families. I want to take the case of Shirley Rector, in my State.

Several years ago, Shirley was putting her husband through school when she learned she would never be able to have any children of her own. The Rectors desperately wanted a family, so they decided to adopt. With encouragement from the adoption agency, they bought baby clothes, they picked out names, they made all the plans excited new parents make.

But the agency required that they take a 3-to-4 month leave of absence to bond with their new child. And when Shirley asked her employer for time off, she was flatly told "no."

The Rectors were forced to choose between the baby they dreamed about and the job they needed to stay afloat. That is not a choice anyone should have to make—certainly not in our great Nation. Please join me in supporting the Family and Medical Leave Act for our families and our futures.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am a little disturbed about some of the opening remarks that were made in this debate, saying this is about children, this is about family.

I would submit to my colleagues that there is no Member on this floor today nor a Member of this body who is not for children and not for families. That is not the issue.

I, for one, am very much in favor of maternity leave. I have a daughter who just had a baby girl and she is on maternity leave from her employer. I think it is extraordinarily important.

The question is not on whether or not maternity leave is a good thing or a bad thing. The question here before this body is the approach to family leave, the approach to maternity leave. That is what is separating this body from the President's approach and the approach of the committee.

Would it not be better to have a bill that is going to apply to a vast number of workers far in excess of the workers covered by this bill? By this bill we are creating two classes of workers in this country, those who work for big employers, and those who work for small employers?

In doing so, we are saying that the vast number of American workers in this country are not going to be covered by maternity leave. They are not going to be covered by maternity leave in this particular bill. We are setting up two classes of workers. That is wrong.

We are also going about it as a mandate to business. Congress knows best. Congress is going to tell the American business people, the American workers, how they are going to operate, and we are going to negotiate these benefits for the workers of America. That is not the right approach.

The right approach is one of giving business incentives, and to apply it to a vastly larger number of businesses, some 90 percent more businesses. That is the approach that we are taking by supporting the President's bill. This is the approach of the bill on which I am an original cosponsor. That is the type of bill that we should be talking about in this House today, instead of being gagged and not having the opportunity to bring this up as a substitute for this bill.

So Madam Speaker, I would say that if you are for mandates, then you are for this bill. If you are for two classes of workers, employees of big businesses and employees of small businesses being lesser class citizens, then support this bill; but if you are for a larger number of people being covered, if you are for incentives instead of mandates, then let us keep our powder dry. Let us sustain the President's veto. Let us come back with a bill that I think this whole House can support. A pro-family bill, not a political statement.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor Standards of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, how the President of the United States can go throughout our country today talking about family values, after having last week vetoed the most important family bill before this Congress in this session, and that is the bill we are discussing now, the family and medical leave bill.

My friends, this is unpaid leave for a very short period of time, only when the employee finds it necessary. There is no cost to the employer for paying that person's wage or salary.

Let me remind you that when a person who is a wage earner finds it necessary to take off a week or two weeks for a vital family necessity, for a child, for a sick parent, then certainly when they are willing to give up their salaries, their wages for that period of time, it is important to them.

What the other side is advocating is that the taxpayers pay the employer a tax credit so that he can let that employee have time off. We are not asking for that. We are not asking for the taxpayer to pay. We are only asking for the very large employers who have 50 or more employees to be able to sacrifice a very limited amount of time for family values.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr FAWELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the Family and Medical Leave Act and urge my colleagues to join me in sustaining the President's veto of this well-intentioned, but misguided legislation.

Madam Speaker, I support the concept of unpaid leave for employees for family and medical reasons. I object with equal conviction to the naive notion that a national personnel leave plan can be mass produced out of Washington. Let me cite five reasons:

First, such a national personnel plan blithely ignores the diversity of America's public and private employers—for-profit and not-for-profit. Personnel leave plans must dovetail with the unique missions of employers and employees. For instance, a big city police or fire department, or trauma unit operating in a busy urban hospital, surely have unparalleled needs to guarantee that frontline service employees will show up for work. If an employer lacks basic control in this regard and vital health, safety or fire protection services are not rendered due to employees taking unpaid leave, people could die. Employers involved therefore in vital public safety and health services need strict and particularized personnel controls which would not necessarily be needed at a McDonald's hamburger outlet.

Second, the health problems which trigger the act's mandates, though described as a "serious health condition" are so broadly defined as to cover anyone under the care of a health care provider with any "illness, injury or impairment, or physical or mental contrition." In turn, the definition of "health care provider" includes not only a physician, but any person "determined by the Secretary (of Labor) to be capable of providing health care services." What qualifies the Secretary of Labor to determine which type of various health care providers may function under the bill is not explained.

This language, in effect, gives employees very liberal discretion as to when to take unpaid leave and when to return to the job, as documented by health care providers who need not even be a physician. If, upon return, the employee's job is no longer in existence, the employee is entitled to an "equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay and other terms and conditions of employment." The employer is not even given discretion to delay reinstatement until an equivalent position is available. In instances where the employer's physician

believes the employee's health condition, upon return to his or her former job, would jeopardize the safety of coworkers or be a danger to the public, the employer would apparently nevertheless be obligated to defer to the decision of the employee's health care provider in that regard. Such are some of the anomalies of this bill.

Third, this one-size-fits-all mandate unnecessarily interferes with employer-employee negotiations. It restricts the opportunity employees generally have to choose from a cafeteria of benefit options increasingly afforded under various employee welfare benefit plans, such as early retirement, a flex-leave policy, a 4-day work week, home work, life and health insurance, education, extended vacations, legal aid, early retirement, elder care, child care, ad infinitum. Why should Congress choose to mandate unpaid leave rather than any other employee benefit plan? Is Congress so omniscient that it knows best which of the many employee benefit options are best or most wanted by employees? Of course not. If Congress mandates unpaid leave, they must realize that they are correspondingly limiting other employee benefit options. Columnist Stephen Chapman has rightly observed that "in a competitive market place, the mix of employee benefits reflects the mixed views of employers and employees, not the demands of politicians."

Fourth, the simple fact is that mandated leave—even unpaid leave—is not without cost. The bill requires employers to continue the same level of health insurance benefits for an employee taking unpaid leave until the date the employee is reinstated. In addition, an affected employer has to find a replacement for the departing employee, expend time and resources in training the replacement, and pay for the replacement's unemployment compensation benefits at the time of termination. The cost of this mandated benefit, estimated to be $1,995 per employee or $3.3 billion in the first year, would have to be borne by either the employer, the employee, consumers, or some combination thereof.

In addition, a federally mandated leave policy would ultimately harm the very people its sponsors claim it would help. Single-worker families, particularly female-headed households, and low-income workers are least able to afford 3 months off in 1 year without pay. Thus, according to a recent study by the Congressional Joint Economic Committee, "low-income workers will stay on the job and be forced to work longer and harder to compensate for lost productivity due to higher paid coworkers taking leave."

Finally, the bill throws the U.S. Department of Labor into yet another massive and costly bureaucracy. No one has estimated what the cost will be to administer and enforce this act. The mandates in S. 5 far exceed anything any State has passed. Employers will be subject to a Federal jury trial and potential damages, including court costs, witness fees, and legal fees each time there is an accusation that one or more of the esoteric provisions of this new law have been violated. Possible awards include liquidated—that is, punitive—damages capped at double the amount of any salary, employment benefits or other compensation lost, plus interest, as a result of the violation of the act.

One need only look at the cost and difficulties of administering workman's compensation laws, whether injuries proscribe an employee from doing his or her job, to understand the legal quagmire involved in determining whether an employee has a right to take leave because of his own health condition or that of a family member as determined by a designated health care provider.

Of course, Congress is spared the threat of being sued in Federal court for damages, despite the fact that they employ roughly 21,000 employees, because both Houses are directed to self-administer the provisions of the act. The ignoble experience of being sued and dragged into Federal court is reserved only for the public and private employers of America who have the misfortune to be fully subject to this Act. As for Congress, employee complaints will be handled in house, so to speak, where Congress will be prosecutor, judge, and jury. Very efficient.

Congress should abandon its efforts to micromanage employee benefit programs. It is my hope that the House will sustain the President's veto of S. 5.

□ 1610

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], one of the original authors of this bill.

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to join with me in voting to override the President's veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act. This legislation will make it possible for working men and women to care for seriously ill children or ailing parents without the fear of losing their jobs. The Family and Medical Leave Act gives substance to our shared concern for family values.

The President's veto of this much-needed, pro-family legislation has condemned thousands of workers who need to care for a newborn baby, sick child, or dying parent to the unemployment lines. In his veto message, President Bush said, leave it to the private sector. Well, that is exactly what we have been doing, and look at what is happening—people are losing jobs.

The tax credit proposal offered by the administration, at the very last moment, is nothing more than a smoke screen. It is too little, too late. The administration's proposal would do nothing to ensure that workers are not fired because they need to be at home during a family or medical emergency. Those experiencing a medical crisis need guaranteed job security, not tax credits. Tax credits don't do a thing for Federal workers or those employed by nonprofit organizations.

The President's proposal would add over $2.7 billion to the Federal deficit over the next 5 years.

The Family and Medical Leave Act has undergone six major, compromises in the last 7 years to address concerns raised by the business community. I remind my colleagues that there are safeguards throughout this legislation to ensure that it is not unduly burdensome for employers and that the protection afforded workers is not abused. Over 95 percent of all businesses, all small, are exempt from the legislation, but 50 percent of the workers will be covered. Part-time workers, key employees, and small and isolated worksites are also exempt. Employees must provide a doctor's certification of the need for medical leave or leave to care for a family member. Leave in any year is limited to 12 weeks, and leave is without pay.

This legislation does not hurt business. It does, however, protect families.

If we do not enact this legislation today, I assure you that similar legislation will nevertheless become law. I personally intend to make good on the promise that working parents never again are forced to choose between the jobs they need and the families they love. If the House fails to override the President's veto I pledge to reintroduce the Family and Medical Leave Act, once again, on the first day of the 103d Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Madam Speaker, this is not a happy day for me. To take to the floor and urge a vote to override the President's veto—my President whom I support and have worked for and worked with for many, many years.

But my commitment to families makes it necessary to rise above party and give my loyalty to a higher order of things. That is—the family values that so many in this body love to give lip service to. Today, on this issue, with this vote, we go beyond lip service to the reality of who really cares about the American family.

My own commitment to this cause has been solidified by my own experience. This is not an abstract subject to me. I know from personal experience the emotional trauma that envelopes a

family when serious illness strikes. When our son Todd became ill with leukemia and needed the care during the terminal weeks, I was there to give him the loving care he needed.

But then, I had a choice. I did not have to choose between my child and the job I needed for economic survival.

This bill is about survival for the millions of men and women who need their jobs and love their families. They should not be forced to make that heartbreaking choice.

This is a day and age when more men and women are working out of economic necessity—to pay the mortgage, the doctor bills, the tuition, to hold their families together.

I find it bizarre that in this United States of America—the richest and most advanced country on the face of this Earth—that we should be debating this humane, family values bill.

In this day and age, are we really going to say to America's hard working, tax-paying men and women—take care of your own family at your own risk?

Are we really going to tell a working mother whose child is terminally ill with leukemia—go find another job?

Is this what the bottom line has come to mean?

I, and other probusiness Republicans, have done everything we can to make this bill flexible to meet the legitimate demands of the business community.

Businesses of fewer than 50 employees are exempt. Key employees are exempt. Only permanent employees are covered. Medical certification is required. I could go on and on.

This bill has been carefully crafted with no loopholes nor ambiguities.

Its costs have been greatly exaggerated by its opponents. The bottom line is that it costs more to recruit and train a new employee than to grant leave to a current employee.

To be fair, I must acknowledge the President's offer for tax credits for business as an incentive. But the offer has come much too late for serious consideration in this Congress. It could be a useful proposal for next year's tax bill. But, in no way can it be considered as a substitute for this minimum labor standard of job security. Tax credits could possibly be a supplement to the job security protection of this legislation, but in no way can it be a substitute.

So what does this bill come down to? Mandates? If this is a mandate by your definition—not mine—so what? You have voted for some heavy duty mandates within the last 3 years—the ADA, the Clean Air Act, to name just two.

These were all big time, costly mandates supported overwhelmingly by this Congress. And yet some of you are voting against this minimalist bill without raising an eyebrow or a murmur.

This vote today is not about who is for and who is against mandates or benefits packages. It is about human values and family values. It is about hard-working Americans. It is about who cares. Who cares for the tax-paying Americans—especially the women.

With your vote today, you can say clearly, I care.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, sometimes a single issue helps to illuminate an entire election campaign. The Family and Medical Leave Act veto override vote is just such an issue. The President and vast majority of our Republicans believe there should be voluntary incentives offered to businesses to provide family and medical leave. We believe the free decisions of employees and employers, reasoning together in thousands of different cases, is the best way to address this particular question. We believe specific, limited, targeted Federal policies can help such a process. And we Republicans believe in the wisdom of workers and businesses to craft appropriate benefits according to individual circumstances. Some may, in fact, prefer a shorter paid leave than a longer unpaid leave policy. Asking clumsy big government to handle this complex issue is like asking a gorilla to play the violin.

Madam Speaker, there is a better, more effective way. The President has proposed giving all small- and medium-sized businesses an incentive to provide their employees family and medical leave.

I support the idea of the President's refundable tax credit covering a variety of costs associated with offering such benefits. I have, in fact, cosponsored the legislation which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], last week.

The President's plan covers those businesses with 50 employees or fewer, not covered by the Democrats' bill, who may be most in need of such family and medical leave policies. The President has indicated that he would be willing to sign legislation providing a tax credit which represents a strong incentive and a flexible mechanism under which benefits can be negotiated between employers and employees, and we want to help that process of freedom of choice.

So, Madam Speaker, count me among those who will vote to sustain the President's position on this particular issue.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] for yielding this time to me, and I am delighted to follow the minority leader because I agree with him. This issue frames this campaign. Yes, it is about who is really for families, and I think all of us should vote to override.

I think the President's proposal is nothing but asbestos underwear to cover his backside at the last minute, in the middle of an election campaign. This bill was introduced 7 years ago. There have been 17 days of hearing, six major bipartisan compromises. There has been every opportunity for the President to come negotiate, and he did not do it until days ago when he realized his own rhetoric was getting wrapped around his record, and people were beginning to see through it.

This bill covers all sorts of people the President would not cover in nonprofits, in the public sector, and in the House and Senate. We would like for it to be even broader, and we would think that this might be some kind of a complement, but this is the absolute floor, and I hope everyone finally votes today to make America's work place more family friendly and to finally catch up with the rest of the world on this very important family issue.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Speaker and colleagues, there is probably no issue and no circumstance that better indicates why the American people are frustrated with the paralysis and gridlock in government than this particular issue and this particular override. The fact is we stand here today because we are unwilling to compromise beyond 12 weeks.

I want to tell my colleagues about a discussion I had yesterday afternoon with a news reporter in my district. He brought up the issue. He asked, "How do you stand?"

I said, "Look, the problem with the bill is people want 12 weeks or nothing. There is no attempt to find some reasonable middle ground."

Madam Speaker, I come from Wisconsin. We have a 6-week parental leave. We have a 2-week family and medical leave.

I said, "Think about it. How many people do you know who can afford to take 12 weeks off with unpaid leave?"

And he looked at me, and he said, "There's no way."

I said, "It's better than that. This is 12 weeks for you and 12 weeks for your wife."

He said, "Do you mean to tell me those people in Congress are thinking about telling us that we, in order to get any kind of parental leave, have to have up to a half year without wages?" He said, "What family in middle America can afford it?"

I said, "That's the point. They can't afford it. We could have tried to find some reasonable number the President would have accepted, but there was no attempt to do that. There was no at-

tempt to reflect generally what State legislatures have done if we decide there's a basis for a Federal preemption."

So, the real issue here today, unfortunately, is: Stick it to the President. Play politics.

□ 1620

There is no intent to try to craft a reasonable, justifiable family leave bill that can and should become Federal law. I am willing to vote for something. I have said that time and time again. There has been no attempt to come up with a reasonable middle ground. That is the issue, and it is called, unfortunately, politics, not protection of the family.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would observe for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] who was just in the well that I remember no amendment the gentleman offered that we did not accept.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, did not I and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI], offer the Wisconsin plan as a substitute?

Mr. FORD of Michigan. On this bill?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Yes, we did, when it was considered in committee this time and on the floor last time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, did the committee accept his amendment?

Mr. GUNDERSON. No; I thought the gentleman just said he would be willing to accept it.

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

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I have served two terms in the House, and in each of those terms, the Family and Medical Leave Act has been passed by the House and vetoed by the President. Although I support the intent of this legislation and have administrative, medical, and family leave policies in my own office, I favor a carrot to a stick in terms of asking businesses to implement such practices. For that reason, I have voted against this legislation each time it has been presented, and today, I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto.

In voting against this legislation, I had hoped that the President would work with the Congress to craft legislation that would provide workers with the leave opportunities and businesses with the incentive to implement those policies. Instead, the legislation was vetoed with the understanding that it could not be overridden, and the legislation died. This impasse does not mean that the President wins, and it does not mean that the Congress loses. It means that American families are losing. They are losing their jobs for taking leave to tend to sick children, and this is yet another example of how roadblocking rather than leading and compromising has hurt this country.

Should I be elected to the next Congress, I sincerely hope that we will be able to adopt a Family Leave Act that encourages businesses to implement family-friendly policies rather than ordering them to do it. For 4 years, I have fostered this idea, and for 4 years, I have voted against the legislation even though I firmly believe it is on the right track. I will continue to press for the carrot over the stick, but I can not continue to vote against legislation that would be so beneficial for American families.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today in supporting the motion to override the veto of S. 5, the Family and Medical Leave Act. I have been a supporter of this legislation since it was first introduced. I appreciate the concerns raised by opponents of this legislation; however, working families in this country should not be placed in the position of forcing a choice between starting and maintaining a family, or a career.

S. 5 is a pro-family bill, simply providing unpaid leave for working family members for purposes of the birth or adoption of a child, or to care for a seriously ill family member. Moreover, this legislation exempts small businesses employing up to 50 from its mandates, covers only full time employees, and gives flexibility to employers located in remote worksite areas.

As ranking minority member on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I reluctantly accepted provisions conforming civil service leave to that given in the private sector. This legislation truly reflects compromise on the parts of all supporters in order to achieve a fair legislative solution to the problems experienced by working families.

S. 5 is fair legislation. It ought to be enacted promptly. As more women enter the work force the need for such leave becomes even greater. We should establish a national policy encouraging responsibility on the part of family members to care for one another in times of serious illness. The Federal Government has an affirmative obligation to see that workers should not be penalized when family necessities compete with job demands.

S. 5 goes to great lengths to see that any disruptions in the workplace associated with an employee taking unpaid leave are minimal at best. Worker morale, productivity, and retention will be enhanced by a clear stated policy not subject to arbitrary changes and discretionary grants of leave. Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the motion to override the President's veto of S. 5.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the authorizing committee for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the timing of this vote to override the veto is election year politics at its cynical worst. Just to briefly review, we have had two extensive debates on this bill. This legislation would not apply to 90 percent of American businesses. It would not apply to 60 percent of American employees.

I have heard from female constituents who worry that it could result in a subtle form of discrimination, a backlash of sorts against them, if they are of childbearing age.

I have also heard from constituents who have expressed concerns that this legislation could ultimately result in the reduction of other benefits in their particular or respective workplace.

Madam Speaker, this legislation would be much improved if in fact we went back to the original Goodling proposal and said all employers had to offer this benefit, but as part of a menu of other benefits subject to management-labor negotiations in the workplace.

But do not take my word for it. I have stood on this floor a couple of times before and cited a guest commentary in the Wall Street Journal by George McGovern about his firsthand experiences.

Mr. McGovern wrote in the Wall Street Journal on June 1 of this year,

> In retrospect, I wish I had known more about the hazards and difficulties of running a business. My business associates and I lived with federal, state, and local rules that were all passed with the objective of helping employees, protecting the environment, raising tax dollars for schools, protecting our customers from fire hazards, et cetera. While I never have doubted the worthiness of any of these goals, the concept that most often eludes legislators is: "Can we make consumers pay the higher prices for the increased operating costs that accompany public regulation and government reporting requirements with reams of red tape."

Mr. McGovern wrote, "It is a simple concern that is nonetheless often ignored by legislators," as it is being ignored again today.

Madam Speaker, he concluded his commentary in the Wall Street Journal by saying, "In short, one-size-fits-all rules for business ignore the reality of the marketplace. And setting thresholds for regulatory guidelines at artificial levels, for example, 50 employees or more," the threshold being applied in this legislation, "$500,000 in sales, takes no account of other realities, such as profit margins, labor intensive versus capital intensive businesses, and local market economic conditions."

Madam Speaker, this legislation is not good legislation. It is literally the camel's nose under the tent. It imposes a mandate on the private sector that

sets a very bad precedent for other Congresses I fear to follow.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, what a sad day when such a basic issue as a right of a person to be able to stay home and care for a loved one in times of great emergency has to choose between that kind of family love and the right to hold a job. That is all this bill is. Yet the President has vetoed it and has taken away from thousands of families all across the country the comfort of knowing that if this crisis occurred in their family, they would not have to choose between their job and their family responsibility.

Madam Speaker, I am so sorry that the President has put before the Nation this kind of callous disregard for human feelings. The President campaigns on the issues of family values as something important to his party, and yet when it comes to really protecting the interests of the family and giving the worker the feeling that the employer will have to understand their personal tragedy and give them time off, unpaid, and that is all this is, unpaid regard for family values, he vetoes the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge this House to override the veto.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, irrespective of the rather feeble intellectual gymnastics that we have seen here to try to connect this Federal mandate to family values, I remain opposed to this legislation on behalf of the working men and women in this country.

It did not take a Federal mandate to get health care benefits for workers. It did not take a Federal mandate to get paid maternity leave for female workers. It does not take a Federal mandate for any of the more valued benefits that workers are able to choose from today in cafeteria plans.

What it takes a Federal mandate for is to impose on every working man and woman in this country a benefit that they do not want and have not asked for, but a benefit that suits the needs of special interests here in Washington, DC.

Madam Speaker, let me give Members one example of how sincerely these special interests hold this legislation. When the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] offered in committee an amendment that would have exempted from this mandate any employer in America that was already doing as much or more by way of providing this unpaid leave, it was voted down. It was voted down because without the mandate, the Government cannot be forcing the issues and the special interest attorneys cannot file lawsuits.

Madam Speaker, the best reason to oppose this legislation and the reason I applaud the President for his willingness to stick by the American working man and woman and veto it is that the harm comes to working people that have their freedom reduced and their well-being reduced by unnecessary and unwarranted intrusion against their rights by Government working on behalf of special interests.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The Chair wishes to advise that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has 22 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], a member of the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override the veto of S. 5. With all the current talk about the need to return to family values, there is no legislation that is more profamily than the Family and Medical Leave Act.

By now, every Member should be familiar with the statistics: That we are the only industrialized Nation without a family and medical leave policy; that only 37 percent of all female workers and 18 percent of all male employees in companies with 100 or more workers are covered by unpaid family leave. With the many changes that have been made to address the concerns of the business community, the bill now provides a modest leave program affecting only 5 percent of the businesses in this country.

Madam Speaker, too many American workers have been forced to choose between their families and their jobs. Today's families already face tremendous stress, and that stress is having a serious impact on our children. This bill would finally allow families to take care of family emergencies and childbirth without risking their economic self-sufficiency.

The Family and Medical Leave Act is profamily legislation that is desperately needed. I urge my colleagues to vote to override the veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me, and I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] for her kind words.

Madam Speaker, today is the day. Today is the day that Congress can really do something about family values. Today Congress can pass the Family and Medical Leave Act over the President's unfortunate objection and his veto.

This is a bipartisan bill. This is a very sensible bill, carefully drafted by the committee to avoid encumbering and burdening small business who would be particularly hard-pressed to find substitutes for their workers.

This bill, I might say, was endorsed by Business Week in its September 28, 1992, issue. It is good for business; it is good for families; and it is good for America.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, against my better judgment, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I proudly yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Speaker, I thank both gentleman for their good judgment.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the Presidential veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act. This is the third time that we have considered this legislation in the House of Representatives over a 7-year period.

If we fail to override the President's veto, then we are no closer to understanding and acknowledging the truth or the realities that working families face today and the daily conflicts that they experience.

This legislation has been compromised down to the barest skeleton of a leave policy. Before us today is the most basic, minimal leave policy with safeguards to address businesses' concerns.

I would be the first to accept a voluntary effort by businesses to offer family and medical leave. But the fact of the matter is, more than a majority of the businesses in this country do not offer this benefit to their employees.

If we fail to override the President's veto, we are saying we just do not get it. We are saying that pregnancy or childbirth or illness of a spouse or a child or a family member is a legitimate reason for dismissal.

I urge all of the Members of this House to stand up and override the President's veto and stand up for the working families of America.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], who has worked on this legislation for many years.

Ms. OAKAR. Madam Speaker, either we are for family values or we are not. We have heard a lot of talk, and it is rhetoric.

Now we have a chance to put all the talk into action. The Family and Medical Leave Act is an all-American act. It is a modest attempt to address the majority of American families in times of serious need. It does not even require wage reimbursement.

It simply provides for a modest period of unpaid leave for an employee who has a new-born child, a sick child, or a sick parent or, if the employee is medically unable to work, up to 12 weeks.

What good parent would leave his or her child at home alone in a critically ill stage because that parent is afraid he or she is going to lose his or her job? No good parent would do that, and what we are saying is, give this parent unpaid leave to take care of the child. Let that parent have his or her job back.

I urge support of the override.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the kinder and gentler gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, this debate has begun to fall into the trap that other debates that we have had over the last year on this subject have also fallen into. That is, the debate over whether we ought to have family and medical leave policies.

The fact is, that is not what this debate is about. This debate is about whether the Federal Government ought to mandate a one-size-fits-all approach to all employers in this country, and I think not.

Employers are dealing with this in a very responsible way. Why? Because they are caring.

Second, because it is in their best interest, because success depends upon the ability of their company and their employees, working together for the benefit of the company and their jobs.

The President was right when he vetoed this bill. What we ought to do is we also ought to do the right thing by supporting his veto and sustaining it.

There has been a lot of talk about family values. Now I am beginning to believe that we think that we can mandate and legislate family values in this country, and we cannot.

Vote no and sustain the veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, today the House has a historic opportunity and a profound obligation as we consider the President's veto of family and medical leave legislation. It is not often that we have an opportunity to provide such assistance to families at so little cost.

Today, we can tell a young mother that she can stay with her newborn child during the first precious weeks of life.

Today, we can tell a father that he can take unpaid leave to care for a sick child or parent.

Today, we can tell the millions of families in which both parents are forced to work to make ends meet, that we care enough about their families to ensure they are able to return to their job after an illness or the birth of a child.

Or, today, we can tell these families that all the talk about family values was just political rhetoric; that the President cares more about a showdown with Congress than about the American family; and that we lack the commitment to press beyond his limited vision.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto and provide this needed assistance to families.

□ 1640

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto and provide this needed assistance to families.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, Governor Clinton tells us that the Democrat Party has changed. They claim they are no longer antibusiness because they recognize that it is the businesses of this country that provide jobs for our citizens allowing Americans to support their families and maintain a good standard of living.

Well, Madam Speaker, I think they still don't get it. They don't get that the ability of American businesses to create jobs is directly related to the burden government places on their backs. They don't get that mandating family and medical leave is just one more burden added to the long list of social benefits being pushed by Members of Congress who know they could never get such a benefit through the legislative process in these tight budget times. Mandating that business pick up the tab for these benefits allows them to advance their agendas without spending Federal dollars. And, as the saying goes, "The best tax is a hidden tax."

Madam Speaker, mandated leave is a chapter taken directly from the same old Democrat playbook of social engineering at the expense of job creation for American families.

Forcing the President to veto this bill at a time when Governor Clinton and the Democrat party are attempting to paint themselves as probusiness sheds some light on what kind of economic growth we can expect under a Clinton administration.

I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Madam Speaker, for the past 6 or 7 years I have supported this legislation, or something similar to this. This is not a last-minute item. This is something that is truly needed in the American work force.

I have heard every conceivable argument, but I will just ask the Members this: Why do the Members think that most of the women from this side of the aisle and from the other side of the aisle have spoken in support of this legislation? Have they stopped to think for just a moment why that occurs?

First of all, they bear the children, and they are the ones many times that are in the work force that have to try to choose between staying an extra week with a child or giving up their home, giving up their job.

Second of all, in a two-spouse work force today, when a child gets sick or when the parent gets sick, it is generally the wife that drops out of work to look after that sick spouse or that sick child.

We are talking about, here, as Members of this House, trying to do something for families. There is nothing wrong with an unpaid leave national policy. There is nothing wrong with the President's policy, if the Members want to complement this next year. The truth of the matter is that the only bill that we have a chance to pass in this session of Congress is this vote that the Members will make today.

Members may hide behind other wonderful potential pieces of legislation and Members may say to their constituents, "This was not good enough. I want to wait until next year to do something else." The truth of the matter is that if Members want to vote for a profamily unpaid sick leave family leave policy, this is the only opportunity that Members are going to have.

It is up or down, it is for families or against, and members can have all of the excuses they want, but this is the only vote that counts.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLLOWAY].

Mr. HOLLOWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise here to ask what happened to unions in this country. What is the purpose of unions? What is the purpose of employee-employer relations in this country?

I think we forget that. I think we think that is Congress' role, is to be the union. They ought to start paying us the dues and forget paying them to the unions, because that is what we are here for today.

I am an employer of 40 employees, and I might have 50 if we would let us run our businesses, but it is sad to say that Congress tells us how to run them. A person calls me in the morning and asks me can they be off, their mother is going to the doctor. Naturally, you tell the employee, if you have a good employee, "Take the day off," if you can possibly do it.

What are the numbers that we are talking about here? Maybe 1 percent in

this Nation who have bosses that basically want to be brutal to their employees and make them go to work when they need to be at home?

I think this is an issue that we are in the wrong place deciding it. It is an issue that the unions and the companies and the companies and their employees should negotiate and work out, without Government doing it for us. I ask the Members of this Congress to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], who has been a long-time supporter of this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I will bet this is similar to the debate that took place around preventing child labor. Business could not afford it, we could not do it, it was a foolish choice.

Some of our Members, none of whom are mothers, believe workers do not want this opportunity. Given the choice, they would choose another benefit. Let me tell the gentlemen, when it comes to a sick child at home, there is no other choice that a woman would make other than to be home with her child. There is no other choice that the child would make than that her mother or father would be there with her.

The only industrialized workers in the world today that has to make that rotten, dreadful choice between parenthood and job is the American worker. Every one of our trading competitors in every industrialized country in the world has a leave program. They are far more generous than we are, because they want the race to continue. They believe business will profit when babies are born and children grow up to pay taxes and to buy goods.

I will not say that American industry is so weak and so incapable of surviving that if this veto is overridden, they can't survive. Both parents have to work to provide for their families. Don't increase their burdens—vote to override.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Madam Speaker, I rise as a sponsor of this legislation. Though I really feel that very few will ultimately benefit, I do not think very many will be hurt, either. The frustration that I had is with those very few employers that will not work with an employee that has a problem, and hence I sponsored this legislation. I very seldom bring mandates down on the American people with my vote.

Sometimes I hear some of the statements that are made in favor of this legislation, though, and I wonder how this country has endured lo these 200 years without it. I have conceded all along that President Bush has some concerns. I have my concerns. One concern is, Is this the first step? The next thing, we are going to have unemployment benefits paid, and the step beyond that, it is not a Herculean leap, to saying that this has to be paid leave.

I will tell the Members, I have my frustrations with the way we do business around here, too. For the last 18 months it is this Member's opinion that this body and the other body have done nothing more than to work night and day to bash and beat President Bush. Last week, for instance, we had to put this vote over until today to give the majority an opportunity to change some votes on that side, to once again bash George Bush. I do not like that.

I think this is a beautiful place. We try to do our work, but it has just been raw rancor, antipolitics, for the last 18 months. I want to say to my colleagues and to those who have worked so hard to make an embarrassment to President Bush come true, "You might have counted on one too many votes."

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I have been lobbied by many leaders of American business to vote against this bill. They have come to my office and sat down and said that it would be absolutely horrible if we had a national policy of family leave. I have asked each and every one of these business leaders the same question: "What is your policy at your business?" In every instance they have told me that trusted employees who have been with them are allowed to leave for medical emergencies at home and they do not fire them.

Let us look at the conclusion that we have to draw from that. This bill will not affect good businessmen, good businesswomen, who are leading good businesses. What these people are doing is lobbying to protect their sleazy competitors who would treat their employees like chattel. This bill will make sure that we have a national standard to protect workers, to protect men and women on the job, and to recognize that American families today need a helping hand to deal with the medical and family emergencies that so many of them face.

I urge the Members to override the President's veto.

□ 1650

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, just in review I would like to indicate there are those who said there is no cost to the employer. I would say there is a cost for insurance and other benefits. There is a cost to train substitutes.

I would also remind Members that this probably only covers about 50 percent of the private work force. It is a one-size-fits-all. We reduce any local effort to determine what benefits they should get.

Madam Speaker, 73 percent of people polled said they already received these benefits when they requested them from their employer, and 70 percent probably could not even afford to take them. It discriminates, therefore, between those that have and those that have not.

It is difficult to change your vote at this particular time, so I suppose this has been an exercise in futility, because obviously there are plenty of votes to sustain the veto. I would not think close to election that someone would change their vote. It might be difficult to explain that back in the district.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, many people have no idea of what it is like to have a sick relative at home. I myself had a mother who had a massive stroke in 1987, and I am an only child. And there was no one to care for my mother at that time but me. And were it not for the fact that I was able to stay with her during those critical hours and those critical days, I am pretty sure that my life would not be as complete as it is today because I was able to satisfy both myself, be by her side and with my family during those terrible heartbreaking days when she lay in a coma.

I think every employee has the right or at least should have that right to be with their loved ones in their time of need. I think that every employer in this Nation should give that unpaid leave right to every employee when he/she has an illness of a child or an aged parent. My mother at the time was 87 years old. I think it does the country good, it does business morale good, and family/medical leave makes for a more stable family, it is humane, it is caring, it is nurturing, and it is what this country needs.

Override the veto.

Madam Speaker, for a President who claims to be interested in families Mr. Bush sure has a funny way of showing it. His veto of the Family Medical Leave Act, a measure that would allow parents to get unpaid time off to care for their sick children or elderly parents shows that he could not care less about family values. However, it does indicate that he is willing to ignore the human, nurturing, caring needs of the family unit.

His principal complaint that this measure is too expensive just does not wash. Investments of this kind always pay off high dividends in more solid families and better performing workers. Everyone knows that when we help families have more secure domestic lives, which is what this act provides, we make it

easier for them to deal with the day-to-day stresses and consequently improve their chances of surviving and prospering as a cohesive unit.

This modest, commonsense measure is not the danger to small businesses that Mr. Bush portrays. His fears run counter to the experience of States which have passed similar legislation.

If we really want to support family values we must start by overriding the President's shortsighted veto of the Family Medical Leave Act. Vote yes to override the President's veto of the conference report S. 5.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, the problem with youth in America today is that parents do not spend enough time with their children. Yet the President's pronouncements on family values do not have the support of public policy.

By adopting a family leave policy, we will help the President keep his word, and we will establish family values as a public policy.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, American families are crying out for help. They fear that the American dream may be slipping away. They recognize this bill won't solve all their problems, but they know it can provide peace of mind and family security when they need it most.

In the name of family values, all they are asking for is 12 weeks, no pay. Twelve weeks to welcome a newborn into the family, tend to a sick child, or care for a terminally ill parent or spouse.

In the name of family values, all they are asking for is a little help in saving their jobs. This bill saves jobs.

Without the Family and Medical Leave Act, over 150,000 American workers who have a family emergency will lose their jobs next year. With the worst job creation record of any President since Herbert Hoover, American families are outraged that the President would not do everything possible to help them avoid this economic catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush vetoed the family leave bill, which is ironic since with vetoes like this, it will be his family who will soon be leaving.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY] for the purposes of a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HENRY. Madam Speaker, I have asked to address the House briefly to offer an apology relative to my conduct as a Member of this House.

Madam Speaker, I want to offer to Members of the House on both sides of the aisle an apology relative to the way in which the body's time is being taken by this bill. In offering my judgment it is an illustration as to how poorly the House Education and Labor Committee has done its work, and as a member of that committee I want to express my personal share of the blame for that fact. It is very obvious from the debate——

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I hate to do it to the gentleman. As unenlightened as he may be on this floor, he has no right to take the time of the people of this country for this kind of a back-door tirade against the committee, and I make a point of order that the gentleman is out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is proceeding in order and may continue.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Madam Speaker, I did not think I was engaging in a tirade. We will look at the RECORD and see who was engaging in a tirade. I was simply pointing out that I do not think the nature of this debate is such that it is really contributing to any intellectual reflection as to the changing of votes so much as it is simply an attempt to create a political record, and also at this point in time when any opportunity to have made compromises on either side of the issue has long gone by. And I regard that as very unfortunate.

This is the second bill before the House today in the waning days and hours of the 102d Congress in which this committee has demonstrated its inability to reach consensus. I have often suggested in jest that a way in which the House could save its time would be to have the votes, and then have general debate and votes on amendments after we had disposed of the legislation. I suggest that only in jest.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, President Bush wanted to be known as the environmental President, the education President. The truth is he is now known as the godfather of the Capitol, Veto Bush. Out of the kindness of his gentle heart, he vetoes the family and medical leave bill. And just think, 4 short years ago all Mr. Bush wanted was a kinder and gentler America.

If this is a kinder, gentler America, then all of us in here are a bunch of masochists. I say override the President's veto, and let us keep his word that he is profamily.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

□ 1700

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I am astonished at the President's reason for vetoing this bill. He says it should be voluntary with the corporations.

Since when has the executive branch and the Congress abdicated to corporations the right to establish national public policy on important issues? We did not do it 50 years ago with child labor, we have not done it in the last half century for conditions governing the workplace, and for legislation mandating worker health and safety.

By what criterion do we abdicate our responsibilities to set national public policy on something as important as this when every other developed country in the world has worker leave?

I think it is aberrational that the President should do this, and it defines the President, defines the kind of person the President is.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. The gentleman made an excellent point. We do not have to go back into 50 or 60 years of labor law, although the gentleman has been very correct in what he said.

This is not a radical idea. It is completely consistent with American labor law. We can only go back a few short years to the day when President Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act which did establish very high standards and mandates on all corporations, businesses, public and private, in this country, and they were big-time mandates compared to this minimalist bill.

I thank the gentleman for his observations.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentlewoman. She is exactly right.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, "Write down on our hearts these words," George Bush said in a prayer on his inauguration day. "Use power to help people."

Like so many of the President's promises these last 4 years, that prayer has been nullified by the President's actions on this veto. He has used his veto power to hurt people, and such are the consequences of his veto of family and medical leave.

This veto is truly a triumph of rhetoric over reality, words over deeds, politics over governing, and cynicism over principle. It must be overridden if we

want to keep the power and the reputation of the Congress on the side of the people that we come here to represent.

Understand the simple justice and idea of this legislation. Under current work rules, if a family has a terminally ill child, the parents must choose between their job and their responsibilities to stay at home, stay at the hospital, stay at the child's side when they are needed there.

This bill mandates a period of unpaid leave, and the President regards this benefit as too costly for business to offer even though it is offered in most, if not all, other industrialized countries. "Forget family values," the President's veto says; watch what he says, not what he does.

More than 30 times the President has scorned the majority in the country and ignored the majority will of the Congress, and he has done it again with this bill. He has made an obsession of having Congress sustain his vetoes, and he has made the American people and some of our Republican colleagues here in the House captives to that obsession.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to treat this issue with greater seriousness. This is not about mastery over the Congress with vetoes. This is not about whether the President can thwart the majority will. This is about whether we have the courage to use our vote, our power, our responsibility to help people.

Vote to override this veto, vote to enact family leave, and vote to keep families together in the midst of a crisis without the fear of losing their jobs, losing their livelihood.

We can override this veto in the name of the good of American families and the American people.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I would, of course, concur with the majority leader that we should use our power to help people, but I think that argues for sustaining the President's veto. I think that argues for beginning the debate rather than closing it, which we will clearly do if we try and override today and force into statute a bill that would not include small employers and their employees.

It would not allow them to help people, because they would be exempted from the threshold, and although we learn as we debate these labor statutes that if you set an arbitrary small employee threshold, you can buy votes in the business community, you do not necessarily provide leave. You do not provide a benefit.

I would hope that in sustaining the President's veto today we will begin a debate on the benefit side of this argument, not the mandate side. Talk about the incentives.

Now let me just say to those people that have argued this bill for so long, and it has certainly extended through my tenure in Congress, this bill today is arguably better than the one that I fought against when I was a freshman Member of this body. This bill has only 12 weeks of leave as opposed to 18; this bill does not have treble damages, which used to be the pain and suffering attached to an employer if they did not comply with this legislation. So it is getting better. But it is still not good enough to deserve this body's full support of the President's full signature.

Let me just say one thing to those people who have argued for passage of this bill, because it comports with what our industrialized nations around the world are doing. It is true, there is some form of statutory entitlement in most industrialized democracies, but I want to point out to all of the Members that are listening to this debate still, and maybe those one or two that have not made up their mind, that in almost every one of those other countries we are talking about a benefit that is administered on an insurance basis and funded by payroll deductions. In other words, the employee very often pays into the benefit which he or she then takes out. Funding for these programs is very often a fixed percentage of wages up to a certain ceiling which are contributed by the employer and the employee directly into a separate program. Very often there is a waiting period before the employee can draw out the paid benefit.

Madam Speaker, again, what is the point of creating a benefit program that the vast majority of beneficiaries could not use? We all know on either side of the debate that the real game is over paid leave, a benefit that people can use regardless of how sick their children are. They still have to pay their bills. They still have to get wages replaced.

That debate only moves forward if we sustain today.

I would also point out that if we are talking about moving the debate to another plane to include all of the employers in this country, not just ones with an arbitrary threshold of employees and providing a benefit that everybody needs and can use which is paid, then we should be talking more about how we, as a Congress, can create a human resource fund which is not defined by a family or medical qualifier but is a benefit that employers and employees pay into such as on insurance to provide a benefit that people can use. That is why we should sustain today, because we want to use our power to help people to get beyond the debate that has so far distinguished this particular argument over this labor law.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

□ 1710

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, let me say I really rise on two accounts. The first is to urge Members to sustain the President's veto.

But the second is, frankly, to urge the Democratic leadership to schedule either today or tomorrow the tax credit for family relief. The fact is this Congress does have the potential to pass a bill which would cover 6 million businesses, which would offer help to 48.7 million employees, by providing the kind of tax credit for small business that would allow us to genuinely help families. I want to emphasize this point: For Congress to simply pass another mandate and then say to people out in the business world, "Now you may have to lay some people off, you may have to eat the cost, you may have to absorb what is involved, but go ahead and do it automatically, and we are not going to have anything to do with helping you," I think would simply be to have, in effect, a mandated increased unemployment bill.

But by providing a tax credit, we actually help businesses deal directly with the cost of providing family leave.

So I would urge my colleagues, first, vote to sustain the president's veto and, then, second, I would ask my colleagues to join in asking the Democratic leadership if not today, then certainly no later than tomorrow, to please schedule the family leave tax credit bill so that we can actually pass family leave in a signable form and get it passed into law and, frankly, in early October we can have businesses beginning to change their plans knowing what the new law would be and in a position to help families. I think it would be much sadder if purely for narrow partisan reasons we would end up in a situation where at the end of this Congress we have not passed a signable family leave and businesses still would not have any opportunity to have that kind of assistance from the Government.

So, my last principle: It is easy for Congress to mandate without paying, because then somebody else will pay and the people who will pay are the workers who are laid off and lose their jobs. On the other hand, if we do the responsible thing and vote for a tax credit for family leave, we have actually helped the businesses create that opportunity to take care of families.

Thank you, and I want to yield back to my colleague who had done such a tremendous job on this, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, If I have any time left, I would like to close by saying that there are at least three polls that indicated that most of

the employees out there, a large percentage of employees out there, in the case of the Washington Post, revealed that only 3 percent responded that they thought that this was one of the most important things they need.

When asked by the Gallup organization, only 1 percent of 1,000 respondents listed parental leave as their most valuable employee benefit.

Penn & Schoen conducted a survey. When asked to choose between the Federal Government mandating fringe benefits or leaving this decision up to employers and employees, 89 percent of 1,000 respondents said they preferred that employee benefits be decided privately. And so do I.

Sustain the President's veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the attempt to override the President's veto.

Madam Speaker, today we will vote to override the President's veto of a bill that makes it illegal for an employer to fire a mother for having a child, to fire a father or mother for caring for a child, or to fire a child for caring for a father or mother.

Opponents of the bill, trying to reconcile their position with their family values rhetoric, say this will bankrupt thousands of businesses and cost us hundreds of thousands of Jobs.

Nonsense, Madam Speaker, a review of the national maternity leave of industrialized countries published in the December 17, 1990, issue of Businessweek, shows that: Canada requires that 17 weeks of leave be paid at up to 60 percent of wages; Italy requires that 20 weeks of leave be paid at 80 percent of wages; Sweden requires that 12 weeks of leave be paid at 90 percent of wages; the United Kingdom requires that 18 weeks of leave be paid at 90 percent of wages; Japan requires that 14 weeks of leave be paid at 60 percent of wages; West Germany requires that 14 weeks of leave be paid at 100 percent of wages; and the United States requires that zero weeks of leave be paid at zero percent of wages.

In this we are equaled by South Africa; and South Africa is not a country whose treatment of its citizens I think we should emulate.

Let's take a step toward joining the family of civilized nations. Let's override the President's veto and pass the family and Medical Leave Act.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the veto override.

Madam Speaker, last November I joined my colleagues in passing the Family and Medical Leave Act and most recently, on September 10, I voted in favor of the conference agreement. Not to leave a job unfinished, I rise today in support of overriding President Bush's veto of S. 5, the Family and Medical Leave Act.

I find it hard to believe that a President who claims himself to be a profamily advocate, has rejected this fair, profamily, proworker initiative. While opponents to family and medical leave claim that mandated unpaid leave would severely harm small businesses, they are being proven otherwise.

A September 21, 1992, editorially in Cranes New York Business, a well-respected New York business weekly and successful small business, supports family and medical leave. The company has voluntarily put in practice flexible working arrangements, including shortened work weeks, splitting a position, and unpaid leave. The editorial concludes that "not only can (we) manage more flexible arrangements to accommodate the needs of working parents, but it is in (our) own best interest to do so." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be entered into the RECORD.

While many businesses have concluded that flexible work arrangements are beneficial for both employee and employer, others have lacked the foresight and sound business sense in establishing such programs. That is why Federal legislation is required.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the veto override. It's a vote for family values and good business practices.

[From Crain's New York Business, Sept. 21, 1992]

THIS SMALL FIRM FOUND HOW FAMILY LEAVE CAN WORK

Once again, President Bush vows to veto legislation requiring that most companies grant workers 12-week unpaid leaves after the birth or adoption of a child or in the event of a serious illness. The president says such a burden would severely harm small businesses. I know he's wrong.

We at Crain's New York Business believe we know a lot about small companies, devoting considerable resources to both covering small businesses, and to arguing their cause. Essentially, I run a small business, the 22-person Crain's editorial staff. What I've learned in recent years is not only that I can manage more flexible arrangements to accommodate the needs of working parents, but that it is in my own best interest to do so.

The issue of granting a 12-week unpaid leave seems to me almost absurd, especially as the father of a four-month-old who still isn't sleeping through the night. Crain's reporters and editors are offered a three-month leave after the birth of a child followed by three months of part-time schedules. (Paid leave varies between four weeks to eight weeks.) We fill in with free-lancers and part timers. Sometimes our coverage of an industry slips somewhat during such times. But it would as well if the reporter, up night after night with a baby, was too tired to concentrate or if we had to hire a replacement. For the record, I always come out ahead financially.

Schedules for working parents (in our experience to date mothers) seemed more complicated for a while, involving endless negotiation, the potential for resentment from colleagues and possible harm to the paper. But it also became clear that I had little choice. One of our best reporters decided she just wouldn't work full time following the birth of her second child. We noticed her loss almost immediately. Eventually, some of our valuable staffers would decide that working full time at Craine's simply was incompatible with their family responsibilities. It was far from certain if their replacements would be as good.

In reality, allowing flexibility wasn't complicated at all. We have two reporters on three-day schedules, splitting a position. We have two staffers on four-day weeks. That accommodates varying needs for health insurance (there isn't coverage for three days a week), job satisfaction and time with the kids. We manage our work somewhat more efficiently, we use free-lancers to fill in and no one resents the situation.

My wife, by the way, just returned to work on a four-day schedule. She wanted three; the business library where she's employed wanted five; they settled on four. Everyone's happy.

If I can manage such arrangements, so can other small businesses. That they won't is why federal legislation is required. I think that's what family values are all about. And I don't think George Bush or Dan Quayle understand at all.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker and Members of the House, for 7 years as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and as the ranking member and then-chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have worked for the enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act. Over the years we have compromised and compromised, many times to accommodate the stated concerns of the President and those of the interests he thinks most important.

As a result, this bill is not as good as that we first introduced, nor will it be if we get the opportunity to pass it now. But I want to make you this pledge: that this bill will be a much better bill if it goes down now, and I am returned to the House and I am selected once more to be the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor; I promise you I will put a good bill on President Clinton's desk and he will sign it.

Now, that is the choice you have got today. You want to take what you beat us down to? You better take it while you have got the chance because this is the last time you are ever going to see as watered-down the rights of American workers to the point where we have to be shamed in the eyes of people all over the world in virtually every country in the world except South Africa, not one that I feel that we ought to be likened to.

Now, this is a unique piece of legislation. It is a rare bill that unites both ends of the debate over family values.

Those who are pro-choice and those who are pro-life. The Catholic Church supports the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the same commitment intensity is put forth by the Women's Legal Defense Fund.

I am pro-choice, but I appreciate and agree with the arguments made by Bishop James Malone and by HENRY HYDE and others that family leave pro-

tection can help prevent women from making a choice between choosing abortion or their job.

Working women deserve to know that if they have a baby and it takes 3 months to take care of that infant, their job will be there for them when they return to work.

That is what family values are all about.

This is the first opportunity all of the people who talk family values on both sides of the abortion issue have to come together and put your money where your mouth is. Do not go out of here with the sophistry we have just heard from the other side, "Oh, I spent my whole career opposing this legislation. I remember opposing it when I was a freshman because it was 18 weeks. Now it is only 12, it is better. However, it is not good enough because it is not paid leave."

Now, who are we kidding? The arguments coming from over here that we are taking benefits away from workers and that is why they are opposing protecting the jobs while they have a baby or take care of a sick child, would be, if I was not on the floor of the House, characterized as sophistry.

Ladies and gentleman, you have a chance. You have a chance.

Now, the minority leader started the debate today by saying rarely had he seen an issue define a campaign like this issue. He spoke resentfully of us bringing this bill here today to define the President's veto as an important issue in the upcoming campaign.

The minority leader said it, I did not say it; but I agree with the minority leader, this is a defining issue. But it does not define just the President, it defines everybody who is going on the rollcall today.

You will be known by your deeds today, not by what you have been saying and what you have been writing home to the folks.

You have got a chance, you can come forward and be saved and vote to override, or you can go on the record books for all of history as one who passed the chance when it was offered to you.

Mr. WELDON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of the Family and Medical Leave Act. For several years, I have voted in favor of this legislation, which would guarantee job protected leave for up to 12 weeks in the case of a family and/or medical emergency. As the parent of five children, I appreciate the need for this law.

Although I am dedicated to the enactment of this legislation, I feel compelled to express my great disappointment over the handling of the bill. For my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I have just one simple question. Why did Congress wait almost an entire year to complete consideration of the Family and Medical Leave Act? This question bothers me a great deal.

Many of the bill's proponents have argued that we waited to complete action on the bill in order to broker some sort of compromise with President Bush. While that explanation certainly sounds reasonable, I'm not so sure that it's true.

Since passage of H.R. 2 in the House on November 13, 1991, I have witnessed few attempts to enter into a serious dialog with the administration. Of course, Madam Speaker, many of my colleagues and I have contacted the White House on many occasions to urge the President to support this legislation. But, I'm not sure that a couple of letters and a few phone calls conveyed a message of compromise.

Regrettably, I fear that our long delay was based partially on partisan considerations. Of course, I fully understand how tired the sponsors are of watering down this legislation to meet the objections of the administration. While I sympathize with them, I have my doubts about the sincerity of their most recent attempts.

In this light, the delay certainly makes sense. Why compromise with the administration when you feel you have already compromised enough? Why not try and score a few political points?

While I am not pleased with the administration's refusal to sign this bill, I am also disappointed that this debate is being used as a weapon in the Presidential campaign. Instead of scoring political points with the various interest groups, we should have just tried to enact some version of this legislation to help our constituents. Both sides are guilty of this type of gamesmanship.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to override the veto and to get on with the serious business of this Nation.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the veto of S. 5, the Family and Medical Leave Act—the bill that is based on the belief that American workers should not risk losing their jobs when they are confronted by family responsibilities or a serious illness.

This bill is the product of many years of negotiations and compromise. The drafters of this legislation have taken great care to produce a fair, balanced bill that provides much needed relief for American families while, at the same time, not overly burdening America's small businesses.

The Family and Medical Leave Act will require employers with 50 or more employees to provide their employees with up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave each year for either caring for a new or seriously ill child, parent, or spouse, or for medical leave if the employees themselves are seriously ill. During the leave, the employee's job and health insurance benefits would be protected.

Because the act only applies to employers with 50 or more employees, only 5 percent of employers and 50 percent of workers would be covered. Small businesses are truly exempt from the Family and Medical Leave Act.

In spite of the fact that millions of American workers are trying to juggle the responsibilities of work and family, most of our employers have failed to adapt their policies to these circumstances. Yet, employees are entitled to a certain amount of job security when they have family and health needs that must be met. They should not have to lose their jobs in order to take care of home.

When our workers who do not have parental and medical leave need it, they end up receiving a greater share of public assistance. These costs amount to well over $4 billion annually in unemployment compensation and other public benefits, and cost workers and taxpayers much more than what it will cost employers to implement leave programs. But, a standard for family and medical leave would provide significant benefits to both American businesses and workers at a low cost.

Yet, ours is the only developed, industrialized country that does not set a minimum family leave standard for its workers. In fact, most of the 125 countries that do provide some sort of leave for their workers give them paid leave.

Madam Speaker, American families want and need this bill. The American people overwhelmingly support the notion that they should be with their children during the first weeks of life, and should care for their family members during illnesses, without having to risk losing their jobs.

And this is not a benefit that the American worker will take lightly or abuse. In all too many instances, employees will not be able to afford to stay home to take care of pressing family priorities. But there will be times when they have no other choice—when they must have the option of staying home, without pay, and without having to worry about whether or not they have a job to come back to. A new mother should not be forced back to work and a sick spouse or parent should have the support of their loved ones. During these times, the Family and Medical Leave Act will help give workers and their families peace of mind by presenting them with choices they can live with. It will help families solve the conflict between family and work, and give them one less thing to worry about so that they can focus on their priorities at home.

In spite of all of these compelling reasons, the President has vetoed this bill, just as he vetoed similar legislation 2 years ago. In spite of his commitment to family and his belief in the so-called family values theme that has been repeated throughout this Presidential campaign, the President has refused to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to join me in this attempt to override the President's veto and to provide some job protection for American workers during family emergencies.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and any mandated leave legislation. I do so because a Federally mandated benefit can never be flexible enough to adapt to the diverse needs of employers and employees across the country.

This bill was well-intentioned. I think we all agree that every employer who can provide the kinds of benefits outlined in this bill ought to do so. But not every good idea makes a good law, for the whole Nation, regardless of the circumstances, needs, or preferences of individual workers and employers.

I believe that this bill will harm many more employees than it helps. Passage of this bill will not expand the benefit pie, but simply locking in one benefit, which will limit the ability of employers to offer other family-friendly benefits and reduce the flexibility of employees and employers to negotiate a benefit package that is best for both. The assertion

that Congress can legislate a free lunch—a benefit without a cost—defies common sense.

I am disappointed that the President waited so long to provide an alternative, and believe his alternative to be inadequate. However, we are not left simply with the two choices of burdensome mandates on businesses as embodied by S. 5 or inadequate tax credits which the President proposes. Members who are philosophically uncomfortable with either of the two extreme positions just mentioned may feel far more at home with the idea I have promoted in H.R. 1270, the American Family Protection Act. I offered this bill as a substitute amendment when H.R. 2 was initially considered by the House.

My alternative, which would require that an employee returning from qualifying leave be rehired if and when his/her previous job or a comparable job again comes open, goes much farther than a simple business tax credit. By providing that an eligible employee be given preferential status for rehiring for a period of 6 years, this legislation asks of business a serious commitment to family life that is workable and beneficial for both employee and employer. However, unlike S. 5, it does not lead us down the slippery slope of mandating specific employment benefits but promotes the principle that the workplace should be flexible. Unlike the mandated approach of S. 5, this bill does not require that an employer fire a replacement worker in order to fill the job with a returning employee. Finally, in contrast to both proposals, it recognizes that parents want and need to spend more than 12 weeks at home to care for their children. This proposal is both pro-family and pro-business.

We should allow employers and employees to work together to meet their mutual needs. This bill does not provide this flexibility and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the veto.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Family and Medical Leave Act and to urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of this landmark legislation.

In the last several months, we've heard a lot about family values, and a lot of discussion about what family values mean. To me, family values mean, first and foremost, supporting family members when they need you most. And today, we have the chance to give millions of working Americans the opportunity to be there for their families and to strengthen the family ties that are the lifeblood of this Nation.

The Family and Medical Leave Act will provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave to employees to care for a seriously ill family member, a new baby, or their own serious illness. This is what family is all about—working together as a family to overcome new challenges and tragedies. Without this act, working Americans will continue to be forced to choose between keeping their jobs and supporting their families. And I don't think that's a fair choice to require them to make.

I agree with those who say that Congress should be careful that employee leave legislation doesn't create such burdens for businesses that it makes them unable to function effectively. That's why I opposed initial proposals for family and medical leave that would have applied stringent leave requirements to small businesses. A business with 5 or 10 employees depends fully on every employee every day, and doesn't have the flexibility that larger companies do to provide extended leave benefits. I was at the forefront of the fight to make sure that those small businesses were protected.

The Family and Medical Leave Act that I'm voting for today has an exemption for small businesses, and imposes leave requirements only on employers with 50 or more employees. The act also has a key employee exemption for businesses of all sizes to make sure that no business is unduly burdened by this law.

This legislation is not overly burdensome or expensive, and I think it makes good business sense for America's employers. A 1989 GAO study estimates that compliance with the law will cost employers only about $7.10 per covered worker per year. That's a small price to pay to retain experienced, productive employees who return to their jobs after responding to a family emergency.

I'm supporting the Family and Medical Leave Act because I think that it's probusiness and profamily. This is the real family values issue of 1992. We can help families stay together—by overriding the President's veto on this bill today.

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of overriding the President's veto on the Family and Medical Leave Act. Over the past several months we've heard so much talk about family values from our President, but who is President Bush trying to kid? In a recent speech in Georgia, he said he has a "belief * * * in strong families and in leaving the world a better and more prosperous place for the young kids here today." Earlier the President had this to say, "* * * every piece of legislation * * *, we're looking at it to see that it does nothing but strengthen the American family * * *. We must strengthen family values. And I will do my level-best to do just that."

But, then the President vetoed the Family and Medical Leave Act. His policy—conceive, but don't expect leave—belies family values.

This bill requires employers with 50 or more employees to provide 12 weeks unpaid leave to their employees to care for a newborn baby or a sick family member. Some 95 percent of all businesses would not be affected by this legislation. This bill also restricts employee eligibility to those who have worked at least 25 hours a week for at least one year. Employers may also exempt key employees, the highest paid 10 percent of the work force, from coverage under the act.

This leave cannot be used for a holiday, nor for play, but only for the caring and nurturing of family members, and that, President Bush, is what family values is all about.

What else has our President been saying? He wants to help the economy? According to a Cornell economist, since Mr. Bush first vetoed the Family and Medical Leave Act in 1990, 300,000 workers with serious illnesses had to choose between family and job, and gave up their jobs because there was no medical leave policy where they worked. This same study shows that providing family and medical leave is more cost effective than permanently replacing employees who need leave.

Our country is the only industrialized country in the world that does not offer family and medical leave. In fact, many countries offer more time and paid leave, not leave at the employee's own expense.

Enactment of the Family and Medical Leave Act would be a positive investment in our work force and could be implemented easily and inexpensively, without placing an undue burden on the business community. This is an investment we can no longer afford to delay.

Mr. COX of Illinois. Madame Speaker, today we have the opportunity to follow in the footsteps of the other body and override the President's veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act legislation. This would provide workers in companies with over 50 employees 12 weeks of unpaid leave per year to care for a sick child, a new child, parent, or spouse, or to use for the employee's own medical treatment. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

It was too long ago that the father was the breadwinner in the family while the mother remained at home raising the children and running the household. Today, however, things are changing. Families are finding it increasingly difficult to survive on a single income, and women—either by choice or necessity—are moving into the work force and away from the home. Thus, workers are torn between the physical and emotional needs of their families and the money and job they need to survive. This is a choice that no one should have to make. If you vote yes, many will not.

The Family and Medical Leave Act gives us the opportunity to relieve the American family of that burden. By offering 12 weeks of unpaid leave to workers, while still providing health insurance coverage, we let them know that we understand their dual role as provider and caregiver.

Many companies have already implemented such a program for their workers; I commend their efforts. Many have not seen fit to offer this benefit, which should be as basic as health insurance and pension plans. The time has come to realize the true value of the American worker and of the American family. If we fail to override the President's veto, we send a message to the struggling work force in this country: We know there is a severe recession, we know you are having trouble making ends meet, we understand your obligations to your family, but we cannot help.

Businesses should realize that this is a positive move toward employee satisfaction, thus improved production and profit. Many workers will never need to take advantage of this benefit, but they will know that they have it if necessary.

Madam Speaker, I fear that the term "family values" has been used so many times in this election year that we have all forgotten the true meaning. We, as a body, must stand back and look at the value of this legislation to keeping our families healthy and happy. We must also ask ourselves what we are doing for families if we fail to enact this legislation. The answer is nothing—nothing but dealing yet another harsh blow to American families.

I urge a yes vote to override the veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Mr. MINETA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the vote to override the

Presidential veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act conference report.

Unlike the 1950's, and the idealized, family paragons of Ward and June Cleaver, the America of the 1990's has more single-parent families than ever before, and in an increasing number of two-parent families both parents work outside of the home.

A new American family has been evolving in which men and women share household responsibilities and both parents follow individual career paths. Unfortunately, as part of this evolution, many American children are bearing the brunt of these changes. That is why it is crucial that we vote to override President Bush's veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act conference report here today.

We have a President who claims that he believes in so-called family values, but he has vetoed this legislation before and has done so again. Why? Because the only American family he sees in our Nation are the Cleavers. That shortsightedness is forcing other Americans to choose between having a job and having a family, and no American should ever have to make that choice.

The initiative that the House and the Senate has adopted is one that is needed throughout the United States. American women will benefit greatly from the realities of life recognized in this law. Women now represent the fastest growing segment of our Nation's work force. Sixty percent of women with children ages 3 to 5 years old have careers. California has long recognized these realities, and established a visionary family and medical leave program. It is now time to make that standard available to all Americans by overriding President Bush's veto of the Family and Medical Leave Act conference report.

Mr. BUNNING. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the president and in support of his veto of the family and medical leave bill.

This bill is not a family bill. It is antijob. It is antibusiness.

This bill would cost jobs. And real families need jobs and security a heck of a lot more than they need more Government mandates. Benefits like this should be left to negotiations between employers and their employees—not dictated from on high by the Members of the U.S. Congress.

The new labor costs associated with this bill are estimated to exceed $3.3 billion the first year—that means a loss of 60,000 jobs, most of which will come from low-income and low-skilled workers. These are precisely the people who can least afford to lose their jobs, and I, with good conscience, cannot vote for something that will result in massive job loss.

Congress should not be sticking its nose into business that's better left up to the employer and employee. Passage of this bill would put us on the brink of upsetting that delicate balance of the system of voluntarily-provided employee benefits

Employers should grant leave to employees in the special cases covered under this bill. However, mandating them to do so is not the answer. Employers should be able to take into account the special needs and unique circumstances of the company. The Federal Government cannot pass a "one-size-fits-all" leave policy. I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 258, nays 169, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—258

Abercrombie	Foglietta	Mfume
Ackerman	Ford (MI)	Miller (CA)
Alexander	Ford (TN)	Miller (WA)
Anderson	Frank (MA)	Mineta
Andrews (ME)	Frost	Mink
Andrews (NJ)	Gaydos	Moakley
Andrews (TX)	Gejdenson	Molinari
Annunzio	Gephardt	Mollohan
Anthony	Gibbons	Moody
Applegate	Gillmor	Moran
Atkins	Gilman	Morella
AuCoin	Gonzalez	Morrison
Bacchus	Gordon	Mrazek
Beilenson	Green	Murphy
Bennett	Guarini	Murtha
Berman	Hall (OH)	Nagle
Bevill	Hatcher	Natcher
Bilbray	Hayes (IL)	Neal (MA)
Blackwell	Hefner	Nowak
Boehlert	Hertel	Oakar
Bonior	Hoagland	Oberstar
Borski	Hochbrueckner	Obey
Boucher	Horn	Olver
Boxer	Horton	Ortiz
Brooks	Hoyer	Owens (NY)
Brown	Hubbard	Owens (UT)
Bruce	Hughes	Pallone
Bryant	Hyde	Panetta
Bustamante	Jacobs	Pastor
Campbell (CA)	James	Payne (NJ)
Campbell (CO)	Jefferson	Pease
Cardin	Jenkins	Pelosi
Carper	Johnson (CT)	Perkins
Chapman	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (FL)
Clay	Johnston	Peterson (MN)
Clement	Jones	Pickle
Coleman (MO)	Jontz	Poshard
Coleman (TX)	Kanjorski	Price
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Rahall
Collins (MI)	Kennedy	Ramstad
Condit	Kennelly	Rangel
Conyers	Kildee	Ravenel
Cooper	Kleczka	Reed
Costello	Klug	Regula
Coughlin	Kolter	Richardson
Cox (IL)	Kopetski	Rinaldo
Coyne	Kostmayer	Roe
de la Garza	LaFalce	Roemer
DeFazio	Lantos	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLauro	Leach	Rose
Dellums	Lehman (CA)	Rostenkowski
Derrick	Lehman (FL)	Roukema
Dicks	Levin (MI)	Roybal
Dingell	Levine (CA)	Russo
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Sabo
Donnelly	Lipinski	Sanders
Dooley	Long	Sangmeister
Dorgan (ND)	Lowey (NY)	Savage
Downey	Machtley	Sawyer
Durbin	Manton	Saxton
Dwyer	Markey	Scheuer
Early	Martin	Schroeder
Eckart	Martinez	Schumer
Edwards (CA)	Matsui	Serrano
Engel	Mavroules	Sharp
English	Mazzoli	Shays
Erdreich	McCloskey	Sikorski
Espy	McCurdy	Skaggs
Evans	McDade	Slaughter
Fascell	McDermott	Smith (FL)
Fazio	McGrath	Smith (IA)
Feighan	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Fish	McMillen (MD)	Smith (TX)
Flake	McNulty	Snowe
Solarz	Torricelli	Wheat
Solomon	Towns	Whitten
Spratt	Traficant	Williams
Stark	Traxler	Wilson
Stokes	Unsoeld	Wise
Studds	Vento	Wolpe
Swett	Visclosky	Wyden
Swift	Volkmer	Yates
Synar	Washington	Yatron
Tallon	Waters	Young (AK)
Thornton	Waxman	Young (FL)
Torres	Weldon	Zimmer

NAYS—169

Allard	Gradison	Patterson
Allen	Grandy	Paxon
Archer	Gunderson	Payne (VA)
Armey	Hall (TX)	Penny
Aspin	Hamilton	Petri
Baker	Hammerschmidt	Pickett
Ballenger	Hancock	Porter
Barrett	Hansen	Pursell
Barton	Harris	Quillen
Bateman	Hastert	Ray
Bentley	Hayes (LA)	Rhodes
Bereuter	Hefley	Ridge
Bilirakis	Henry	Riggs
Bliley	Herger	Ritter
Boehner	Hobson	Roberts
Brewster	Holloway	Rogers
Broomfield	Hopkins	Rohrabacher
Browder	Houghton	Roth
Bunning	Hunter	Rowland
Burton	Hutto	Santorum
Byron	Inhofe	Sarpalius
Callahan	Ireland	Schaefer
Camp	Johnson (TX)	Schiff
Carr	Kasich	Schulze
Chandler	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Clinger	Kyl	Shaw
Coble	Lagomarsino	Shuster
Combest	Lancaster	Sisisky
Cox (CA)	LaRocco	Skeen
Cramer	Laughlin	Skelton
Crane	Lent	Slattery
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Smith (OR)
Dannemeyer	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Darden	Lightfoot	Stallings
Davis	Livingston	Stearns
DeLay	Lloyd	Stenholm
Dickinson	Lowery (CA)	Stump
Doolittle	Luken	Sundquist
Dornan (CA)	Marlenee	Tanner
Dreier	McCandless	Tauzin
Duncan	McCollum	Taylor (MS)
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Taylor (NC)
Edwards (TX)	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Emerson	Meyers	Thomas (GA)
Ewing	Michel	Thomas (WY)
Fawell	Miller (OH)	Upton
Fields	Montgomery	Valentine
Franks (CT)	Moorhead	Vander Jagt
Gallegly	Myers	Vucanovich
Gallo	Neal (NC)	Walker
Gekas	Nichols	Walsh
Geren	Nussle	Weber
Gilchrest	Olin	Wolf
Gingrich	Orton	Wylie
Glickman	Oxley	Zeliff
Goodling	Packard	
Goss	Parker	

NOT VOTING—5

Barnard	Huckaby	Staggers
Dymally	McCrery	

□ 1739

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On the vote:

Mr. Barnard for, with Mr. Staggers and Mr. Dymally against.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained, and the bill was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the question on the override of the Presidential veto of S. 5, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1992.

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

There was no objection.

SUNLIGHT AND FRESH WINDS COMING SOON

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Senator AL GORE was right to speak out to the American public about the duplicity, covert dealings and special favors of this administration in tilting toward Iraq right up until the day of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The sorry spectacle of this administration propping up that brutal regime of Saddam Hussein through tax subsidized programs—like the Agricultural Commodity Credit Loan Program—is an outrage, particularly when many of the U.S. backed dollars were used to purchase military equipment, not farm equipment. So much for the foreign policy brilliance and expertise of this administration.

I might add that it is getting a bit confusing to keep up with the foreign policy imbroglios coming to light but never discussed forthrightly by the policymakers themselves—first, Iran Contra, now Iraq. Obviously, the power keg region of the Persian Gulf has not been a forte of the Bush foreign policy team.

But equally troubling to me is the administration's dogged pursuit of covering up their track—by altering documents submitted to Congress, by holding back information, and by blatant misinformation and disinformation—when investigators sought to get a full accounting.

There is no dispute that documents in the Commerce Department were altered to hide the fact that agricultural loan programs were being corrupted by permitting military vehicles to be exported to Iraq. When these and other actions were presented to the Attorney General by the House Judiciary Committee, he refused to appoint an independent counsel to provide an objective look at the actions of high-level officials in obstructing justice and misleading Congress and the American people. He also rejected any investigation into the handling of the BNL case in which U.S. prosecutors confined their indictment to three bank officials in Atlanta for diverting billions of dollars to Iraqi-front companies. Justice refused to interview Iraqi and Italian officials or United States officials, instead concentrating on a bank manager and two assistants. The Federal judge in the case, disturbed by the sudden plea bargain and silence of the principal defendant, also called for an independent counsel, all to no avail.

So the tilt toward Iraq still remains the secret province of the executive branch which initiated it, which refused to allow the sunlight of an independent investigation to look into it, and which now trumpets its foreign policy prowess as a reason to continue in government.

Let us hope that with fresh winds blowing in the executive branch very soon, the American people will learn precisely how and why the United States formulated its special handling of a tyrant and how it proceeded to compound the felony by cover up, deception, and the hope that the joy surrounding Desert Storm would somehow wash over these illegalities. It won't, and the facts will come out.

□ 1740

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, September 29, 1992, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 3281, S. 2681, H.R. 2548, and S. 1528.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM EXPANSION SITE SELECTION ACT OF 1992

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3281, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3281, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, is it the intention of the Chair to ask for 5-minute votes for the next three votes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it is the intention of the Chair to have a 15-minute vote, and the next three votes will be 5-minute votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 106, nays 317, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 444]

YEAS—106

Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Annunzio
Atkins
Bacchus
Bentley
Berman
Bilbray
Bonior
Brown
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Clay
Clement
Collins (IL)
Cox (CA)
Crane
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Edwards (CA)
Fazio
Flake
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Glickman
Hayes (IL)
Hefley
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoyer
Jefferson
Jones
Jontz
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowey (NY)
Markey
Matsui
Mazzoli
McDermott
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Moody
Morella
Murtha
Natcher
Oakar
Ortiz
Packard
Panetta
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Price
Rangel
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Stallings
Stokes
Swift
Thomas (WY)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Traxler
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waxman
Whitten
Williams
Wolpe
Yates
Young (FL)

NAYS—317

Abercrombie
Allen
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Aspin
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bellenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Geren
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
Lagomarsino
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Mavroules
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Myers
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle

Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Towns
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Walker
Washington
Waters
Weber
Weldon
Wheat
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Barnard
Dymally
Huckaby
Ireland
Jenkins
Lowery (CA)
McCrery
Nagle
Staggers

□ 1801

Messrs. MARKEY, COX of California, ROHRABACHER, SMITH of Florida, and PACKARD changed their 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that she 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 in which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

NATIVE HAWAIIAN HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 2681, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2681, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 194, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brown
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Porter
Price
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—194

Allard
Allen
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Bruce
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox (CA)
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Holloway
Hopkins
Hubbard
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Kasich
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Olin
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Tallon
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Barnard
Dymally
Huckaby
Ireland
Jenkins
Lowery (CA)
McCrery
Ridge
Riggs
Staggers

□ 1810

Mr. SHAYS and Mr. HARRIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McDADE and Mr. ESPY changed their 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.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN RESEARCH AND INTERPRETIVE CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. KENNELLY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2548, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2548, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 298, nays 121, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

YEAS—298

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Blackwell
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Broomfield
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carr
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Henry
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Hoyer
Hughes
Hyde
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Quillen
Rangel
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Studds
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)

NAYS—121

Allard
Allen
Andrews (ME)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Brooks
Browder
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Carper
Chapman
Coble
Condit
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Derrick
Dickinson
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodling
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Harris
Hatcher
Hefley
Herger
Holloway
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Hunter
Hutto
Inhofe
James
Johnson (TX)
Klug
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Laughlin
Lewis (FL)
Lloyd
Machtley
Marlenee
McCandless
McCollum
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Moorhead
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Patterson
Penny
Petri
Porter
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Ridge
Riggs
Ritter
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Santorum
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weldon
Wylie
Young (AK)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Barnard
Chandler
Dymally
Huckaby
Ireland
Jenkins
Lehman (FL)
Lowery (CA)
McCrery
Staggers
Stokes
Thomas (WY)
Zeliff

□ 1818

Mr. HEFNER and Mr. PAXON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIMBRES CULTURE NATIONAL MONUMENT ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 1992

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1528, 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. 1528, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 243, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 447]

YEAS—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brown
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Dicks
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Engel
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hayes (IL)
Hefner
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Johnson (SD)
Johnston
Jones
Jontz
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
LaRocco
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Livingston
Long
Lowey (NY)
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDermott
McHugh
McNulty
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moody
Moran
Morella
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sharp
Shays
Sikorski
Smith (FL)
Solarz
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Vento
Visclosky
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—243

Allard
Allen
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Carr
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Ewing
Fawell
Fields
Fish
Flake
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor

Gilman	McCurdy	Rowland
Glickman	McDade	Sanders
Goodling	McEwen	Sangmeister
Goss	McGrath	Santorum
Gradison	McMillan (NC)	Sarpalius
Grandy	McMillen (MD)	Saxton
Green	Meyers	Schaefer
Guarini	Mfume	Schiff
Gunderson	Michel	Schulze
Hall (TX)	Miller (OH)	Sensenbrenner
Hammerschmidt	Miller (WA)	Shaw
Hancock	Moakley	Shuster
Hansen	Molinari	Sisisky
Harris	Montgomery	Skaggs
Hastert	Moorhead	Skeen
Hatcher	Morrison	Skelton
Hayes (LA)	Myers	Slattery
Hefley	Nagle	Slaughter
Henry	Neal (NC)	Smith (IA)
Herger	Nichols	Smith (NJ)
Holloway	Nussle	Smith (OR)
Hopkins	Olin	Smith (TX)
Horton	Orton	Snowe
Hubbard	Oxley	Solomon
Hunter	Packard	Spence
Hutto	Patterson	Spratt
Hyde	Paxon	Stallings
Inhofe	Payne (VA)	Stearns
Jacobs	Penny	Stenholm
James	Peterson (FL)	Stump
Jefferson	Peterson (MN)	Sundquist
Johnson (CT)	Petri	Swett
Johnson (TX)	Pickett	Tallon
Kanjorski	Pickle	Tanner
Kasich	Porter	Tauzin
Kennelly	Poshard	Taylor (MS)
Klug	Pursell	Taylor (NC)
Kolbe	Quillen	Thomas (CA)
Kyl	Ramstad	Thomas (WY)
Lagomarsino	Ravenel	Upton
Lancaster	Ray	Valentine
Laughlin	Reed	Vander Jagt
Leach	Regula	Volkmer
Lehman (CA)	Rhodes	Vucanovich
Lent	Ridge	Walker
Lewis (CA)	Riggs	Walsh
Lewis (FL)	Rinaldo	Weber
Lightfoot	Ritter	Weldon
Lipinski	Roberts	Wilson
Lloyd	Roemer	Wolf
Luken	Rogers	Wylie
Marlenee	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Martin	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)
McCandless	Roth	Zeliff
McCollum	Roukema	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Barnard	Huckaby	McCrery
Chandler	Ireland	Staggers
Dymally	Jenkins	
Gingrich	Lowery (CA)	

□ 1828

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

Mr. CARDIN and Mr. HUGHES changed their 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. YATRON. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained at a human rights meeting on the Senate side of the Capitol and did not know the vote on House Joint Resolution 553 was taking place. I would like the record to show that had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on House Joint Resolution 553, rollcall 440.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5678, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF SUCH CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-959) on the resolution (H. Res. 582) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5678) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and against the consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON, AND PROVIDING FOR CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF, H.R. 5488, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993, AND AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-960) on the resolution (H. Res. 583) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany, and providing for corrections in the enrollment of, the bill (H.R. 5488) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and against consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1637, BLACK LUNG BENEFITS RESTORATION ACT OF 1991

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-961) on the resolution (H. Res. 584) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1637) to make improvements in the Black Lung Benefits Act, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR COMPLETION OF ACTIVITIES OF TASK FORCE TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING HOLDING OF AMERICANS AS HOSTAGES IN IRAN IN 1980

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-962) on the resolution (H. Res. 585) providing for the completion of the activities of the Task Force to Investigate Certain Allegations Concerning the Holding of Americans as Hostages in Iran in 1980 in the second session of the 102d Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1830

EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF OFFICIAL MAIL IN LOCATION AND RECOVERY OF MISSING CHILDREN

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3279) to extend the authorization of use of official mail in the location and recovery of missing children, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for a brief explanation of this important bill.

Mr. CLAY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Madam Speaker, S. 3279 reauthorizes the Government Missing Children Mailing Program for an additional 5 years.

Since 1984, when Congress passed the Missing Children Assistance Act, widespread dissemination of pictures of missing children has been one of the techniques employed to raise public awareness of the need for assistance in locating missing children. Pictures have been disseminated through the use of television, inserts in utility bills, milk cartons, grocery bags, and posters. In 1985, Congress provided for the use of official mail as an additional means of disseminating the pictures of missing children.

It is widely believed that the widespread dissemination of these pictures into thousands of homes each month by means of House and Senate official mail serves to keep public awareness of the problem of missing children at a higher level and enhances the effectiveness of all other means of dissemination. Members who use this program are provided the pictures from the Na-

tional Center for Missing and Exploited Children. The Center has been in the forefront of locating missing children around the Nation since 1984.

The problem of missing children is of great concern to the public and one of the greatest fears of all parents. This is a worthy program that helps to locate and recover missing children and I hope my colleagues support this important legislation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this is very important legislation, as has been mentioned. It really has helped police departments and the public, alerting them to missing children.

I support it wholeheartedly.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3279

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF OFFICIAL MAIL IN THE LOCATION AND RECOVERY OF MISSING CHILDREN.

The Act entitled "An Act to amend title 3, United States Code, to authorize the use of penalty and franked mail in efforts relating to the location and recovery of missing children", approved August 9, 1985 (39 U.S.C. 3220 note; Public Law 99-87) is amended—

(1) in section 3(a) by striking out "June 30, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1997"; and

(2) in section 5 by striking out "December 31, 1992" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on S. 3279, the Senate bill just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5006, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until 12 midnight tonight, September 30, 1992, to file the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5006) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1992

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2322) to increase the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments as follows:

Senate amendment to House amendments: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment to the text of the bill, insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION RATE INCREASES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, as provided in paragraph (2), increase, effective December 1, 1992, the rates of and limitations on Department of Veterans Affairs disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation.

(2)(A) The Secretary shall increase each of the rates and limitations in sections 1114, 1115(1), 1162, 1311, 1313, and 1314 of title 38, United States Code, that were increased by the amendments made by the Veterans' Compensation Rate Amendments of 1991 (Public Law 102-152; 105 Stat. 985). The increase shall be made in such rate and limitations as in effect on November 30, 1992, and shall be by the same percentage that benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et. seq.) are increased effective December 1, 1992, as a result of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).

(B) In the computation of increased rates and limitations pursuant to subparagraph (A), amounts of $0.50 or more shall be rounded to the next higher dollar amount and amounts of less than $0.50 shall be rounded to the next lower dollar amount.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases made under subsection (a), the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (2 Stat. 1263) who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) PUBLICATION REQUIREMENT.—At the same time as the matters specified in section 214(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) are required to be published by reason of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act during fiscal year 1992, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the rates and limitations referred to in subsection (a)(2)(A) as increased under this section.

Mr. MONTGOMERY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment to the House amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUMP. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, S. 2322, as amended, would direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to increase the rates of disability compensation and dependency indemnity compensation payable to service-disabled veterans and their survivors by the same percentage as the cost-of-living increase that will be provided in the Social Security legislation. This is a COLA increase for service-connected combat veterans.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I support S. 2322 and urge its immediate passage.

This bill provides a clean COLA which we can all support.

When the actual Consumer Price Index figure is announced, S. 2322 will permit the VA to make the appropriate changes in these rates so they will be effective December 1, 1992, and reflected in January compensation checks of these beneficiaries.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure so that our service-connected disabled veterans can keep up with inflation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 2322, a bill to provide a cost-of-living increase in the rates of veterans' compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC].

This is legislation that our Nation's veterans count on us to pass in a timely fashion. As my colleagues know, compensation rates for veterans and DIC rates for their dependents, are not subject to automatic indexing and must be considered by the Congress in separate legislation each year.

I urge my colleagues to pass a clean COLA bill so that veterans can count on having this cost-of-living increase in their January checks.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2322, the bill just considered, and also on S. 775, the bill that will be considered next.

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

There was no objection.

VETERANS BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 775) to improve the compensation of certain veterans for exposure to ionizing radiation, to improve the administration of veterans benefits programs, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 775

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans Benefits Improvement Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF SCOREKEEPING RULE FOR COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES IN COMPENSATION RATES.

For the purpose of calculating the baseline under section 257(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)) with respect to the increase in veterans' compensation for a fiscal year, the amount by which each rate of compensation is increased is assumed to be rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

SEC. 3. REDUCTION IN PENSION FOR VETERANS' SURVIVORS WHO ARE RECEIVING MEDICAID-COVERED NURSING HOME CARE.

(a) REDUCTION IN PENSION.—Paragraph (2) of section 5503(f) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Not more than $90 per month may be paid under chapter 15 of this title to or for any person described in subparagraph (B) for any period that a nursing facility furnishes such person with services covered by a Medicaid plan. The restriction in the preceding sentence applies to periods after the month of the person's admission to the nursing facility.

"(B) A person referred to in subparagraph (A) is a person—

"(i) who is covered by a Medicaid plan for services furnished such person by a nursing facility; and

"(ii) who is (I) a veteran who has neither spouse nor child, or (II) a surviving spouse who has no child.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5503(f) of such title is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking out "a veteran" and inserting in lieu thereof "a person referred to in paragraph (2)(A)"; and

(B) by striking out "such veteran under paragraph (2) of this subsection" and inserting in lieu thereof "such person under such paragraph".

(2) In paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking out "A veteran" and inserting in lieu thereof "A person referred to in paragraph (2)(A)";

(B) by striking out "the veteran" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the person"; and

(C) by striking out "the veteran's" and inserting in lieu thereof "the person's".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on November 1, 1991, and apply with respect to months after October 1991, and shall expire in accordance with section 5503(f)(6) of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ACCESS TO INFORMATION NECESSARY FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN VETERANS' BENEFITS LAWS.

Section 1113 of the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3413) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(p)(1) The provisions of this title do not apply to a disclosure of information requested pursuant to paragraph (2).

"(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may request a financial institution to disclose to the Department of Veterans Affairs the name and address of any customer who is receiving or has received payment of disability compensation, dependency and indemnity compensation, or pension under the provisions of title 38, United States Code, or section 10 of Public Law 85-857 (72 Stat. 1263) by direct deposit in the customer's account at that financial institution.

"(3)(A) The Secretary may make a request referred to in paragraph (2) only if the Secretary determines that the requested information—

"(i) is necessary in order for the Department of Veterans Affairs to administer the provisions of law referred to in such paragraph; and

"(ii) cannot be secured by a reasonable search of records and information of the Department.

"(B) The Secretary shall include a certification of the determination referred to in subparagraph (A) in each request presented to a financial institution.

"(4) Information disclosed pursuant to a request referred to in paragraph (2) may be used solely for the purpose of the administration of benefits programs under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs if, except for the exemption in paragraph (1), the disclosure of that information would otherwise be prohibited by any provision of this title.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'direct deposit' means a process in which funds are disbursed (by electronic transfer or otherwise) from the Treasury of the United States to a financial institution and are deposited in one or more accounts in that financial institution pursuant to instructions provided by the Secretary of the Treasury.".

SEC. 5. EXPANSION OF LIST OF DISEASES PRESUMED TO BE SERVICE-CONNECTED FOR CERTAIN RADIATION-EXPOSED VETERANS AND ELIMINATION OF LATENCY-PERIOD LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1112(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out "to a degree" and all that follows through "subsection)";

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new clauses:

"(N) Cancer of the salivary gland.

"(O) Cancer of the urinary tract.";

(3) by striking out paragraph (3); and

(4) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on May 1, 1992.

SEC. 6. IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO IONIZING RADIATION.

The Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Compensation Standards Act (38 U.S.C. 1154 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITIES INVOLVING EXPOSURE BEFORE JANUARY 1, 1970"

"SEC. 10. (a) IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITIES INVOLVING EXPOSURE BEFORE JANUARY 1, 1970.—(1) In order to determine whether veterans (other than veterans who participated in the tests or occupation activities referred to in section 5(a)(1)(B)) suffer from disabilities as a result of the exposure of such veterans to ionizing radiation during the active military, naval, or air service of such veterans that occurred before January 1, 1970, the Advisory Committee established under section 6 shall—

"(A) review all available scientific studies and other relevant information relating to the exposure of such veterans to ionizing radiation during such service; and

"(B) on the basis of such review, submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a report containing the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on the feasibility and appropriateness for the purpose of the determination under this paragraph of any additional investigation with respect to any activity of such veterans during such service.

"(2) Upon the request of the Advisory Committee, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (after seeking such assistance from the Secretary of Defense as is necessary and appropriate) shall make available to the Advisory Committee records and other information relating to the service referred to in paragraph (1) that may assist the Advisory Committee in carrying out the review and recommendation referred to in that paragraph.

"(3) The Advisory Committee shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the report referred to in paragraph (1)(B) not later than September 30, 1992.

"(b) INVESTIGATION PLAN AND REPORT OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—(1) Upon receipt of the report referred to in subparagraph (B) of subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

"(A) identify which of the activities referred to in that subparagraph, if any, that the Secretary intends to investigate more fully for the purpose of making the determination referred to in that subsection; and

"(B) prepare a plan (including a deadline for the plan) to carry out that investigation and make that determination.

"(2) Not later than April 1, 1993, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report containing—

"(A) a list of the activities identified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) and the basis of such identification; and

"(B) the plan referred to in paragraph (1)(B).".

SEC. 7. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO MAINTAIN THE REGIONAL OFFICE IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Section 315(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "September 30, 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1996".

SEC. 8. REDESIGNATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) REDESIGNATION OF POSITION OF CHIEF MEDICAL DIRECTOR.—Section 305(a)(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "a Chief Medical Director," and inserting in lieu thereof "an Under Secretary for Health, who is the Chief Medical Director and".

(b) REDESIGNATION OF POSITION OF CHIEF BENEFITS DIRECTOR.—Section 306(a) of such title is amended by striking out "a Chief Benefits Director," and inserting in lieu thereof "an Under Secretary for Benefits, who is the Chief Benefits Director and".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"Chief Medical Director, Department of Veterans Affairs.

"Chief Benefits Director, Department of Veterans Affairs.";

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Under Secretary for Health, Department of Veterans Affairs.

"Under Secretary for Benefits, Department of Veterans Affairs.".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Radiation Exposure Amendments of 1992".

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF LIST OF DISEASES PRESUMED TO BE SERVICE CONNECTED FOR CERTAIN RADIATION-EXPOSED VETERANS AND ELIMINATION OF LATENCY-PERIOD LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1112(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking out "to a degree" and all that follows through "subsection)";

(2) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

"(N) Cancer of the salivary gland.

"(O) Cancer of the urinary tract.";

(3) by striking out paragraph (3); and

(4) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3).

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 1992.

SEC. 3. IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO IONIZING RADIATION.

The Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Compensation Standards Act (38 U.S.C. 1154 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITIES INVOLVING EXPOSURE BEFORE JANUARY 1, 1970

"SEC. 10. (a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In order to determine whether activities (other than the tests or occupation activities referred to in section 5(a)(1)(B)) resulted in the exposure of veterans to ionizing radiation during the service of such veterans that occurred before January 1, 1970, and whether adverse health effects have been observed or may have resulted from such exposure in a significant number of such veterans, the Advisory Committee established under section 6 shall—

"(A) review all available scientific studies and other relevant information relating to the exposure of such veterans to ionizing radiation during such service;

"(B) identify any activity during which significant numbers of veterans received exposure; and

"(C) on the basis of such review, submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a report containing the recommendation of the Advisory Committee on the feasibility and appropriateness for the purpose of the determination under this paragraph of any additional investigation with respect to any activity of such veterans during such service.

"(2) Upon the request of the Advisory Committee, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (after seeking such assistance from the Secretary of Defense as is necessary and appropriate) shall make available to the Advisory Committee records and other information relating to the service referred to in paragraph (1) that may assist the Advisory Committee in carrying out the review and recommendation referred to in that paragraph.

"(3) The Advisory committee shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the report referred to in paragraph (1)(C) not later than August 1, 1993.

"(b) INVESTIGATION PLAN AND REPORT.—(1) Upon receipt of the report referred to in subparagraph (C) of subsection (a)(1), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

"(A) identify which of the activities referred to in that subparagraph, if any, that the Secretary intends to investigate more fully for the purpose of making the determination referred to in that subsection; and

"(B) prepare a plan (including a deadline for the plan) to carry out that investigation and make that determination.

"(2) Not later than December 1, 1993, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report containing—

"(A) a list of the activities identified by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (1)(A) and the basis of such identification;

"(B) a copy of the report of the Advisory Committee referred to in subsection (a)(1)(C); and

"(C) the plan referred to in paragraph (1)(B).".

SEC. 4. REVIEW OF BRONCHIO-ALVEOLAR CARCINOMA.

(a) ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall direct the Advisory Committee on Environmental Hazards to review pertinent scientific data relating to bronchio-alveolar carcinoma to determine whether such disease entity should be considered to be radiogenic. Based on its review, the Advisory Committee shall report its findings to the Secretary.

(b) DECISION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary, based on the Advisory Committee's findings, shall, not later than April 1, 1993, submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives a report setting forth the Secretary's decision as to whether such disease entity should be presumed to be service connected if suffered by a radiation-exposed veteran (as defined by section 1112(c)(4)(A) of title 38, United States Code).

Mr. MONTGOMERY (during the reading) Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, on August 4, the House passed H.R. 3236, which would add 2 additional disabilities to the list of 13 presumptive disabilities for certain veterans who were exposed to ionizing radiation while in military service by adding cancers of the salivary gland and urinary tract. It would also require further investigation by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs concerning activities that are not covered under current law which also might have resulted in exposure to radiation and added health risks. H.R. 3236 as passed by the House contained provisions that are very similar to certain provisions in S. 775 which includes these two cancers and would require further studies of other possible radiation-risk activities involving service members. The differences in the two bills are relatively minor.

During the August recess we began working with our counterparts to reach a compromise between the two bills. The amendment I am proposing today reflects what has been agreed to with the leadership of the committee in the other body.

Madam, Speaker, there follows a joint explanatory statement on the provisions of S. 775.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT ON S. 775

S. 775 reflects a compromise agreement that the Senate and House of Representatives Committees on Veterans' Affairs have reached on certain bills considered in the Senate and the House of Representatives during the 102d Congress. These are S. 775, which the Senate passed on November 20, 1991 (hereinafter referred to as "Senate bill") and H.R. 3236, which the House passed on August 4, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as "House bill").

The Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives have prepared the following explanation of S. 775 as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "compromise agreement"). Differences between the provisions contained in the compromise agreement and the related provisions in the above-mentioned bills are noted in this document, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by the compromise agreement, and minor drafting, technical, and clarifying changes.

EXPANSION OF LIST OF DISEASES PRESUMED TO BE SERVICE CONNECTED FOR CERTAIN RADIATION-EXPOSED VETERANS AND ELIMINATION OF LATENCY-PERIOD LIMITATIONS

Current law: Section 1112(c) of title 38, United States Code, provides a presumption of service connection for 13 diseases in veterans who participated in a radiation-risk activity. These diseases are: leukemia (other than chronic lymphocytic leukemia), multiple myeloma, lymphomas (except Hodgkin's disease), primary liver cancer (except if cirrhosis or hepatitis B is indicated), and cancers of the thyroid, breast, pharynx, esophagus, stomach, small intestine, pancreas, bile ducts, and gall bladder. Section 1112(c)(4) defines "radiation-risk activity" as participation onsite at an atmospheric nuclear weapons test; participation in the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki, Japan, during World War II from August 6, 1945, to July 1, 1946; or internment as a prisoner of war in Japan during World War II, or service on active duty in Japan following such internment, resulting in an opportunity for exposure to radiation.

Senate bill: Section 5, effective May 1, 1992, would, (a) repeal the requirement that, to be presumed service connected, diseases listed in section 1112(c) of veterans who participated in radiation-risk activities become at least 10-percent disabling within a specified time after the veterans' last exposure to radiation, and (b) add to the list of diseases cancer of the salivary gland and cancer of the urinary tract.

House bill: Section 2 is substantively identical to the Senate provision, except it would take effect October 1, 1992.

Compromise agreement: Section 2 contains this provision with the October 1, 1992, effective date.

IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES RELATING TO EXPOSURE TO IONIZING RADIATION

Current law: Section 6 of the Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Compensation Standards Act of 1984, Public Law 98-542, established the Veteran's Advisory Committee on Environmental Hazards. The Agent Orange Act of 1991, Public Law 102-4, modified the Advisory Committee's responsibilities to include only the review and evaluation of scientific studies on the health effects of exposure to ionizing radiation. The Advisory Committee submits to the Secretary recommendations concerning administrative and legislative actions the Advisory Committee considers appropriate to recognize disabilities possibly related to exposure to radiation during veterans' participation in an atmospheric nuclear weapons test or the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki during World War II.

As noted above, section 1112(c) of title 38 provides a presumption of service connection for 13 radiogenic diseases that applies to veterans who participated in "radiation-risk" activities, which include atmospheric nuclear weapons tests, the occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki during World War II, or internment in Japan during the war, or service in Japan following such internment, that resulted in an opportunity for exposure to radiation.

Senate bill: Section 6 would amend Public law 98-542 to establish a mechanism to determine whether veterans who participated in activities not considered "radiation-risk" activities under current law suffer from disabilities as a result of exposure to radiation during active duty prior to January 1, 1970. It would require the Advisory Committee to review all available scientific and other relevant information concerning these veterans' exposure to radiation during their service and, by September 30, 1992, report to the Secretary on its recommendations on the feasibility and appropriateness of additional investigation to determine whether the veterans suffer from radiogenic disabilities.

The Secretary would be required, upon request of the Advisory Committee and after seeking the assistance of the Secretary of Defense, to submit to the Advisory Committee information that would assist the Advisory Committee in carrying out its review and making its recommendations.

The Secretary, after receiving the Advisory Committee's report, would be required to identify which activities, if any the Secretary intends to investigate more fully to determine whether these veterans suffer from radiogenic disabilities. The Secretary also would be required to prepare a plan for carrying out the additional investigation and making the required determination, including a deadline for completing the plan. The Secretary would be required to submit a report to the Veterans' Affairs Committees by April 1, 1993, listing the activities the Secretary intends to investigate further and containing the plan for the investigation and required determination.

House bill: Section 3 is similar to the Senate provision, except that the Secretary would be required to determine whether there are activities that could have resulted in radiation exposure without the benefit of monitoring systems during pre-1970 military service, rather than determining whether there are veterans who suffer from disabilities from such exposure. The Advisory Committee would be required to identify activities during which significant numbers of veterans received unmonitored exposure to radiation.

The Advisory Committee would report to the Secretary by April 1, 1993, and the Secretary would report to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs by August 1, 1993. The Secretary's report would be required to include a copy of the Advisory Committee's report to the Secretary.

Compromise agreement: Section 3 contains a provision derived from these provisions which would amend the Veterans' Dioxin and Radiation Exposure Compensation Standards Act (Public Law 98-542). The Advisory Committee would be required to identify any activity during which significant numbers of veterans were exposed to radiation. The Secretary would be required to identify which, if any, of those activities the Secretary intends to investigate more fully in order to determine whether the identified activities (other than those currently considered radiation-risk activities) resulted in the exposure of veterans to ionizing radiation during pre-1970 military service and whether adverse health effects have been observed or may have resulted from the exposure in a significant number of these veterans.

The Advisory Committee would report to the Secretary by August 1, 1993, and the Secretary would report to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs by December 1, 1993. The report also would be required to include a copy of the Advisory Committee's report to the Secretary.

REVIEW OF BRONCHIO-ALVEOLAR CARCINOMA

Current law: There is no presumption of service connection for bronchio-alveolar cancer in current law.

Senate bill: No provision.

House bill: Section 4 would require the Secretary to direct the Advisory Committee on Environmental Hazards to review pertinent scientific evidence to determine whether bronchio-alveolar carcinoma should be considered radiogenic and to report its findings to the Secretary. The Secretary would be required, by April 1, 1993, to report to the Committees on Veteran's Affairs on the Secretary's decision whether, based on the Advisory Committee's report, bronchio-alveolar carcinoma should be presumed to be service connected for radiation-exposed veterans.

Compromise agreement: Section 4 contains the House provision.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the proposed House amendment.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I support S. 775, the Veterans' Radiation Exposure Amendments of 1992.

This measure illustrates what a bipartisan legislative process can accomplish, and I want to applaud DOUG APPLEGATE, LANE EVANS, and CHRIS SMITH for their contributions to the formulation of this bill.

I would also like to express my appreciation to my good friend and chairman, SONNY MONTGOMERY, for his leadership, and to the Members of the other body for their efforts in achieving a compromise on this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 775.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 775, the Veterans' Radiation Exposure Amendments of 1992.

As my colleagues have pointed out, this bill expands the current list of 13 cancer-related diseases eligible for compensation under Public Law 100-321, the Radiation-Exposed Veterans Compensation Act of 1988, to include cancer of the salivary gland and cancer of the urinary tract. Additionally, H.R. 3236 removes the current requirement that any of these diseases suffered by radiation-exposed veterans be manifested within 40 years after exposure.

It is only fair that our Nation's veterans who were exposed to various levels of ionizing radiation during World War II, as well as during subsequent nuclear testing, be justly compensated for their suffering.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 775.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title Amendment offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY: Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to improve the program of compensation for veterans exposed to ionizing radiation while in military service.".

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1840

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 436, MFN to Romania, and rollcall No. 437, the D.C. appropriation conference report. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 436 and "aye" on rollcall No. 437.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation which was, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, DC, September 24, 1992.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted today by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. These resolutions authorize studies of potential water resources projects by the Army Corps of Engineers in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Act of March 4, 1913.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. ROE,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AND TRANSACTIONS REGULATIONS RELATING TO HAITI—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

1. On October 4, 1991, in Executive Order No. 12775, I declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by events that had occurred in Haiti to disrupt the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government of that country (56 FR 50641). In that order, I ordered the immediate blocking of all property and interests in property of the Government of Haiti (including the Banque de la Republique d'Haiti) then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of a U.S. person, including its overseas branches. I also prohibited any direct or indirect payments or transfers to the de facto regime in Haiti of funds or other financial or investment assets or credits by any U.S. person or any entity organized under the laws of Haiti and owned or controlled by a U.S. person.

Subsequently, on October 28, 1991, I issued Executive Order No. 12779 adding trade sanctions against Haiti to the sanctions imposed on October 4, 1991 (56 FR 55975). Under this order, I prohibited exportation from the United States of goods, technology, and services, and importation into the United States of Haitian-origin goods and services, after November 5, 1991, with certain limited exceptions. The order exempts trade in publications and other informational materials from the import, export, and payments prohibitions, and permits the exportation to Haiti of donations to relieve human suffering as well as commercial sales of five food commodities: rice, beans, sugar, wheat flour, and cooking oil. In order to permit the return to the United States of goods being prepared for U.S. customers by Haiti's substantial "assembly sector," the order also permitted, through December 5, 1991, the importation into the United States of goods assembled or processed in Haiti that contained parts or materials previously exported to Haiti from the United States. On February 5, 1992, it was announced that this exception could be applied for on a case-by-case basis by U.S. persons wishing to resume a pre-embargo import/export relationship with the assembly sector in Haiti.

2. The declaration of the national emergency on October 4, 1991, was made pursuant to the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. I reported the emergency declaration to the Congress on October 4, 1991, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). The additional sanctions set forth in my order of October 28, 1991, were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, and implemented in the United States Resolution MRE/RES. 2/91, adopted by the Ad Hoc Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States ("OAS") on October 8, 1991, which called on Member States to impose a trade embargo on Haiti and to freeze Government of Haiti assets. The present report is submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c), and discusses Administration actions and expenses directly related to the national emergency with respect to Haiti declared in Executive Order No. 12775, as implemented pursuant to that order and Executive Order No. 12779.

3. On March 31, 1992, the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury ("FAC"), after consultation with the Department of State and other Federal agencies, issued the Haitian Transactions Regulations ("HTR"), 31 C.F.R. Part 580 (57 FR 10820, March 31, 1992), to implement the prohibitions set forth in Executive Orders No. 12775 and No. 12779. Since my last report, there have been two amendments to the HTR.

On June 5, 1992, new section 580.211 was added (57 FR 23954, June 5, 1992) prohibiting vessels calling in Haiti on or after that date from entering the United States without authorization by FAC. This amendment is explained more fully in section 6 of this report. In addition, effective August 27, 1992, new section 580.516 (57 FR 39603, September 1, 1992) authorizes the exportation to Haiti of certain additional food items (corn and corn flour, milk (including powdered milk), and edible tallow), as well as the issuance of specific licenses permitting, on a case-by-case basis, exports of propane for noncommercial use. Copies of these amendments are attached to this report.

4. The ouster of Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the democratically elected President of Haiti, in an illegal coup by elements of the Haitian military on September 30, 1991, was immediately repudiated and vigorously condemned by the OAS. The convening on September 30, 1991, of an emergency meeting of the OAS Permanent Council to address this crisis reflected an important first use of a mechanism approved at the 1991 OAS General Assembly in Santiago, Chile, requiring the OAS to respond to a sudden or irregular interruption of the functioning of a democratic government anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. As an OAS Member State, the United States has participated actively in OAS diplomatic efforts to restore democracy in Haiti and has supported fully the OAS resolutions adopted in response to the crisis, including Resolution MRE/RES. 2/91 and MRE/RES. 3/92.

5. In the first year of the Haitian sanctions program, FAC has made extensive use of its authority to specifically license transactions with respect to Haiti in an effort to mitigate the effects of the sanctions on the legitimate Government of Haiti and on the livelihood of Haitian workers employed by Haiti's export assembly sector having established relationships with U.S. firms, and to ensure the availability of necessary medicines and medical supplies and the undisrupted flow of hu-

manitarian donations to Haiti's poor. For example, specific licenses have been issued (1) permitting expenditures from blocked assets for the operations of the legitimate Government of Haiti, (2) permitting U.S. firms with pre-embargo relationships with product assembly operations in Haiti to resume those relationships in order to continue employment for their workers or, if they choose to withdraw from Haiti, to return to the United States assembly equipment, machinery, and parts and materials previously exported to Haiti, (3) permitting U.S. companies operating in Haiti to establish, under specified circumstances, interest-bearing blocked reserve accounts in commercial or investment banking institutions in the United States for deposit of amounts owed the *de facto* regime, (4) permitting the continued material support of U.S. and international religious, charitable, public health, and other humanitarian organizations and projects operating in Haiti, and (5) authorizing commercial sales of agricultural inputs such as fertilizer and foodcrop seeds.

6. The widespread supply of embargoed goods, particularly petroleum products, to Haiti by foreign-flag vessels led to the adoption on May 17, 1992, by the Ad Hoc Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the OAS of Resolution MRE/RES. 3/92 urging, among other things, a port ban on vessels engaged in trade with Haiti in violation of the OAS embargo. There was broad consensus among OAS member representatives, as well as European permanent observer missions, on the importance of preventing oil shipments to Haiti. Vessels from some non-OAS Caribbean ports and European countries have been involved in trade, particularly oil supplies, that undermines the embargo.

In response to Resolution MRE/RES. 3/92, section 580.211 was added to the HTR on June 5, 1992, prohibiting vessels calling in Haiti on or after that date from entering the United States without FAC authorization. Vessels seeking such authorization must demonstrate that all calls in Haiti on or after June 5 were (1) for transactions exempted or excepted from the applicable prohibitions of the HTR, (2) specifically licensed by FAC, or authorized by an OAS Member State pursuant to Resolution MRE/RES. 3/92, or (3) made under a contract of voyage that was fully completed prior to the vessel's proposed entry into a U.S. port.

Strict enforcement of the new regulation has benefitted from the close coordination between FAC, the U.S. Embassy at Port-au-Prince, the U.S. Customs Service, the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Coast Guard in monitoring vessel traffic to and from Haiti.

7. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12779, FAC has worked closely with the U.S. Customs Service to ensure both that prohibited imports and exports (including those in which the Government of Haiti has an interest) are identified and interdicted and that permitted imports and exports move to their intended destinations without undue delay. Violations and suspected violations of the embargo are being investigated, and appropriate enforcement actions have been initiated.

Since my last report, penalties totalling more than $30,000 have been collected from U.S. banks for violations involving unlicensed transfers from blocked Government of Haiti accounts or the failure to block payments to the de facto regime. Additional penalties totaling nearly $175,000 have been proposed for other violations of the HTR, including penalties against the masters of vessels violating the new regulation, effective June 5, 1992, applicable to vessels calling in Haiti on or after that date.

8. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from April 4, 1992, through October 3, 1992, that are directly attributable to the authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to Haiti are estimated at $2.3 million, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in FAC, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the General Counsel), the Department of State, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

9. The assault on Haiti's democracy represented by the military's forced exile of President Aristide continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The United States remains committed to a multilateral resolution of this crisis through its actions implementing the resolutions of the OAS with respect to Haiti. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Haiti as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1992.*

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 319) to designate the second Sunday in October of 1992 as "National Children's Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the chief sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman TOM SAWYER of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, and ranking member Congressman TOM RIDGE for their efforts in bringing this important commemorative to the House floor.

Madam Speaker, on Sunday October 11, this country will celebrate the fourth annual National Children's Day. It is a time to honor our kids, celebrate their many triumphs, listen to their hopes and concerns, and reflect for a moment on the world they are living in and the world we are leaving them.

Each year in America, we honor mothers and fathers with special days that let them know how important they are to this Nation and to each individual family. But we still have not permanently designated a single day of the year honoring the most cherished member of the American family, and the hope of this country's future—our children.

In honor of National Children's Day, the National Children's Day Foundation has sponsored 40 youth ambassadors to come to Washington DC, from across the country to participate in 3 days of activities. These children come from all walks of life, and have overcome significant social and economic hardships in their struggle to succeed. You will have the opportunity to meet many of these children during their scheduled hearings, personal appointments, and a congressional luncheon to be held this week. I hope you will join me in welcoming them to Washington, and will take the time to listen to their concerns, their hopes, and the dreams.

The message of Children's Day is to set aside 1 day a year, in the tradition of Father's Day and Mother's Day, to honor our children. If every adult set aside some time each day to be with their children—to take them camping, or to a baseball game, or even just to read with them—we can begin to rebuild the foundation of love and support our children need to reach their full human potential.

Today I hope that the House will pass this resolution that designates Sunday, October 11 as National Children's Day. I hope the Congress of the United States will lead the way by saying we value our children—and that our children deserve our love, our support, and our recognition. Please join with me today in taking this small step to help our kids be all that they can be.

On National Children's Day, and everyday, I hope you will take the time to listen to what these exceptional

young people have to say and that you will rededicate yourselves to their cause and to improving their lives. Our future literally depends on it.

Mr. GILMAN. Further reserving the right to object Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 319 which designates October 11 as National Children's Day, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his staunch efforts in bringing this important measure to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, as we review our current education policy and review the statistics on child welfare, we cannot help but to conclude that our Nation is not taking care of its children.

Birth weights are down, illiteracy is up, and more children live in poverty in the United States than in other developed countries. The most important priority we as legislators could have is our children. Our national policy should first be directed toward bettering the condition of our next generation, who indeed are our future. If we fail them, we are failing our Nation.

Madam Speaker, I welcome designating the second Sunday in October as "National Children's Day." This national day will help draw necessary attention to the plight of children in the United States, and I urge my colleagues to join in support.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. Res. 319

Whereas the people of the United States should celebrate children as the most valuable asset of the Nation;

Whereas children represent the future, hope, and inspiration of the United States;

Whereas the children of the United States should not be allowed to feel that their ideas and dreams will be stifled because adults in the United States do not take time to listen;

Whereas many children face crises of grave proportions, especially as they enter adolescent years;

Whereas it is important for parents to spend time listening to their children on a daily basis;

Whereas modern societal and economic demands often pull the family apart;

Whereas encouragement should be given to families to set aside a special time for all family members to remain at home;

Whereas adults in the United States should have an opportunity to reminisce on their youth to recapture some of the fresh insight, innocence, and dreams that they may have lost through the years;

Whereas the designation of a day to commemorate the children of the United States will provide an opportunity to emphasize to children the importance of developing an ability to make the choices necessary to distance themselves from impropriety;

Whereas the designation of a day to commemorate the children of the Nation will emphasize to the people of the United States the importance of the role of the child within the family;

Whereas the people of the United States should emphasize to children the importance of family life, education, and spiritual qualities; and

Whereas parents, teachers, and community and religious leaders should celebrate the children of the United States, whose questions, laughter, and tears are important to the existence of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second Sunday in October of 1992 is designated as "National Children's Day" and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5820

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5820. His name was added by mistake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL BONE MARROW DONOR AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 551) designating October 4, 1992, through October 10, 1992, as "National Bone Marrow Donor Awareness Week" and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for bringing this resolution up this evening.

I want to especially thank those who are the original cosponsors of this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES], who are all very strong supporters of this Bone Marrow Donor Program.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that these gentlemen are heroes, as is every Member of this House, because every Member of this House has supported the National Bone Marrow Donor Program, and they are heroes.

In addition to the Members of the Congress are those people who worked on the program out in the country, and those who are donors, and the nearly 700,000 Americans who are in this registry to be potential bone marrow donors.

I reported to the House earlier this summer that our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES], himself, was a donor in that time period, and we are extremely proud of that.

When we began this program, we were told that it would never succeed, that there probably would not be 50,000 people who would be part of this registry. Today I am happy to report that we are right at 700,000 Americans, and growing. As a matter of fact, we are international in that we signed agreements with 10 other nations, meaning that our registry has expanded dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, I call this resolution to your attention, and I ask for its support. It is a recognition of the many, many heroes in this Congress and in this country who are willing to make a minor donation of bone marrow to give another American an opportunity to live, where they have no chance to live today.

Mr. RIDGE. Continuing my reservation, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], an original cosponsor, one of the heroes that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] was talking about.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support for House Joint Resolution 551, designating the week of October 4 to October 10 as, "National Bone Marrow Donor Awareness Week." I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] for introducing this important measure, for his hard work on this measure, and I am pleased to cosponsor this resolution.

There are over 9,000 patients searching for a bone marrow donor. One of these patients is a constituent of mine, Jay Feinberg, who is 23 years of age and is dying of leukemia. His only hope of a cure is a bone marrow transplant. Without such a transplant, Jay will not survive.

These leukemia patients need to find unrelated donors—people who have offered to give the living gift of life to a specific patient in need. As the pool of potential marrow donors increases, so do the odds of a match for the thousands of patients in need. The chance that a patient will find a matching, unrelated donor in the general population is between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1 million.

Currently, there are over 650,000 names in the National Marrow Donor Program registry in the United States. Registries in Canada and Europe contain thousands more names, and computer links enable any leukemia patient access.

But, the odds are still long. In 1990, of the 331,656 people tested as possible bone marrow donors, only 733 were matched with a marrow receiver.

It is crucial that the public be made aware that they have it within themselves to save lives. To be typed as a potential bone marrow donor requires a small and simple blood test. If a volunteer is identified as a match, the donation itself requires only 2 to 5 percent of the body's marrow, which regenerates in full within 3 weeks.

The requirements to be a marrow donor are few. To be a marrow donor, you must be between 18 and 55 years old and be in good health. All it takes is 10 minutes and two tablespoons of blood to join the National Marrow Donor Program registry.

Mr. Speaker, its saddens me to know that the technology is available to save countless lives, if only our national registry was large enough to find each one of them a compatible donor.

Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to urge all of my colleagues to support this measure, and urge eligible people to give the living gift of life by joining the national marrow donor registry.

□ 1850

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 551

Whereas more than 10,000 Americans are in need of a bone marrow transplant for the treatment of leukemia, aplastic anemia, and 60 other fatal blood-related diseases;

Whereas only 30 percent of such patients have a matching sibling to donate bone marrow;

Whereas a bone marrow transplant between matched, unrelated individuals is the preferred therapy for certain diseases;

Whereas very precise tissue typing is required to identify unrelated patients and donors, with the odds between 1 in 100 and 1 in 1,000,000 that the bone marrow of any 2 unrelated individuals will match perfectly;

Whereas the National Marrow Donor Program was established by the Congress in 1987 to provide a computerized registry through which patients can find matching unrelated donors;

Whereas in the 5 years since the National Marrow Donor Program was activated, more than 700,000 Americans have volunteered to take the simple blood test required to be listed in the national registry as a potential bone marrow donor;

Whereas the national registry is growing at a rate of 20,000 potential donors per month through a wide variety of donor recruitment efforts, which include family and community drives, corporate-sponsored education and recruitment programs, Department of Defense-wide drives, targeted minority recruitment efforts, and international agreements to expand the donor pool overseas;

Whereas the National Marrow Donor Program has entered into or is negotiating formal agreements with registries in more than 10 other nations;

Whereas the success of the National Marrow Donor Program depends on people who are willing to sign up to provide the living gift of life to someone who is not related to them;

Whereas many patients have received a life-saving bone marrow transplant from a donor found through the National Marrow Donor Program, but many others continue the search for their miracle match; and

Whereas increasing the size of the volunteer donor pool will better the chances of finding a matching bone marrow donor for every patient in need of a transplant: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 4, 1992, through October 10, 1992, is designated as "National Bone Marrow Donor Awareness Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities designed to encourage Americans to volunteer to be bone marrow donors.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FIREFIGHTERS DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 523) designating October 8, 1992, as "National Firefighters Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title to the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object solely to identify my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] who is not only the chief sponsor of this resolution, but the originator and the founder of the fire service caucus, which is the largest caucus in the Congress of the United States and is comprised of 430 Members of the House and Senate. He is the prime mover, the chief source of the energy behind it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], for yielding this time to me, and I thank both the Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], in addition to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], for their cooperation in again allowing us to bring forth this important piece of legislation to this body.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 523 in fact designates October 8 of this year as the national day during which we can honor those 1.5 million men and women across this country who devote their lives and their energies to protecting the lives and property of neighbors in cities and towns all across America. It is appropriate that we do this bill today, and I would hope that this is a first of a series of legislative initiatives that I expect to have brought up on this floor this week in recognition of the fire service, another one calling for the minting of a special coin honoring the firefighters, and a third series of bills dealing with enhancing Federal fire protection standards.

But this particular act is important because it sets aside one day during Fire Prevention Week which is held each year, as designated by the National Fire Protection Association, from October 4 through October 10, and following that week we have the annual fallen firefighters memorial at Emmitsburg, the National Fallen Firefighters Memorial at National Fire Academy, where this year we will honor the families of well over 125 firefighters from all over America who gave their lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially significant that we have this day this year because America has seen a number of terrible tragedies. We just witnessed Hurricane Hugo, we witnessed the storms in Guam, in Hawaii. We witnessed the terrible tragedies of the wild lands fires in Idaho, California, Yellowstone, the Loma Prieta earthquake, and the one similarity in each of these disasters in America is that they have been responded to by America's domestic defenders. The American domestic defenders are the men and women of the fire service, be they paid or volunteer.

In every city, every town, every municipality, Mr. Speaker, there is an organized effort to protect the lives and the property of the American people. They are the best example of what America is all about, people who are willing to put back into their communities, oftentime without compensation and just ask for the support and the recognition of various levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, by passing this resolution today we send a signal that we honor these brave heroes, that they, in fact, are the best of what America has to offer, and we pledge to provide them the kind of support that they so desperately need and deserve.

I thank my colleagues for allowing this bill to come up today. I thank the

members of the subcommittee and full committee for their full support and cooperation in this effort. I also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] for having yielded to me.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, we are certainly pleased to join with our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] in this meaningful recognition of the sacrifices and contributions of the professional firefighters, be they compensated or not compensated. They are there whenever we need them.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 523

Whereas there are over 2,000,000 professional firefighters in the United States;

Whereas firefighters respond to more than 2,300,000 fires and 8,700,000 emergencies other than fires each year;

Whereas fires annually cause nearly 6,000 deaths and $10,000,000,000 in property damages;

Whereas firefighters have given their lives and risked injury to preserve the lives and protect the property of others;

Whereas the contributions and sacrifices of valiant firefighters often go unreported and are inadequately recognized by the public; and

Whereas the work of firefighters deserves the attention and gratitude of all individuals in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 8, 1992, is designated as "National Firefighters Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POLISH-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 305) to designate October 1992 as "Polish-American Heritage Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply wish to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI], who is the chief sponsor of this legislation, the companion piece that I believe was passed in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to speak on this matter.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 305, a measure designating October 1992 as "Polish-American Heritage Month." I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] for introducing this measure.

Since the beginning of this Nation's struggle for independence, millions of Poles have emigrated to America and made invaluable contributions to our Nation's success. It is fitting that we honor Polish-Americans and recognize them nationwide by establishing Polish-American Heritage Month.

Many Poles, including Thaddeus Kosciuszoo, who helped the Colonists defeat the British in the Battle of Saratoga, fought for our Nation's independence in the Revolutionary War. Since that time, countless Polish-Americans have served with distinction in many capacities, ranging from our industries and Armed Forces to foreign policy positions and the fields of medicine, law, and education to further the democratic way of life in this country.

In their homeland, democracy has triumphed over the totalitarianism under which Poland labored for so many years. Now, Polish-Americans who have enjoyed the freedom of the United States turn to the land of their ancestors with joy and excitement as it establishes its fledging democracy.

Mr. Speaker I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Joint Resolution 305, and thereby honoring the Polish-Americans who have made such important contributions to the American way of life.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of designating October 1992 as "Polish-American Heritage Month."

There are numerous ties between Poland and the United States of America. Polish people fought in the American Revolutionary War and soon after the adoption of the American Constitution, Poland adopted a constitution styled after the American Constitution.

We have recently witnessed the great transformation in Poland, spearheaded by Lech Walesa. As Americans salute this achievement and wish for Poland the very best. Poland is leading the way in Europe during this transition from communism to democracy.

There is much for Poland that we have assimilated into American culture. We listen to music composed by Polish composers and admire art by Polish artists. Currently, we adore American athletes who are of Polish ancestry. Polish-Americans have contributed much to America in arts, science, government, and, in fact, all spheres of life.

I want to wish the best to the Polish-American Congress as they celebrate their 48th anniversary this year. I also want to recognize my constituent, Michael S. Pawlowski, who has been elected President of the Polish-American Congress for the Washington Metropolitan Area and the president of the Polish Club of Rockville.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will support this important measure recognizing the accomplishments and commitment of Polish-Americans to our country.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 305

Whereas the first Polish immigrants to North America were among the first settlers of Jamestown, Virginia, in the seventeenth century;

Whereas Kazimierz Pulaski, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, and other Poles came to the British colonies in America to fight in the Revolutionary War and to risk their lives and fortunes for the creation of the United States;

Whereas Poles and Americans of Polish descent have distinguished themselves by contribution to the development of arts, sciences, government, military service, athletics, and education in the United States;

Whereas the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was modeled directly on the Constitution of the United States, is recognized as the second written constitution in history, and is revered by Poles and Americans of Polish descent;

Whereas Poles and Americans of Polish descent take great pride and honor in the greatest son of Poland, his Holiness Pope John Paul the Second;

Whereas Poles and Americans of Polish descent and people everywhere applauded the efforts of Solidarity's leader and now President in fighting for freedom, human rights, and economic reform in Poland;

Whereas the Polish American Congress is observing its forty-eight anniversary this year and is celebrating October 1992 as "Polish-American Heritage Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1992 is designated "Polish-American Heritage Month", and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE AND CULTURE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 400) designating October 1992 as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month," and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I take this time in order to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to another colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

□ 1900

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 400, legislation to designate October 1992 as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month." I am pleased to have cosponsored this legislation and wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] for his sponsorship of this legislation.

Italian-Americans in the United States represent one of the largest ethnic groups in our Nation. With 20 million Americans of Italian descent it would be difficult, if not impossible, to name the many contributions they have made to the formation and development of our great Nation.

Perhaps the greatest contribution made by an Italian is being celebrated this year. Of course, I am speaking about the 500th anniversary of the Discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 400, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank my colleagues for joining me for the fourth year in a row in passing House Joint Resolution 400, legislation which will designate the month of October as Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month.

During the past 4 years, the month of October has become a time of great celebration for the Italian-American community. In addition, 1992 marks the quincentenial commemoration of Christopher Columbus' historic voyage to the Americas, giving added meaning to Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month. Already, hundreds of activities have been planned on both the local and national levels in recognition and celebration of the achievements of Italian-Americans.

As you know, some 25 million citizens make up the Italian-American community, representing one of the largest ethnic groups in the United States. There are thousands of Italian-American organizations and clubs throughout the United States who greatly contribute to the prosperity and progress of our Nation on a yearly basis, not to mention the individual Italian-Americans who have contributed to the United States in all aspects of life including art, science, civil service, military service, athletics, education, and politics.

Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month gives the American people the opportunity to highlight the many contributions and achievements of Italians and Italian-Americans throughout history. Most celebrated, of course, is this year's quincentenial celebration of Christopher Columbus' historic voyage to the Americas. In addition, as the recent publication "Columbus in the Capitol" illustrates, Columbus and Italian artisans have played an important role in developing and implementing the decorative style found in the Capitol Building. Columbus' historic role in American history is a recurrent theme within the Halls of the Capitol. This theme has often been conceived and implemented by Italian artisans, such as sculptors Enrico Causici and Antonio Capellano. Several frescos of Constantino Brumidi can also be found within the Capitol.

In addition, Philip Mazzei, an Italian patriot and immigrant, is credited with coining the Declaration of Independence phrase "all men are created equal." During the American Revolution, he devoted much of his time and energy to the preservation of both religious and political freedom in America. Also to be remembered are the contributions made by Enrico Fermi, one of the early pioneers of nuclear physics, and William Paca, an original signed of the Declaration of Independence.

Finally, Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month gives us the opportunity to reflect upon the many common values and ideals shared between the American and Italian people. The importance of individuality, the protection of basic human rights and freedoms, and the advancement of mankind, are but a few of shared beliefs that bond our two nations together.

Mr. Speaker, we are giving a great honor to one of the largest ethnic communities in this country by passing this resolution and I am thankful for the many contributions that they have made to our society. I look forward to continuing this tradition in the many years ahead.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 400

Whereas Italians and Italian-Americans have contributed to the United States in all aspects of life, including art, science, civil service, military service, athletics, education, law, and politics;

Whereas Italian-Americans make up one of the largest ethnic groups in the United States;

Whereas in recognition of the accomplishments of Christopher Columbus, recognized as one of the greatest explorers in world history and the first to record the discovery of the Americas, a national observance day was established in October of every year;

Whereas 1992 is the quincentennial commemoration of the historic voyage of Christopher Columbus to the Americas;

Whereas the phrase in the Declaration of Independence "All men are created equal", was suggested by the Italian patriot and immigrant Philip Mazzei;

Whereas the people of the United States take great pride in the accomplishments of the many outstanding men and women of Italian descent who have enriched our Nation's history such as Fiorello La Guardia, the beloved Mayor of New York City, and Enrico Fermi, who won the 1938 Nobel Prize in Physics;

Whereas Italy enjoys a rich cultural heritage and has given the world the great works of Dante, the breathtaking art of Giotti and Michelangelo, and the inspirational music of Antonio Vivaldi and Domenico Scarlatti;

Whereas the Americas were named after the Italian explorer Amerigo Vespucci;

Whereas Giuseppe Verdi, one of the world's most renowned opera composers, was born October 10, 1813;

Whereas William Paca, an Italian-American, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas during October 1992 special attention will be directed at National, State, and local programs that promote Italian heritage and culture: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1992 is designated as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 287) to designate the week of October 4, 1992, through October 10, 1992, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to recognize the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], the chief sponsor of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 287, a measure to designate the week of October 4, 1992, through October 10, 1992, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week." I would like to commend the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], who introduced similar legislation in the House.

As we know, since 1973, Federal law has prohibited discrimination on the basis of mental illness in federally funded programs. Those provisions, however, have not removed all the barriers that have kept our Nation's mentally disabled people from participating fully on the job and in the activities of daily life.

Unfortunately, many of these remaining barriers result from ignorance

and misunderstanding. Mental Illness Awareness Week is intended to help to dispel the basis for much of the discrimination against the mentally disabled by education and by recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in support of this measure, and to provide the mentally disabled with the help and recognition they so richly deserve.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to announce that 239 of our colleagues have agreed to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 476, authorizing the President to designate the week of October 4–10, 1992, as "Mental Illness Awareness Week." The companion resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 287, introduced by Senator SIMON, has already passed the Senate.

The purpose of this joint resolution is to focus public attention on concerns surrounding, and the advances made in, the treatment of mental illness. A Mental Illness Awareness Week resolution has been passed by Congress for the last 8 years. This resolution has for the past 8 years served as a focal point for educating the public about conditions such as phobias, depression, anxiety, and schizophrenia.

Mental illness is a problem of staggering proportions. One in five American families will be affected by serious mental illness. Mental illness strikes all social levels and all ethnic groups in equal proportion.

According to the American Psychiatric Association, 15 to 25 percent of the elderly suffer from significant symptoms of mental illness. In addition, approximately 12 million children under the age of 18 suffer from mental disorders such as depression, hyperactivity, and autism. About 15 percent of Americans will suffer a major depressive episode. One-third of the homeless on our streets are victims of mental illness.

But many people with mental illness are suffering needlessly. Many mental disorders are diagnosable, treatable, and even curable. But fewer than one-fifth of those who have mental disorders seek or receive the treatment they need. Many do not even realize that they have an illness which can be effectively treated.

Nine out of ten patients suffering from major depression or anxiety can recover; 7 of 10 suffering from manic depression can return to normal lives; 1 in 4 with schizophrenia can recover.

We can help turn this problem around by letting people know that help is available for mental illness. Of all the resolutions that will be considered by Congress this year, I hope you will agree that Mental Illness Awareness Week has particular merit. Its passage will help bring-much needed attention to the fact that so many mental disorders can be attacked and conquered.

The inspiration for Mental Illness Awareness Week comes from such groups as the American Psychiatric Association [APA] and the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill. APA members conduct research and provide treatment necessary for those suffering from mental illness. The alliance which was formed in 1979 for families of the mentally ill, supports education, advocacy, and research in the mental health field.

Few diseases have the potential which mental illness has to disrupt the lives of the sufferers, and their families and friends. And no other disease is more clouded by misunderstanding.

Only through an increased understanding of the causes and treatments available will the fear and ignorance surrounding mental illness become a thing of the past.

Mental Illness Awareness Week provides us with an opportunity to reach out and help fellow Americans understand this disease and encourage those afflicted to seek appropriate care. I thank my colleagues for their support of this important resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 287

Whereas mental illness is a problem of grave concern and consequence in the United States and it is widely, but unnecessarily, feared and misunderstood;

Whereas on an annual basis 40,000,000 adults in the United States suffer from clearly diagnosable mental disorders, including mental illness, alcohol abuse, and drug abuse, which create significant disabilities with respect to employment, school attendance, and independent living;

Whereas more than 17,000,000 United States citizens are disabled for long periods of time by schizophrenia, manic depressive disorder, and major depression;

Whereas 33 percent of homeless persons suffer serious, chronic forms of mental illness;

Whereas alcohol, drug, and mental disorders affect almost 22 percent of adults in the United States in any 1-year period;

Whereas mental illness interferes with the development and maturation of at least 12,000,000 of our children;

Whereas a majority of the 29,000 American citizens who commit suicide each year suffer from a mental or an addictive disorder;

Whereas our growing population of elderly persons faces many obstacles to care for mental disorders;

Whereas 20 to 25 percent of AIDS patients will develop AIDS-related cognitive dysfunction and as many as two-thirds of AIDS patients will show neuropsychiatric symptoms before they die;

Whereas mental illnesses, alcohol abuse, and drug abuse result in staggering costs to society, estimated to be in excess of $249,000,000,000 in direct treatment and support and indirect costs to society, including lost productivity;

Whereas the Federal research budget committed to the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration represents only about 1 percent of the direct treatment and support costs of caring for persons with alcohol, drug, and mental disorders;

Whereas mental illnesses are increasingly treatable disorders with excellent prospects for amelioration when properly recognized;

Whereas mentally ill persons and their families have begun to join self-help groups seeking to combat the unfair stigma of mental illness, to support greater national investment in research, and to advocate an adequate continuum of care from hospital to community;

Whereas in recent years there have been unprecedented major research developments bringing new methods and technology to the sophisticated and objective study of the functioning of the brain and its linkages to both normal and abnormal behavior;

Whereas research in recent decades has led to a wide array of new and more effective modalities of treatment (somatic, psychosocial, and service delivery) for some of the most incapacitating forms of mental illness, including schizophrenia, major affective disorders, phobias, and phobic disorders;

Whereas appropriate treatment of mental illness has been demonstrated to be cost effective in terms of restored productivity, reduced use of other health services, and lessened social dependence; and

Whereas recent and unparalleled growth in scientific knowledge about mental illness has generated the current emergence of a new threshold of opportunity for future research advances and fruitful application to specific clinical problems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 4, 1992, through October 10, 1992, is designated as "Mental Illness Awareness Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIRE A VETERAN WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 542) designating the week beginning November 8, 1992, as Hire a Veteran Week, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the chief sponsor of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolutions 542, designating the week beginning November 8 as Hire a Veteran Week. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for his work in bringing this measure before the House in such a timely fashion so that it may be well publicized before Veterans Day, 1992.

Mr. Speaker, we are well-aware that our Nation no longer faces the threats that we did during the cold war. Accordingly, our military will be reduced

in size. This reduction will necessarily include personnel cuts. Many men and women in uniform who served their country faithfully and hoped to make a career in the military will find themselves without a job.

By enacting Hire a Veteran Week, we will help publicize to employers the skills and knowledge that our veterans possess. Our veterans are highly trained and skilled in a number of occupations: veteran electricians and mechanics, engineers and managers, are eager to put their skills to work in the private and public sectors.

In addition, the publicity generated by Hire a Veteran Week will help make veterans aware of the array of employment services available to them through State veterans and labor agencies. We all must also take this opportunity to apprise the private sector of the services that State and local labor and veterans organizations can provide to employers, such as matching of job listings with veterans possessing the requisite skills.

Mr. Speaker, once again I commend the gentleman Mr. BROWN, for introducing this measure, which will benefit all our Nation's veterans, and I urge my colleagues to unanimously support it.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments and remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. Nobody can say it better than that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 542

Whereas the people of the United States have a deep appreciation and respect for the men and women who serve our Nation in the Armed Forces;

Whereas, although veterans possess special qualities and skills which make them ideal candidates for employment, many veterans encounter difficulties in securing employment;

Whereas military spending cuts and reductions-in-force in the Armed Forces will send tens of thousands of veterans looking for employment in the job market;

Whereas it would be inconsiderate and contrary to the economic competitiveness of our Nation to neglect the post-military needs of the men and women who served our Nation in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Labor, the Office of Personnel Management, and many State and local governments administer veterans programs and have veterans employment representatives both to ensure that veterans receive the services to which they are entitled and to promote employer interest in hiring veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning November 8, 1992, is hereby designated as "Hire a Veteran Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon employers, labor organizations, veterans organizations, and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies to lend their support to the campaign to increase employment of the men and women who have served our Nation in the Armed Forces.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6056. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5503) "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes."

NATIONAL VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATIONS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 484) designating the week beginning February 14, 1993, as "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, certainly we on this side support this resolution, but I wish to continue our reservation in order to give my neighbor of a couple of districts away, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR], my friend and colleague on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, an opportunity to speak. The gentlewoman is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and neighbor, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Ridge]. The gentleman represents the area where my mother was born, and I am proud of that region.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], the ranking minority member, for their fine leadership and efforts on that subcommittee. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] for his distinguished leadership on the full committee, of which I am proud to be a member. Gratitude is also due to Senator BRADLEY and Senator HATCH for their companion bill which is under consideration in the other body. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who is also one of the sponsors of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking tonight about the Visiting Nurse Associations movement in the United States of America. it is as diverse as the Nation which the Visiting Nurse Associations serve.

Mr. Speaker, we have to pay special tribute to the health providers who call themselves nurses. They are the ones who spend more time with patients than frankly any other health providers, and especially those who are visiting nurses, who go into homes.

Mr. Speaker, in every community in America, from inner city areas to sprawling farms, these vibrant associations involved registered nurses, nurses' aides, medical specialists, counselors, therapists, and volunteers to provide quality professional home care to nearly 1 million of our Nation's neediest citizens, regardless of the patient's ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve on the Pepper Commission which studied the health care needs of our people, and I know that we are facing a crisis with respect to affordability and access to health care in the United States. We also face a crisis with respect to the need for long-term care.

Eight million people need home care. They do not want to institutionalize their children if their children have chronic diseases. We have 70-year-old children taking care of 90-year-old parents today.

Mr. Speaker, the visiting nurses are the ones who go into the homes and give dignity and compassion to those who are ill and those who are terminally ill. They go into hospice situations, they go into counseling situations, personal care situations, physical therapy situations, and social service situations. So people of all ages, races, and cultures benefit from the continued success of the Visiting Nurse Associations in America. Today they are carrying on a tradition in health care as they have since coming into existence.

□ 1910

They remain in the forefront of maternal child care as well as home intra-

venous therapy and respiratory care. and in many cities, such as my own city of Cleveland, they have developed special shelters where the homeless can receive attention they would not get otherwise. So it is fitting, I think, that we honor the Visiting Nurse Association by having a special week devoted to them so that we tell all Americans that they mirror one of the most important needs of our country, and that is the generalized area of home care.

VNA's should also be commended as one of the first groups to recognize the home care needs of aids victims. Nearly every time circumstances have conspired to create a health care need, VNA's have been the first to identify and respond to that need.

To add to the skills of talented and dedicated health care professionals, Visiting Nurse Associations have successfully incorporated the spirit of volunterism into their good work. Community volunteers assist VNA's wherever they can help by delivering meals, running errands, fundraising, and in general, serving as an extension of the compassionate spirit that surrounds VNA's in our Nation. It is essential that Congress recognize the efforts of volunteer and not-for-profit organizations that help to reduce health costs. As a compassionate, unique method of health care delivery, VNA's certainly merit such distinction. We should encourage their growth.

I thank my colleague Mr. BURTON for his efforts in their bipartisan legislation. By naming the week beginning February 14, 1993, as "National Visiting Nurse Association Week," we extol the endeavors of these modern day samaritans to ensure that they get the appreciation and recognition they so justly deserve. February 1993 will mark the fifth year our Nation will celebrate National Visiting Nurse Associations Week. This resolution recognizes all the medical professionals and volunteers in each community who enable Visiting Nurse Associations to advance their innovative and essential role in America's changing health care system.

I want to pay special tribute to my own hometown, my own Visiting Nurse Association of Cleveland and its president and CEO Mary Lou Stricklin. They go beyond the call of duty and this not-for-profit organization should be commended.

I want to thank my colleagues for reserving this week for them.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from Mary Lou Stricklin.

MARCH 23, 1992.

Congresswoman MARY ROSE OAKAR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN OAKAR: As you are aware, the Visiting Nurse Association of America (VNAA) is beginning its efforts to have a resolution introduced in Congress designating February 14–20, 1993 and February 13–19, 1994 as National VNAA Weeks.

Since you were instrumental in establishing the first National VNAA Week by introducing legislation in 1988, we would like to request that you, once again, serve as House Sponsor for our resolution to salute the dedicated staff members of the Visiting Nurse Association who are committed to helping people become healthy and independent.

Your generous support of the VNA and dedication to home healthcare issues result in thousands of patients—from the terminally ill to premature newborns—having the opportunity to remain in their homes for the healthcare they need.

We look forward to your continued support and thank you, in advance, for your consideration of the resolution sponsorship.

Sincerely,

MARY LOU STRICKLIN,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 484

Whereas visiting nurse associations have served homebound Americans since 1885;

Whereas such associations annually provide home care and support services to more than 1,500,000, men, women, children, and infants;

Whereas such associations serve 422 urban and rural communities in 45 States;

Whereas such associations adhere to high standards of quality and provide personalized and cost-effective home health care and support, regardless of an individual's ability to pay;

Whereas such associations are voluntary in nature; independently owned, and community based;

Whereas such associations ensure the quality of care through oversight provided by professional advisory committees composed of local physicians and nurses;

Whereas such associations enable hundreds of thousands of Americans to recover from illness and injury in the comfort and security of their homes;

Whereas such associations ensure that individuals who are chronically ill or who have physical or mental handicaps receive the therapeutic benefits of care and support services in the home;

Whereas, in the absence of such associations, thousands of patients with mental or physical handicaps or chronically disabling illnesses would have to be institutionalized;

Whereas such associations provide a wide range of services, including health care, hospice care, personal care, homemaking, occupational, physical, and speech therapy, friendly visiting services, social services, nutritional counseling, specialized nursing care by registered nurses, and meals on wheels;

Whereas, in each community serviced by such an association, local volunteers support the association by serving on the board of directors, raising funds, visiting patients in their homes, assisting patients and nurses at wellness clinics, delivering meals on wheels to patients, running errands for patients, working in the association's office, and providing tender loving care; and

Whereas the need for home health care for young and old alike continues to grow annually: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning February 14, 1993, is designated as "National Visiting Nurse Associations Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MILITARY FAMILIES RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 503) acknowledging the sacrifices that military families have made on behalf of the Nation and designating November 23, 1992, as "National Military Families Recognition Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY], who has championed this cause annually.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for helping me to pass for the fourth time the National Military Families Recognition Day, which is listed as House Joint Resolution 503.

Mr. Speaker, in these waning hours of the 102d Congress, I am very pleased that 222 of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring National Military Families Recognition Day to be celebrated on November 23, 1992, the Monday before Thanksgiving.

This, as I said, marks the fourth consecutive year that we have so designated the Monday before Thanksgiving in this way; and I think it is very appropriate that we do so. During the week of Thanksgiving there are of course, football games, parades, and general goodwill across America. It is a time when families try to get together in one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, there are 2,815,000 children and spouses who are part of the 4,880,000 persons in the active duty military community. Members of the Reserves in paid status account for 1,320,000 of the 2,470,000 individuals in the Reserves community. These families are called upon in peacetime and in times of national security threats to

stand steadfast and supportive of the military service member in the household. These families are at the core of the morale of our military and Reserves communities.

The emotional and mental readiness of the U.S. military personnel around the world is tied to the well-being and satisfaction of their families. We are truly indebted to military families for facing adversities, including extended separations from their service members, frequent household moves due to reassignment, and restrictions on their employment and educational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, with reduced global military tensions after the end of the cold war, our military will undoubtedly undergo downsizing and refocusing of national priorities to strengthen the American economy and competitiveness in the global marketplace. Military families need to know that we will be with them during this restructuring of our national defense requirements.

In conclusion, let me say that I appreciate the support of Chairman SAWYER and Mr. RIDGE for moving to bring House Joint Resolution 503 to the floor today and a special personal thanks to our military personnel stateside and abroad in hopes that they will know that Monday, November 23, is a special day for them and their families.

□ 1920

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I want to thank the gentleman for his strong statement. I am pleased to be associated with his remarks. I think it is important that we have an annual reminder that when a man or woman takes upon himself or herself the responsibility and the obligation to this country and puts on their uniform, that their spouse and their children are subject to the dictates and the demands of this country.

The fact that the gentleman takes time out on an annual basis to ensure that there is some kind of public recognition, that it is not only the men and women in uniform but their spouses and children that are also subject to the call of their country, is something I am pleased to be associated with, and I am sure that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], is as well.

Mr. Speaker, the minority certainly supports this very valuable public recognition of military families.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 503

Whereas the Congress recognizes and supports the Department of Defense policies to recruit, train, equip, retain, and field a military force that is capable of preserving peace and protecting the vital interests of the United States and its allies;

Whereas military families shoulder the responsibility of providing emotional support for their service members;

Whereas, in times of war and military action, military families have demonstrated their patriotism through their steadfast support and commitment to the Nation;

Whereas the emotional and mental readiness of the United States military personnel around the world is tied to the well-being and satisfaction of their families;

Whereas the quality of life that the Armed Forces provide to military families is a key factor in the retention of military personnel;

Whereas the people of the United States are truly indebted to military families for facing adversities, including extended separations from their service members, frequent household moves due to reassignments, and restrictions on their employment and educational opportunities;

Whereas 72 percent of officers and 54 percent of enlisted personnel in the Armed Forces are married;

Whereas families of active duty military personnel (including individuals other than spouses or children) account for more than 2,815,000 of the more than 4,880,000 individuals in the active duty community, and spouses and children of members of the Reserves in paid status account for more than 1,320,000 of the more than 2,470,000 individuals in the Reserves community;

Whereas spouses, children, and other dependents living abroad with members of the Armed Forces total nearly 450,000 and these family members at times face feelings of cultural isolation and financial hardship;

Whereas the significantly reduced global military tensions after the end of the Cold War have led to a down-sizing of the national defense and a refocusing of national priorities to strengthening the American economy and competitiveness in the global marketplace;

Whereas the Congress is grateful for such sacrifices and is committed to assisting the service members and their families who undergo the transition from active duty to civilian life; and

Whereas military families are devoted to the overall mission of the Department of Defense and have accepted the role of the United States as the military leader and protector of the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) the Congress acknowledges and appreciates the commitment and devotion of present and former military families and the sacrifices that such families have made on behalf of the Nation; and

(2) November 23, 1992, is designated as "National Military Families Recognition Day". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YEAR OF AMERICAN CRAFT: A CELEBRATION OF THE CREATIVE WORK OF THE HAND

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution [S.J. Res. 218] designating the calendar year, 1993, as the "Year of American Craft: A Celebration of the Creative Work of the Hand," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so simply to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 218

Whereas the twentieth century has witnessed an outpouring of creative craftsmanship and it is appropriate that we now pay tribute to excellence in craftsmanship;

Whereas the value of creative work of the hand through craft remains clear even as the most industrialized century of our history draws to a close;

Whereas peerless craftsmanship, once commonly associated with American industry, is now a theme of renewed importance and interest;

Whereas the traditional values of craftspeople such as dedication to the qualities of excellence, perseverance, self-discipline, and integrity, affirm the work of the hand invested with energy of mind and spirit and will serve as a continuing force in the improvement of life and culture;

Whereas craft is the hand print of all cultures and through craft we commemorate the multicultural heritage of our Nation and pay tribute to the artistic diversity that exists among all people;

Whereas craft forms the root of our cultural richness, variety, and vitality and serves as a material record that functions as a bridge between past and present;

Whereas craft is an art form that is easily accessible to many individuals;

Whereas Americans of all ages should be provided with opportunities to experience the pleasures of the creative work of the hand through craft;

Whereas the dedicated craftsperson is a role model worthy of emulation by our young;

Whereas craft, inspired by tradition, may be lost unless it is nurtured and unless the economic and social well-being of its practitioners is advanced; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States recognizes the artistry of today's American craftspeople: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The calendar year, 1993, is designated as the "Year of American Craft: A Celebration of the Creative Work of the Hand".

SEC. 2. PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT.

The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the Year of American Craft with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SEC. 3. PROCLAMATIONS BY STATE OFFICIALS.

Each State Governor and each chief executive of each political subdivision of each State is urged to issue a proclamation or other appropriate official statement calling upon the citizens of such State or political subdivision to observe the Year of American Craft with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SEC. 4. CEREMONIES AND ACTIVITIES.

The ceremonies and activities referred to in sections 2 and 3 should—

(1) bring attention to craft throughout America;

(2) recognize the breadth of the contributions made by the craft community in America; and

(3) demonstrate that craft, as an expression of values, is a link that joins humankind.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 546) designating February 4, 1993, and February 3, 1994, as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to speak on this matter.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 546, designating February 3, 1993, and February 4, 1994, as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day." I commend the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for introducing this important measure.

Female athletes and sporting events often do not receive the attention and praise heaped upon their male counterparts. This measure attempts to remedy that. Generations of young men have learned the importance of hard work, physical fitness, endurance, and teamwork from playing sports. Alongside them, however, often unnoticed, many young women were taking home the same virtues from their athletic contests. These young women have grown up to become the parents, laborers, educators, and business and political leaders that have made our Nation great.

As was apparent at the 1992 Olympics, numerous women represented our country to the world in a fair and friendly competition. These women represented all the best America has to offer to the world: dedication, perseverance in the face of adversity, and a commitment to be the very best. As we glory in their triumphs, let us not forget the thousands of hours of practice behind their achievements, as well as the millions of other women who have traveled the same path, playing and practicing and competing far from the bright lights and network TV cameras. Surely we can set aside a single day to show our appreciation for these remarkable women.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 546.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I want to also acknowledge the work of the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], who is the chief sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1920

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 546

Whereas women's athletics is one of the most effective avenues available for women of the United States to develop self-discipline, initiative, confidence, and leadership skills;

Whereas sports and fitness activities contribute to emotional and physical well-being;

Whereas women need strong bodies as well as strong minds;

Whereas the history of women in sports is rich and long, but there has been little national recognition of the significance of women's athletic achievements;

Whereas the number of women in leadership positions as coaches, officials, and administrators has declined drastically since the passage of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;

Whereas there is a need to restore women to leadership positions in athletics to ensure a fair representation of the abilities of women and to provide role models for young female athletes;

Whereas the bonds built between women through athletics help to break down the social barriers of racism and prejudice;

Whereas the communication and cooperation skills learned through athletic experience play a key role in the contributions of an athlete at home, at work, and to society;

Whereas women's athletics has produced such winners as Flo Hyman, whose spirit, talent, and accomplishments distinguished her above others and exhibited the true meaning of fairness, determination, and team play;

Whereas parents feel that sports are equally important for boys and girls and that sports and fitness activities provide important benefits to girls who participate;

Whereas early motor skill training and enjoyable experiences of physical activity strongly influence lifelong habits of physical fitness;

Whereas the performances of female athletes in the Olympic games are a source of inspiration and pride to the United States;

Whereas the athletic opportunities for male students at the collegiate and high school levels remain significantly greater than those for female students; and

Whereas the number of funded research projects focusing on the specific needs of women athletes is limited and the information provided by the projects is imperative to the health and performance of future women athletes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That—

(1) February 4, 1993, and February 3, 1994, are designated as "National Women and Girls in Sports Day"; and

(2) the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on local and State jurisdictions, appropriate Federal agencies, and the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRISH-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 500) designating March 1993 as "Irish-American Heritage Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to acknowledge the work of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. BEN O'GILMAN.

Mr. GILMAN. Begorra, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 500, designating Irish-American Heritage Month. And I would like to commend my colleague from New York [Mr. MANTON] for introducing this resolution.

The Irish, and, in particular, the New York Irish, have had a proud and rich history in the United States of America.

In particular, I would like to commend the many Irish organizations

who have worked over the years to keep Irish tradition alive and to ensure peace and justice for Irish-Americans as well as the many Irish in Northern Ireland who face persecution and discrimination daily.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure, and I urge my colleagues as well to join in support of this important measure.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend all the gentlemen and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for this resolution. There is no question that the Irish in America have made significant cultural contributions. I was always fortunate to have gone to St. Patrick's Elementary School, where learning all the Irish songs and learning the Irish set was mandatory or you did not graduate from St. Patrick's.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, the truth of it is that we have in Greater Cleveland an Irish organization which is an Irish political action committee that really functions not only in endorsing candidates, in talking about the wonderful culture of the Irish people, but it also is very concerned about human rights violations that have taken place in particular in Northern Ireland.

I think that one of the real negligent areas, it seems to me, of our foreign policy is not to speak out more forcefully about the human rights violations that have taken place and continue to take place in Ireland. It is for that reason, when we are honoring the Irish culture, that we never forget that there is still work to be done.

Our country as the leader of the world and as a leader for human rights ought to speak out more clearly and definitively in support of the Irish who are still persecuted to this day.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 500, a resolution I introduced to proclaim the month of March 1993 as "Irish-American-Heritage Month." I am pleased that 218 of my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring this important resolution. I would also like to thank Chairman SAWYER for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Joint Resolution 500 celebrates the heritage of over 40 million Americans of Irish descent. Irish-American Heritage Month is designed to honor all Irish-Americans and complement the hundreds of parades and activities sponsored around the United States every March in honor of St. Patrick's Day.

Mr. Speaker, Irish-Americans have played an important role in U.S. history. Irishman James Hoban assisted in the construction of the U.S. Capitol over 200 years ago. Eight signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish origin. Eighteen Presidents have proudly proclaimed their Irish-American heritage. Irish-born John Barry was the first naval hero of the American Revolution and became known as the Father of the U.S. Navy 190 years ago. The U.S.S. *Sullivans* was commissioned as a naval memorial to the famed Irish-American Sullivan brothers who made the ultimate sacrifice for democracy and freedom in the world 50 years ago. In short, Irish-Americans have contributed greatly to the enrichment of all aspects of life in the United States.

The idea for an Irish-American Heritage Month was first conceived by the late John W. O'Beirne, chairman of the American Foundation for Irish Heritage. The enactment of Irish-American Heritage Month will again serve as a tribute to his hard work and dedication to increase the awareness of Irish-American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank my friend Mr. SAWYER for bringing House Joint Resolution 500 to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 500

Whereas by 1776 nearly 300,000 natives of Ireland had emigrated to the colonies that would become the United States;

Whereas following the victory at Yorktown over the English, a French Major General reported that the Congress owed its existence, and America possibly owed its preservation, to the fidelity of the Irish;

Whereas at least 8 signers of the Declaration of Independence were of Irish origin;

Whereas 18 Presidents have proudly proclaimed their Irish-American heritage;

Whereas 200 years ago, Irish-born James Hoban and Irish immigrants assisted in the construction of the United States Capitol;

Whereas 190 years ago, Irish-born John Barry was the first naval hero of the American Revolution and became known as the "Father of the United States Navy";

Whereas 180 years ago, Commodore Oliver Perry, an Irish-American, achieved his major naval victory in the Battle of Lake Erie;

Whereas 50 years ago, the USS Sullivans was commissioned as a naval memorial to the famed Irish-American Sullivan brothers who made the ultimate sacrifice for democracy and freedom in the world; and

Whereas the Governors and mayors of 37 states and cities have designated March 1992 as "Irish-American Heritage Month": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 1993 is designated as "Irish-American Heritage Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL CREDIT EDUCATION WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate Joint Resolution (S.J. Res. 252) to designate the week of April 18 through 24, 1993, as "National Credit Education Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so simply to acknowledge the patience of the chairman, and we thank the gentleman from Illinois as we move through these 11 or 12 commemoratives.

I certainly join with our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. TORRES], who is the chief sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 252

Whereas consumer credit is an integral part of the free enterprise economy of the United States;

Whereas the vast array of credit products has increasingly complicated the problem and opportunities for consumers;

Whereas the benefits consumers receive from using credit depend upon the prudent use of credit and the prompt discharge of credit obligations;

Whereas educated consumers who know their choices, rights, and responsibilities are better able to use credit wisely, thus increasing economic stability and marketplace competition;

Whereas the increasing sophistication and complexity of the financial marketplace necessitates that consumers be given simple and understandable information about financial products in order to make informed decisions; and

Whereas businesses, schools, community organizations, and individuals should educate the people of the United States concerning consumer credit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 18, 1993, is designated as "National Credit Education Week", and the President is authorized to request to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

ON KILLING OF POLICE OFFICER AND THE NEED FOR CRIME BILL

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, early last Friday, a uniformed Minneapolis police officer was shot in the back, execution style, as he was taking a break in a south Minneapolis pizza parlor frequented by cops.

I have sat with Officer Jerry Haaf and the other third precinct cops at the very cop table where he was shot, drinking coffee and listening to his fishing stories.

Jerry was a regular guy, a good cop who was gunned down simply because he was wearing the uniform.

Mr. Speaker, the two killers of Officer Haaf—alleged gang members who walked into a crowded restaurant and shot a cop in the back—deserve the death penalty.

That's one reason we need to pass the Omnibus Crime Control Act, which imposes the death penalty for some 50 crimes, including the killing of a police officer.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot bring officer Jerry Haaf back, but we can put politics aside and address the problem of violent crime.

Before time runs out on this Congress, let us pass the Violent Crime Control Act of 1991.

VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1992—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration and enactment the "Violent Crime Control Act of 1992." Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

In a speech I delivered recently at the DeSales Catholic Church in Fox Park, Missouri, I outlined my crime agenda for the remainder of this Congress and for next year. I discussed several issues of particular concern to the families of this country such as carjacking, sexual and domestic assault, and gang violence. The enclosed legislative proposal addresses these critical problems.

As you know, I first proposed a comprehensive crime bill to the Congress on June 15, 1989. I again submitted a bill to the 102nd Congress on March 11, 1991. That bill, which has yet to be enacted, includes provisions for restoring and expanding the Federal death penalty, ending the abuse of habeas corpus, reforming the exclusionary rule, and establishing additional crimes and penalties involving the criminal use of firearms. The failure of the Congress to pass these pro-law enforcement proposals is particularly frustrating in light of the broad bipartisan support they enjoy.

I know that there is currently an effort being made to forge a genuine compromise that would include effective death penalty provisions and a version of habeas corpus reform that would be acceptable to me. It is my hope that the Congress will present me with such a compromise, one that is truly meaningful for Federal, State, and local law enforcement. This apparent willingness to work realistically on crime legislation provides the basis for me to call on this Congress to act quickly in its final days to pass the additional crime-fighting measures I am today proposing.

The bill I am transmitting today addresses several of the most significant current threats to public safety. It includes:

1. *New tools for fighting sexual violence* such as increased penalties, new rules of evidence and conduct for trial lawyers, expanded restitution for victims, and grants to State and local law enforcement.

2. *Anti-carjacking provisions* in the form of a new Federal crime, expanded use of law enforcement grants to the States, and a study of devices to prevent carjacking.

3. *Provisions for combating domestic violence* such as a new Federal offense covering spouse abuse, violations of protective orders, and stalking, and a comprehensive grant program to fight domestic violence and enforce child support obligations.

4. *Anti-gang amendments*, including a new RICO-type offense for street gang activities, a new offense for involving a minor in the commission of a violent crime, and broadened adult prosecution of violent juveniles.

5. *New laws for child support enforcement* that will give the Federal Government the ability to punish criminally "deadbeat dads" who leave a State in order to avoid child support or who are significantly late in the payment of child support obligations. The legislation will also assist the States in the enforcement of child support orders.

6. *Increased penalties for crimes against the elderly* that will punish and deter criminals from assaulting or defrauding senior citizens.

7. *New crimes and penalties for the criminal use of firearms* such as a mandatory 10-year sentence for using a semiautomatic firearm in the course of a violent or drug trafficking crime, and a mandatory 5-year sentence for possession of a gun by a dangerous felon.

As the 102nd Congress draws to a close, the Congress has an opportunity to pass legislation that will have a major impact on many of the most serious crime problems facing Americans. The public wants decisive action from government to combat the menacing presence of violent criminals. Let us address this unfinished agenda now.

GEORGE BUSH.

The White House, *September 30, 1992.*

□ 1930

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY L. JOHNSON, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 1992.

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

Attention: Steve Ross/Mike Murray

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule L of the rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut in connection with a trial that is ongoing in that court.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will notify you of my determinations as required by the Rule.

Very truly yours,

NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to transpose the names in the Special Order Calendar on October 2, 1992, of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

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

There was no objection.

NEW ZEALAND, THE UNITED STATES AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps a trite but nevertheless valid observation that in the post-cold war world international relations are increasingly being characterized by reliance on multilateral diplomacy. On issues of war and peace, neither the United States nor any other country is prepared to assume the mantle of lone guarantor of the new world order. Likewise, the strategic challenge posed

by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction cannot be successfully countered by the few, but can only be surmounted with the help and cooperation of the many. And in an interdependent but competitive and market-oriented world economy no nation—or regional grouping of nations—can promote environmentally sustainable prosperity isolated behind exclusionary and discriminatory trade walls.

This vision of a new world order based on multilateral diplomacy, collective security, open trade, fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law is today more widely shared than at any time since the end of World War II. It is expressed in the foreign policies of former adversaries on the Eurasian land mass, like Russia and several of the successor States to the former Soviet Union. And it is also expressed in the foreign policies of historic allies in the South Pacific, like our important strategic partner in Australia and our old and dear friends in New Zealand.

As the Honorable Don McKinnon, New Zealand's Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of External Relations and Trade, observed recently: "No country—least of all New Zealand which in a geographical sense is so isolated—can afford to stand alone." In this regard, despite the strains in our bilateral relationship caused by the nuclear issue, it should be understood that New Zealand has historically made, and continues to make, impressive contributions to strengthening both international as well as regional peace and security.

New Zealand's commitment to international collective security was demonstrated anew during the gulf war. At that time, Wellington sent two C–130 transport aircraft and two medical teams to demonstrate New Zealand's solidarity with the multinational forces confronting Iraqi aggression in the Persian Gulf. More broadly, over the years New Zealand has contributed personnel to U.N. peacekeeping endeavors in almost every corner of the globe: in Korea, Egypt, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Israel, Kashmir, the Congo, Yemen, Cyprus, the Golan Heights, the Iran-Iraq border, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Namibia, Nicaragua, Angola, the former Yugoslavia, and Cambodia. In fact, since 1950 New Zealand has participated in 15 of the U.N.'s 26 peacekeeping operations. Unlike the United States, New Zealand consistently makes full and prompt payment of its peacekeeping assessment.

Given this record of impressive commitment to the U.N. system and collective security, I would hope that the administration would give very serious consideration to New Zealand's announced candidacy for election to one of the two U.N. Security Council seats available to the Western European and other states group [WEOG] for the 2-year term 1993–94.

New Zealand has also been an active participant in helping to strengthen regional peace and security. Wellington has demonstrated its commitment to improving the efficacy of the U.N. as an instrument of collective security most dramatically in its own backyard, the Asia-Pacific, by contributing almost 100 personnel to the unprecedented U.N. peacekeeping operation in Cambodia. New Zealand continues to play an important role in the five power defense arrangements—which recently concluded its 12th annual exercises—involving Australia, Malaysia, Singapore, the United Kingdom as well as New Zealand, which are playing an important role in providing stability in southeast Asia. New Zealand is also seeking to upgrade the capability of its navy by following through on frigate purchases from Australia. As a complement to New Zealand's security commitments, the great bulk of Wellington's foreign assistance is spent promoting economic development in the South Pacific and southeast Asia. Likewise, New Zealand plays an important and vigorous role in providing humanitarian assistance and disaster relief throughout the South Pacific. New Zealand has also shown its commitment to regional cooperation through its participation in the 15-member South Pacific Forum.

Like the United States, New Zealand understands that the key to future world growth is expanding economic opportunities through open markets and free trade. Wellington's top priority for 1992 has been working with the United States and others to achieve a successful result in the Uruguay round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT]. New Zealand and the United States are also working closely to cooperate through the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation [APEC] process to stimulate cooperative, open, and outward-looking approaches toward strengthening economic and trade links in the Asia-Pacific region.

In point of fact, despite our sticky differences on the nuclear ship visit and NCND issue, the United States and New Zealand enjoy an enormous commonality of values and interests. In particular, each shares elements of common heritage and shared sacrifice in the great war of this century. Each shares a vision of international relations based on cooperative problem solving, peaceful settlement of disputes, and collective security. With continued good will and farsighted leadership on both sides, our common efforts to support the U.N. system and a liberal international order should make it easier to resolve our differences over the nuclear issue and revive the ANZUS alliance.

In this regard, I have enjoyed the high privilege of working with a senior colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee who has long recognized America's important and multifaceted interests in the South Pacific, with New Zealand, and in ANZUS: our retiring distinguished ranking member, Representative WILLIAM BROOMFIELD.

Under our constitutional framework, U.S. foreign policy can only succeed with bi-institutional as well as bipartisan cooperation. I know of no Member of Congress who has done more in his many long years in this body to promote this cooperative spirit, in word and in deed, than my distinguished colleague from Michigan. He has worked with Republican and Democrat administrations, as well as Members on both sides of the aisle, to do what is right, and at all times act in the national interest. Our committee and our country will miss his leadership.

It is especially appropriate, therefore, that I bring to the attention of my colleagues an important article by our distinguished ranking Member on the subject of our bilateral relations with New Zealand. I commend it highly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 1, 1992]

NUKES, THE NAVY, AND NEW ZEALAND

(By William S. Broomfield)

Despite a history of close ties based on shared interests and values, relations between the United States and New Zealand have been strained since 1985, when New Zealand's former Labour government decided no longer to allow visits by US Navy vessels if they are nuclear powered or potentially nuclear armed. In 1986 the Reagan administration cut off security links with our former ally. Based on development in New Zealand and the wider world, however, I believe the time has come to consider lifting sanctions and restoring military relations.

The action of then Prime Minister David Lange's government precluded full military cooperation with the US, including under the ANZUS alliance among Australia, New Zealand, and our country. It also affected US interests elsewhere in the world, where the nuclear issue is often raised in connection with US military operations. That's because the US, for security reasons, will neither confirm nor deny the presence of nuclear weapons with US forces.

Despite calls for broader action, the response of the Reagan administration was confined to the security area. The US cut off military relations, including intelligence sharing, and withdrew the security assistance and arms-export preferences enjoyed by New Zealand under its allied status. It also limited high-level contacts on military and security matters. The US's alliance commitments toward New Zealand were suspended.

The US and New Zealand have had a long and friendly relationship. Many Americans became familiar with New Zealand during World War II and as a result of its participation in the Korean and Vietnam Wars. More recently, New Zealand lent logistical support and medical assistance during the military conflict with Iraq. Influenced by antinuclear activists, however, the Labour government provoked a confrontation with the US over ship visits, actually forcing the Navy frigate Buchanan to turn around enroute. Not content merely to adopt a policy that excluded US naval vessels, the Labour government enacted it as law.

In 1987 I proposed legislation that would have reciprocated for the actions of the Labour government by enacting the Reagan administration's restrictions on security assistance into law. My intent in so doing was not to punish New Zealand, but to highlight the issue and keep up the pressure for its resolution. I felt then, and feel now, that to allow relations to continue in their current form would damage our long-term interests in the South Pacific and elsewhere in the world.

Since the rupture in our security relationship, the preparedness of the New Zealand military has declined. This affects not only New Zealand's traditional role in the South Pacific, but also its ability to play a constructive role in security developments outside the region, such as international peacekeeping operations.

Under the current National Party government in New Zealand, the atmosphere of bilateral relations has improved markedly. Prime Minister Jim Bolger has responded positively to President Bush's decision to remove nuclear weapons from US warships except strategic submarines, and has in effect invited the US Navy back. I believe that we should respond by moving to solve this problem as speedily as possible and consider re-

suming port calls as well as other aspects of the military relationship.

Granted, it would be difficult for the US to resume normal military contacts, possibly even an alliance relationship, at this time. The New Zealand antinuclear legislation remains on the books and the current government, which is preoccupied with economic problems, may not seek to amend it during its present term. (The government has taken tentative steps on the nuclear-power issue by appointing a commission to study the safety of nuclear propulsion.)

Even if security ties cannot be completely resumed, however, consideration should be given to relaxing current sanctions to permit limited military and intelligence contacts. Despite the risks, Washington should seize the current opportunity to help the New Zealand government bring its country back into the Western system of military relations and alliances.

TRIBUTE TO GERALD AND JANICE SALOW

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

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding couple, Gerald and Janice Salow. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting this remarkable couple, and in congratulating them on being chosen as this year's recipient of the 1992 Ingham County Farm Bureau's Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award.

The success of America is a result of the hardworking men and women, like Gerald and Janice Salow, who work every day of the year to produce food for America's table and for much of our world. I am truly thankful that our agriculture community has been represented so strongly through their service, dedication, and hard work. Their contributions to Michigan agriculture and in promoting the prosperity and well-being of farmers throughout our Nation are truly deserving of our appreciation and praise.

In addition to managing a successful farming operation, the Salows have a long list of involvement in numerous agriculture organizations including the Ingham County Farm Bureau where Mr. Salow has served as president for the past 3 years; the Michigan Farm Bureau; 4–H; and the American Farm Bureau. The Salows have provided critical leadership in the areas of agriculture promotion, education, policy development, and in membership activities.

The Salows have spent virtually a lifetime together, forging a true union of partnership in their 40 years of marriage. Success and devotion are qualities they both possess, qualities that shine through in their marriage and in their contributions to their community and church. The Salows are longtime members of the Stockbridge United Methodist Church, and Mrs. Salow recently received the Second Century Award from the Methodist Women's Committee for her achievements. In addition to their agricultural gifts, the Salows have been bestowed with 6 loving children and have graciously opened their home to 28 foster children.

At this time when everyone is talking about family values, I am proud to stand here today to say that no one has better and more true values than my friends, Gerald and Janice Salow. They are a symbol of what every American should aspire to be, and the people of our community can look to them with pride and inspiration.

It is my hope that the Salows will continue to play an important role in our community for decades to come. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting this outstanding couple for their tremendous accomplishments, and in wishing them the best of luck in their future endeavors.

TAIWANESE MEMBERSHIP IN GATT

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, GATT Council Ministers began consideration of Taiwan's application for membership to GATT [the General Agreement for Tariffs and Trade] the world's largest and most important trade body.

Taiwan has long sought membership in this important body both to gain international recognition and to gain new markets for its exports. Claiming its historical status as a major trading territory, Taiwan wishes to be GATT's newest member.

While this Member welcomes this important and long-awaited initiative to consider Taiwan's application for membership in GATT, it is extremely important to point out that Taiwan must substantially reform many of its restrictive trade practices before it can be accepted into this world body.

Nearly 2 months prior to the GATT deliberations, this Member spoke about Taiwan's excessive tariffs and nontariff barriers to United States agricultural products despite its $9.8 billion trade surplus with the United States in 1991. Today, those substantial barriers and obstacles to trade remain unchanged.

In order to become a member of GATT, it has been agreed upon by GATT's 104 members that Taiwan will have to enter as a developed country. That means that Taiwan must abide by all new and existing international trade agreements to reduce their significant barriers to imports.

Unfortunately, Taiwan has a long way to go to satisfy these criteria. The USDA reports that Taiwan has continually denied access to many high value United States agricultural products through excessively high tariffs, de facto import bans, or other nontariff barriers. Despite numerous commitments from Taiwan authorities, the USDA also reports that Taiwan has slowed down their reforms—even resorted to greater protection—to control the import of United States agricultural products.

For example, Taiwan's food management law constitutes a very real and substantial threat to United States exports of feed grains, soybeans, and wheat valued at $1.2 billion in 1991. De facto import bans virtually exclude from Taiwan rice, chicken, pork, peanuts, sugar, and wheat flour from the United States. United States beef exports face exorbitant tariffs and most high-value and consumer oriented agricultural products from the United States—like apples, pears, citrus, peaches, grapes, fruit juices, soups, raisins, and dried fruits—are subject to tariffs between 40 and 50 percent.

It is clear that, together, these unreasonable restrictions on United States agricultural exports to Taiwan makes it extremely difficult for otherwise highly competitive United States agricultural industries to sell their products to Taiwanese consumers. Taiwanese consumers also suffer because they are forced to pay some of the highest prices in the world for their food.

A recent article on Taiwan in the USDA's August publication of Agricultural Trade Highlights states that young Taiwanese consumers are hungry for United States food products and therefore concludes that Taiwan should be among the best markets for United States food consumer products during the next 3 to 6 years.

However, unless Taiwan representatives decide to substantially reform their excessive barriers to United States agricultural products, these Taiwanese consumers will pay substantially more or be flatly denied their choice of United States food products. Such blatant obstacles to trade, unless removed, must be predominantly considered when GATT members make their determination on whether to accept Taiwan's application for membership into the world trade body.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, this Member would have strong reservations about the acceptance of Taiwan into GATT unless these protectionist measures are adequately addressed. This Member encourages the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and other Members of Congress to advocate and negotiate an equally strong position that Taiwan make these reforms before it can become a member of GATT.

INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL TO HONOR WORLD WAR II ERA PHILIPPINE SCOUTS AND FILIPINO VETERANS OF U.S. ARMY

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce a joint resolution which would pay long overdue tribute to the World War II-era Philippine Scouts and Filipino veterans who honorably served the U.S. Army. These dedicated individuals demonstrated unique cour-

age and resolve in support of the allied war effort and they deserve our gratitude and recognition.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of the fierce battle at Corregidor and the Bataan death march in the Philippines. Yet for those who fought under the command of Gen. Douglas MacArthur in the heroic defense of Bataan and Corregidor against Imperial Japan and who survived the infamous Bataan death march and captivity in Japanese prison camps, these memories have not faded. During these historic events and throughout the war, the Philippine Scouts displayed selfless sacrifice rivaling any other military unit. In addition to the Philippine Scouts, many Filipinos also served in the U.S. Army and again the courage and dedication of the Filipino people was displayed. Unfortunately, this same bravery which was demonstrated during World War II has gone virtually unacknowledged in the intervening years.

I am pleased to make note that this important issue was the subject of hearings and attention by the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials during the 100th Congress. The truth is, however, that the dream of a memorial for the Scouts and Filipino Americans is a long way from realization.

Mr. Speaker, let us allow this integral segment of the U.S. Armed Forces to fulfill their dreams and establish a tangible memorial for all to reflect on their contributions.

It is important to emphasize that the Philippine Scouts were not foreign soldiers; they were a vital part of the U.S. Army from the date of the unit's creation in 1901. At the onslaught of war in the Pacific, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and invaded the Philippine Islands, these soldiers became the key to our entire South Pacific strategy. Against overwhelming odds, faced with superior numbers and equipment, devoid of air cover against constant bombings by the Japanese, and ravaged by malaria and beri-beri, these men helped hold the Bataan Peninsula for 98 days. Over 1,000 went on the fight another 5 weeks in Corregidor. This determined resistance denied the Japanese an essential base for the projected thrust into the South Pacific. The enemy was also forced to retain a large army and navel force in the Philippines, which otherwise could have been deployed against allied shipping of men and materials to Australia and New Caledonia from the United States and the Middle East.

Frankly, it was the Scouts' protracted defense of these islands that allowed the United States to recover from the first blows of the war and regroup for what would utlimately prove to be a successful counterattack. Their contributions and sacrifice have been noted in historical accounts of the war. Indeed, General MacArthur described the Scouts as "excellent troops, completely professional, loyal and devoted." However, they have never received the gratitude and the honor from the United States that they rightly deserve. The time has come to give them this recognition.

The joint resolution I am again introducing would authorize the establishment of a memorial to the World War II-era Philippine Scouts in the Washington, DC, area. Specifically, this joint resolution would authorize the Philippine Scouts and U.S. Veterans' Association of America to establish a memorial which would recognize and honor the contributions of the Philippines Scouts in Bataan and Corregidor. The responsibility for raising the necessary funds for the establishment of this memorial would be left solely to the Philippine Scouts association named in the resolution. No Federal dollars would be used to establish the memorial.

World War II was a war fought on fronts that could not have been won without strategic ties to other peoples. We have consistently paid tribute to the cooperation of our European allies, but have virtually ignored our similar relationship with our friends in the Pacific. It is time that we recognize the achievements and sacrifices made by the people of the Filippino-Americans during World War II. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to demonstrate our deep gratitude for the faithful and gallant Philippine Scouts by cosponsoring this joint resolution as a sign of their support in this final week of the 102d Congress.

H.J. RES. —

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMORIAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Philippine Scouts and United States Veterans' Association of America is authorized to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor Filipino veterans who served in the United States Army during World War II.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the memorial shall be in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to provide standards for placement of commemorative works on certain Federal lands in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes" approved November 14, 1986 (40 U.S.C. 1001, et seq.).

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.

The Philippine Scouts and United States Veterans' Association of America shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial. No Federal funds may be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial.

SEC. 3. DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.

If, upon payment of all expenses of the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount provided for in section 8(b) of the Act referred to in section 1(b)), or upon expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 10(b) of that Act, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Philippine Scouts and United States Veterans' Association of America shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the account provided for in section 8(b)(1) of that Act.

TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING MEMBERS OF OHIO DELEGATION

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for joining me today in this special tribute to Members of the Ohio Democratic congressional delegation. On our side of the aisle, four distinguished Members of our delegation will depart at the close of this legislative session. Collectively, Representatives DONALD PEASE, DENNIS ECKART, EDWARD FEIGHAN, and CHARLES LUKEN have amassed more than 37 years in the Congress. Individually, they have represented the State of Ohio and their congressional districts in an outstanding manner over the years.

With their departure, our State and the Nation lose the services of four dedicated, hard working and talented legislators. As dean of the Ohio Democratic delegation, I am honored to lead my colleagues in this special order recognizing the contributions of DON PEASE, DENNIS ECKART, ED FEIGHAN, and CHARLES LUKEN to this body.

Mr. Speaker, DON PEASE is completing his eighth term in the Congress, having been elected in 1976 to represent Ohio's 13th Congressional District. He brought to the House of Representatives his experience as member of the Oberlin City Council and the Ohio General Assembly, where he served as both a State representative and as State senator.

In the Congress, DON has served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and Science and Technology. Currently, he served on the Ways and Means Committee and its Subcommittee on Trade. On the subcommittee, DON has focused his efforts on reforms that will enable American businesses to compete in the global marketplace, as well as legislation to help local industry and workers adjust to the changing world. DON PEASE is also a key architect of legislation representing the most comprehensive overhaul of our Nation's trade laws in 20 years. DON PEASE has been able to actively demonstrate his commitment to human rights as a member of the Trade Subcommittee. He is well known for his efforts to link a country's eligibility for trade benefits to its respect for human rights and workers rights.

Mr. Speaker, DON was also appointed as a member of the Budget Committee. He is an advocate of reforming our current tax system to make it simpler and more fair. DON was a conferee on the landmark Tax Reform Act of 1986.

Mr. Speaker, throughout his tenure in the Congress, DON PEASE has been an influential voice on State, national, and international issues. He has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues in the Ohio delegation for his leadership in coordinating our delegation meetings. He is valued as a hard working individual; a conscientious legislator; and a staunch advocate on behalf of his constituency. It has been an honor and privilege to serve in the Congress with this distinguished gentleman and I wish him much continued success.

Mr. Speaker, DENNIS ECKART came to the Congress in 1980 to represent Ohio's 11th Congressional District. Many of us can recall that he advanced quickly up the ladder. During his first term in Congress, DENNIS was elected freshman whip, a unique and outstanding accomplishment. During his first term, he was also cited repeatedly for his legislative ability, and quickly labeled as an outstanding new Member of the 100th Congress.

In the House, DENNIS has served with distinction as a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In addition, he chairs the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Deregulation, and Ecology of the House Committee on Small Business. DENNIS also devotes considerable efforts to monitoring legislation and laws that impact the Northeast region, serving as vice chairman of the Northeast-Midwest congressional coalition.

Mr. Speaker, DENNIS ECKART has successfully authored key environmental legislation here in the Congress. He sponsored legislation to update the Superfund Program to reform management of dangerous toxic chemcial waste sites; he sponsored the Safe Drinking Water Act to protect the quality of our Nation's drinking water; and the Great Lakes Research and Management Act to remove toxins threatening the quality of the Great Lakes. In addition, DENNIS is the author of many key provisions of the historic Clean Air Act, including those relating to urban smog and acid rain.

Throughout his tenure in Congress, meeting the needs of his constituency has been the cornerstone of his legislative career. In the 11th District, DENNIS ECKART has won the respect of his constituency for his hard work on their behalf. He is an exceptional legislator and he is concerned about those for whom he have been chosen to speak. I respect DENNIS ECKART as my colleagues and I have valued his friendship over the years.

EDWARD FEIGHAN was elected to the Congress in 1982, representing the 19th Congressional District of Ohio. This was not, however, his first legislative assignment. At the age of 24, ED FEIGHAN was elected as a member of the Ohio General Assembly. He is also a former Cuyahoga County Commissioner.

Early in his first term in this body, ED was named chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Task Force on International Narcotics Control. By virtue of his election, he became the first freshman Member to hold a chairmanship during the 98th Congress. ED continues to chair this important task force.

ED FEIGHAN also serves as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and its Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, and the International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee. In addition, ED is a member of the Subcommittee on Africa. In the area of foreign affairs, ED FEIGHAN has been a strong and consistent supporter of the State of Israel. He has also worked tirelessly to expand foreign assistance to the poorest sections of the Third World. He is respected by his colleagues and well known outside this body for his expertise in foreign affairs.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, ED has made a name for himself on several key issues. He is a member of the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice and the Subcommittee on Economic and Commercial Law. In the Congress, ED FEIGHAN will be remembered for his sponsorship of the Brady bill, which imposed a 7-day waiting period on the sale of handguns. ED FEIGHAN has also developed legislation to ban the sale of plastic guns; to ban semiautomatic weapons; provide scholarships for law enforcement personnel, and set national standards for bulletproof vests.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed a close working relationship with ED FEIGHAN over the years. Often he and I have had opportunities to work together on projects to benefit the Greater Cleveland area. I have enormous respect for his skills as a legislator. More importantly, however, I value ED FEIGHAN's friendship and admire his dedication on behalf of his constituency and our Nation. His name will always be remembered in these Halls and I join others in wishing him well.

Mr. Speaker, CHARLES J. LUKEN was elected to the House in 1991 to represent Ohio's First Congressional District. Many of us in this body were honored to serve with CHARLIE'S father, Tom Luken, during his distinguished career in the House.

Prior to his election to Congress, CHARLIE was a member of the Cincinnati City Council from 1981 to 1984. In 1984, he was elected mayor of Cincinnati where he enjoyed a distinguished record of service to his constituency.

In the House, CHARLIE has worked tirelessly as a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. His subcommittee assignments include Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance, the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization and the Subcommittee on Policy Research and Insurance.

CHARLIE LUKEN was also appointed to the Committee on Government Operations. As a member of the Subcommittee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources, CHARLIE has been directly involved in the debate on the environmental, safety and health concerns associated with the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex. He is also a member of the Subcommittee on Employment and Housing.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to serve with CHARLIE LUKEN in this body. He has earned a reputation as a hard worker and he has served his constituency and the Nation in an outstanding manner.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield to the distinguished dean of the Ohio congressional delegation, who is himself also retiring at the end of this Congress.

I want to say that while we paid honor to him a few nights ago in a special order on this floor that I want to reiterate what a pleasure it has been for me to work with him as co-dean of our delegation. It has been an experience where together we have put many meetings together for the purpose of our delegation meetings, generally at least once a month, and in other cases when necessary. He and I have had an excellent working relationship, and I deem it an honor to yield to him at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the gentleman in the well, asked me to join him in paying tribute to four department members of our Ohio delegation, DON PEASE, ED FEIGHAN, DENNIS ECKART, and CHARLIE LUKEN.

□ 1950

I would just like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LOU STOKES, with whom I have had the pleasure and honor of serving as, as he mentioned, co-dean, and I will say co-chairman, of the Ohio delegation. We have worked well together, and I think in working well together we have contributed enormously to the success of the Ohio delegation's influence as far as getting things done for the State of Ohio.

One of the sadnesses I feel is due to the fact that I will not be serving with LOU in the 103d Congress. He has been a gentleman, and it has been my pleasure to work with him.

As a member of a party on the other side of the aisle from those we honor, it is only natural and I would not always see eye to eye with them on legislation. But I note that each of these gentlemen has represented their country, the State of Ohio, and their districts diligently and with honor.

DON, ED, DENNIS, and CHARLIE have contributed in the areas of public service to their country, and it has been a high honor and pleasure to have served with them.

In addition to his distinction as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means DON PEASE, should be recognized for the hard work he has done as part of the Ohio delegation, for being a cat-

alyst who put together nonpartisan meetings that Congressman LOU STOKES and I have had the honor of chairing.

DON, you have brought in people who were knowledgeable speakers, and you have helped to keep us advised very well on various issues of mutual concern to our State. I think as a result of that the fact that LOU STOKES, DON PEASE, and I worked together with Gov. George Voinovich and State officials, that we have brought benefit to the State of Ohio and have enhanced the process of bringing programs to our State.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from Ohio, ED FEIGHAN, for his yeoman service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary. Particularly, I commend him for his diligent effort on behalf of the Brady bill, which I had the honor to cosponsor with him and speak in favor of.

I know on occasion it was a lonely fight for ED, but his commitment to overcome any and every obstacle prevailed and did him justice and honor.

DENNIS ECKART has worked very hard on the important Committee on Energy and Commerce, as the gentleman in the well has mentioned, in helping shape critical environmental legislation, on such issues as clean air and hazardous waste disposal.

I also note he has been one of the all-stars on the congressional baseball team. If weather cooperates, he will be representing his party on the diamond this weekend.

Now, there is where I draw the line, I am sorry. I must root for the other team, Ohioan or not.

Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE LUKEN has only been on the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs for 1 term, but he is one of those young men who is knowledgeable on the issue of banking. He has worked honorably and well, and I would say he has supported me on several issues which I felt were important to banking legislation. And I am grateful for that.

I want to wish him the very best in his new field of endeavor, which will be journalism. I know his father, who served in this body honorably and effectively, and who is a friend of mine. I know he is proud of CHARLIE's services in Congress, and I know he will be glad to get his son home as will his nice family.

So I would congratulate each and every one of these gentleman for the contributions they have made in making our country a better place in which to live and serve.

Mr. Speaker, the people of the 2d, 11th, 13th, and 19th Districts of Ohio should be proud of their retiring Members of Congress.

May I say it is indeed a privilege for me to have served with these hard-working men.

My wife, Marjorie, and I want to wish each of them and their families happiness and satisfaction in the years to come.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his contribution. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield to my distinguished friend and colleague, who also represents Cleveland, OH, and does so in such a distinguished manner, the gentlewomen from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the dean of our delegation for having this special order. I want to certainly identify myself with the chronology of work that the four individuals have done. I will not repeat them.

I also want to pay tribute to two other Members on the other side of the aisle who are not going to come back to this body.

First, CHALMERS WYLIE, the minority leader on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, has done a tremendous amount of work in his wonderfully moderate style and added so much to the dignity and the lives of the American people, not only in areas related to banking but also in areas relating to the wonderful field of housing.

Mr. Speaker, he has been tremendously cooperative in a bipartisan way.

So, CHALMERS, I want to say how sorry I am that you decided not to run. You are an excellent person, and Ohio loses significantly by your not being on that committee and not returning.

You have served this body and the country and all Ohioans with great dignity.

Mr. Speaker, the same is true for CLARENCE MILLER.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield momentarily to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think I would be remiss, after hearing those nice remarks about me, if I did not say "thanks" to the gentlewoman from Cleveland, and I would say it has been a pleasure to serve and to work with her on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. She is a very sensitive person who is a fighter for causes in which she believes. I know that is true in the area of housing, which she just mentioned. We are working together on a housing conference right now, working together to provide housing for people who are most in need of housing.

So, as I say, it is a pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I will miss our association.

Ms. OAKAR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, also CLARENCE MILLER, who is a long-time Member of this body from the southern part of our State, has served on the Committee on Appropriations with great dignity and service to his community and our State.

We are losing, as Congressman STOKES has said, with respect to the Democratic Members who decided not to run for office, 40 years of accumulated service in Congress, four key Democratic Members: DON PEASE, my classmate, ED FEIGHAN, DENNIS ECKART, and CHARLIE LUKEN.

Mr. Speaker, all have made major contributions during their time in office here, and their constituents and the Nation, I think, have been better served because of their service.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to give a capsule view of these colleagues from my point of view. I know there are many others who want to speak tonight.

Mr. Speaker, DON PEASE and I came into Congress together in 1977. He has represented, among other places, our neighboring Lorain County.

I think DON is a man of enormous integrity who worked tirelessly in so many areas as a senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I will always remember him especially for his work as whip of our delegation and his wonderful way of asking you to support certain issues and the very conscientious way of trying to get the Ohio delegation organized.

I also think one of the key areas that sometimes is overlooked that DON has done so much on is the area of displaced workers, those people who lost their jobs because of some of the unfair trade practices and so on.

Some of the areas that DON and others have represented have double-digit unemployment. If it were not for DON PEASE'S legislation and work, I suppose these people would have lost not only their economic security but their survival. So I am proud to have served with DON.

□ 2000

DENNIS ECKART, as Congressman STOKES mentioned, rose very, very rapidly in this House. I think from my point of view he is especially well known for his diligence as a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Superfund, the toxic wastes, all those areas that influence our lives in a very negative fashion. I think DENNIS has done some very fine work in those areas of legislation, along with legislation relative to the cable industry and consumer-oriented legislation that was recently passed.

CHARLIE LUKEN served on the Banking Committee with CHALMERS and myself. He was a welcome addition. He was very conscientious in the brief time that he has been a Member of Congress, and of course, his family has a record of public service. His father, Tom, was an excellent Member in his own right.

I had heard of CHARLIE when he was mayor of Cincinnati, the beautiful city of Cincinnati, and did such a wonderful job. I think it is with great regret that someone as young and conscientious has decided not to run again, but he is

putting his family first, and really that is very understandable.

Congressman ED FEIGHAN and I have a long history of mutual support in our public lives. I remember working on ED's first campaign when he ran for state representative, a campaign that people thought he could not win and ended up winning handily.

I think so much about ED relates to his compassion for people less fortunate than himself.

He was courageous in going to Korea to protest and to assure that human rights were not violated, and he risked his life, really, to go there.

He has gone to Central America and attempted to deal with the problems of inequity that existed, and the list goes on, and his wonderful service on the Foreign Affairs Committee; but I think the lasting imprint that I will always feel no one will ever be able to take away is his wonderful work on the Brady bill. It took a lot of courage to introduce that bill. He had very powerful lobbyists against him, and yet I really believe that the public awareness of this issue, the whole issue of having handguns being bought in a wholesale fashion and not being able to have any kind of standards and a waiting period, et cetera, will be ED's lasting legacy not only to this body, but the country.

I really believe from the bottom of my heart that that legislation will in the awareness that we all have from it, will save thousands and thousands of lives. No one can ever take that kind of service away.

His family has a legacy of public service. There have been many Feighans who have consistently won in our area, and ED did his family very proud by his years of service.

So Mr. Speaker, we are seeing here tonight men who brought special talents to the House of Representatives. Sometimes with all the negative things that are written these days about Members of Congress, you wonder if anyone will ever say things that are aboslutely true about Members who have served. Perhaps no one will ever write a book about these gentlemen and their service, but I feel very, very strongly that they have achieved notable success in pursuing their respective legislation.

I also believe that the quality of life of the residents of Ohio and the United States have been served very, very well.

I hope their successors bring the same degree of honor to this greatest deliberative body in the world, the greatest parliament in the world, the Congress of the United States.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her contribution to this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield to my very distinguished friend and colleague from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman for Ohio as stated earlier, and also the remarks of Chairman WYLIE, who I am saddened to see leaving the Congress, and Chairwoman OAKAR.

Being in the Congress now for four terms, I have had an opportunity to work closely with these Members.

I want to first of all commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] for his tremendous service on the Tax Committee.

I want to thank him personally for helping me at a time when we had a company in my district that got in the middle of the investment tax scenario. They had made an investment, but the rules were changed in the middle of the game and they were sort of left hanging.

I want to thank DON PEASE for helping me with North Star Steel. We were able to work that out and get language in the transition rule of the tax bill which helped my company. I think that is the legacy of DON PEASE. In a quiet way, he has helped a lot of people.

I want to echo the remarks of Chairwoman OAKAR. I think he made sure that in all these trade bills, which many of us may not support, he took after the welfare of many of those workers who were adversely affected by some of those policies and actions.

DENNIS ECKART, my neighbor to the north, has developed into a leader. I think he had his fingerprints all over Superfund and many of the other energy and commerce initiatives. He did a tremendous job. I think everybody in the Congress recognizes his tremendous ability. We will miss him.

ED FEIGHAN, I was very glad to support ED in his efforts with the Brady bill, and I think anything that is said about that is not enough. I think he did take on some powerful lobbies in the Congress, but he went full steam ahead. He also will be missed.

Although we did not spend a whole lot of time and get to know CHARLIE LUKEN very well, I knew his dad quite well. I think that he is beginning to make a mark here. He could be here probably as long as he wanted to be. I think it is indicative of his insight that he had other priorities. He decided to go back home. I think that says a little bit about Mr. LUKEN.

CHALMERS WYLIE and CLARENCE MILLER, both on the other side, I was glad to have worked with them. I can say this, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, Ohio is taking a big hit. It will be many years before these Members and their absence will be replaced. I do not believe that we can do that. It will be very hard to fill the shoes of these Members. I think their years of experience and their legislative effectiveness is really going to hurt Ohio. So I think that Ohio has a tough job ahead of us. I think we all look toward the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] to carry on for us.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution to this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and commend him for reminding all of us in the busy closing days of this Congress, the 102d Congress, of the distinguished service of the Members from the delegation.

Last week I had the privilege to put a statement in the RECORD with regard to CHALMERS WYLIE.

I certainly want to recognize the service of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER] on the Republican side of the aisle. Both men have been long-term Members and have made significant contributions, but tonight appropriately we recognize our fellow Democrats who served with us in the caucus, who have been helpful this last term and beyond, way beyond in terms of our service and the work that we do in terms of public policy.

CHARLES LUKEN just came a couple years ago to us on the Banking Committee. I had the privilege of serving with him. He has performed well in that role.

The Banking Committee is not the committee everyone seeks to serve on these days because of tough decisions dealing with the S&L's and banking; but I can report to this body and to others that he proved himself very well and did very well on that particular assignment and was a key in a number of tough decisions that have had to be made.

Of course, he did not come to it new. He had the seasoned experience of having worked on the city council and city government in Cincinnati. He will be a loss.

I think he has a promising career ahead of him. There is life after Congress, and certainly for him he will have I am sure a bright career back home in Cincinnati, OH.

DENNIS ECKART I think has served many years in this body, served on the Energy and Commerce Committee. It was apparent from the beginning that DENNIS ECKART was someone who did his homework and took that information and applied it.

He worked as one of our whips on the Democratic side. He was one of the people, as Congressman STOKES noted tonight, had worked on a lot of key legislation that has truly been the hallmark of the 1980's in terms of clean air and Superfund that moved through that committee.

DENNIS really was one of the key people working with the leadership of that committee. In fact, he knew how to demonstrate a certain amount of inde-

pendence, but I think also a lot of collaboration and cooperation.

We wish DENNIS well as he goes on to his future, a bright young person who I think this Nation has been well served by.

□ 2010

And of course ED FEIGHAN had been mentioned, his work in human rights, his work on tough legislative questions when special interests were stacked against him. He persisted.

Mr. Speaker, we only had 120 votes on handgun control. I was one of them, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] was another one, and in the end we turned that around with some drastic success. This session, hopefully, we will see that handgun waiting period signed into law before we leave here.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us recognize the type of work and the type of pressure that he took on in fighting those types of tasks, and I think, while it is demonstrated more in that particular case, it really proves the character.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, tonight I just would like to comment a little more at length about the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE], someone who I served with for 16 years and I think has done an outstanding job in terms of serving this Nation, serving the great State of Ohio.

I say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] that, as he has noted, serving as a whip for our then incoming class in 1977, time goes by so quickly that it is hard to reflect that it has been 16 years of work because in many respects I think DON looks the same and has maintained his demeanor throughout these 16 years.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I think that the shape of public law, whether it deals with welfare reform, whether it deals with trade adjustment and trade laws, whether it deals with workers rights, I remember one of his first actions was we took on working on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. There was DON PEASE who actually served in another committee around here before he was promoted, I guess, to the Committee on Ways and Means. He served in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and he took on the brutal dictator in Africa and really led the then Carter administration to focus on the policy of Idi Amin and the problems that were occurring in Africa at that time, and so often, I think, these nations that are less developed, have less focus, are not that we are very much European-centric, as it were, in terms of our foreign policy, but I think that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE] in that case played a very important role as the conscience of the House and, finally, of the Nation, to deal with the type of repression that was going on in Uganda at that time. And so I can remember when he started out.

Then, of course, he slipped from the Committee on Ways and Means and did the yeoman service that has really characterized, I think, more his contributions in the future, and while his name—he had to be satisfied being in an omnibus tax bill, an omnibus welfare bill, an omnibus trade bill, I do not think—I think that we understand the measure of success.

I am very happy now that I have talked to DON, and DON is going to take his famous walking, his legendary walking, programs in the parks and public lands, and he is going to do a personal oversight work for me in these areas. So, I will be well equipped and armed to come back here and to hold accountable the Park Service, the Forest Service and others because of DON PEASE's work and the work of his walking shoes in those areas. So, I am looking forward to getting that information back and employing his as one of my agents out in the broad parks and public lands of this Nation. I know he is looking forward to fulfilling that new mission that I am assigning to him this evening.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for having yielded to me.

Congressman DON PEASE has been an outstanding Member, indeed an ideal Member of Congress throughout his service over the past 16 years in the U.S. House of Representatives.

DON PEASE and I began our service together and over the course have become good friends. While assigned to different committees, we found significant common interests and concerns with regards to many public and policy issues.

I will miss his thoughtful analysis and objective review of the issues before his committee that he shared with the Members and specifically with this Member and our informal commutes back and forth to the Hill when we could share, in depth, the issues before our respective committees. Certainly, this type of synergy is what underlies the basic strength of the legislative branch of our Government.

While DON PEASE has been satisfied to contribute behind the scenes to the big tax bills or the omnibus reconciliation measures or welfare reform, he is surely recognized by Members as a major author of significant public policies that have led to creative, meaningful laws serving our Nation today.

Too often in these past sessions we have been left to defend existing programs and National Government commitments, trying to hold together a semblance of Federal Government, rather than free to cooperatively tackle evolving issues and new problems that have been visited upon the people we represent. DON PEASE held up well throughout this process, building the support for time honored trade laws and the trade adjustment assistance program, key to working people in this Nation.

Surely this Congress will miss the reasonable and effective work of DON PEASE, but I take some satisfaction in knowing that he will be available for consultation and no doubt a special advocate for our common interest in conservation issues. I expect him to do most of his famed walking in the national parks and forests and return to me all the oversight information that we will need to craft more effective policy for these areas that we share a mutual love for as part of the American heritage.

I wish DON and his spouse, Jeanne, all the best in the future and hope that we will see them often in years ahead. Their contributions and friendship have had a special meaning to me and my family.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] for his significant contribution here, too, this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased now to yield to another distinguished Member of the Ohio delegation, the gentleman from Akron, OH, Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank our distinguished dean, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], for having taken this hour this evening in order to recognize the distinguished contributions of our colleagues we recognize tonight. I would be remiss if I did not mention the friendship, the collaboration, the working together that all of us have done with our colleagues, CHALMERS WYLIE and CLARENCE MILLER.

Mr. Speaker, they, like the four whom we come here tonight to speak about, are good friends and will be well remembered in this body.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has distinguished our delegation, in addition to all of the extraordinary and exemplary service that we have heard detailed prior to what I have to say tonight, one of the things that distinguishes this delegation is the remarkable amount of overlapping services that we have had with one another over the years. Fully two-thirds of us have overlapping service over the last 25 to 35 years in the Ohio General Assembly. We have graduated from that graduate school of parliamentary procedure and practical politics in a way that I, as one who has followed these four into this Chamber, can appreciate perhaps as well as any of us. We have been through battles together over many years.

DON PEASE, I recall in the general assembly session in Ohio between 1974 and 1976, was one of the leaders in a substantial public utility reform measure on which I was a legislative agent on behalf of the public utilities commission of the State of Ohio, and I will always remember coming before his committee and just being bombarded with one incredibly complex question after another until I got to PEASE, and he just kept serving up one softball after another. It was perhaps the greatest service that one could do to a young spokesman on behalf of complex legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the kind of work that really has characterized what DON PEASE, and DENNIS ECKART, and ED FEIGHAN have done since they have come to this Chamber is the kind of

work that even on those relatively rare occasions where they disagreed, their capacity to work within this delegation to serve the better interests of the whole State of Ohio is no accident. It comes from years and years of working together.

CHARLIE LUKEN and I, in addition to the kind of overlapping service that the other three and I have had in legislative settings in Columbus, CHARLIE and I served together as mayors, he of Cincinnati, and I of Akron, and I can say without qualification that, as I looked across the State at that handful of colleagues of mayors of major cities that there was no one in Ohio that was better loved, more respected, for his balance, for his even-handedness, for his recognition of the breadth of the needs of all of his constituents than CHARLIE LUKEN. He brought that attitude, that notion that there is no Republican or Democrat way to pave a sidewalk, or to resurface a street, or to build a bridge.

Mr. Speaker, he brought that to this U.S. Congress, and, as a result, the kind of work that he has done here has reflected that willingness to continue to build, to pave sidewalks, to resurface streets and to rebuild bridges, not only cross rivers, but among Members whose differences sometimes are greater than they needed to be.

Mr. Speaker, as those of us who come here tonight turn and look back across that service that all four have given, it is with a sense of genuine affection, lasting respect and the desire to use the example that they have set to inspire our work as we go on that we come here tonight to offer genuine honor to them.

I want to thank our dean, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for the opportunity to be a part of this.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for his contribution here this evening.

I am pleased now to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

□ 2020

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman very much for calling this special order in honor of our colleagues from Ohio and our colleagues in this House of Representatives. I am pleased to join with the gentleman in having this opportunity to acknowledge our colleagues CHALMERS WYLIE and CLARENCE MILLER on that side of the aisle who are leaving. I had the opportunity to serve with BRUCE VENTO and CHALMERS WYLIE on the Banking Committee. I know he will be missed there as the ranking member, and certainly Mr. CLARENCE MILLER will be sorely missed.

However new CHARLIE LUKEN was to the Congress, we knew about him long before he came here from his father who served so long and well, and we wish him success in his young years, as he just came here for one term, to go forward. Our colleague TOM SAWYER has very beautifully spoken of his contribution, both in this body and then civically across the board, not only in the Congress, but in the community.

ED FEIGHAN, of course, is a champion on human rights, a champion for human rights in Greece and Cyprus, a leader in the gun control issue, as Mr. VENTO has referred to. I will not repeat all of those kind things that have been said about him, except to say that I too will miss him.

DENNIS ECKART, this young man going out into the world, having served so long and well in the Congress of the United States. What is remarkable about him, and his constituents should know this, is that until the last day, and we only have 3 or 4 more days, but until the last minute you would think he was going to be here for the next 10 years. He is part of all of the planning and part of all of the bringing together of people for the future of legislation in this body now and down the road, ever trying to reach solutions.

I guess I would think the temptation might be when you are just about ready to leave that you might be wrapping up your own office, your own affairs, saying goodbye. But DENNIS is in the fray every day on behalf of his constituents and on behalf of the country, and I think that is another demonstration of his commitment. I know he will do well out in the world there, out beyond Congress, and the community will be well served by the experience he gained here.

It is with particular pleasure that I join my colleagues in honoring one of our finest members, DON PEASE, but it is also with much regret that this occasion means the loss of such a valuable individual from this institution. I am one of the many fortunate Members who have benefited from working with Congressman PEASE. When DON PEASE speaks, people listen. And with good cause. When he looks at an issue from all sides, his distinguished service in the field of journalism is obvious. He is an intelligent and thoughtful man who doesn't operate on whims but on well-reasoned, logical decisionmaking. This Nation needs more leaders like DON PEASE. DON has been a tireless advocate for the oppressed and downtrodden in what is sometimes a cruel and callous world. He has also been a leader in pushing for the improvement of workers' rights. And his work on human rights, from highlighting the atrocities in Idi Amin's Ugandan regime to finding creative ways to fight against abuses in China, is exemplary of the good work that should be accomplished in this body.

As you know, Congressman PEASE introduced the United States-China Act of 1992, which would condition China's most-favored-nation [MFN] status on improvement in human rights, trade and weapons proliferation, before China can have most favored nation treatment for its state-run industries. It has been an honor for me to be able to work so closely with Mr. PEASE, whose commitment to workers rights and human rights worldwide is a model for us all. His absence will be deeply felt by those of us who have served with him, and in fact, by all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad farewell to Mr. PEASE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LUKEN, and to our colleagues across the aisle. I again thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this special order.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for her very kind and warm words on behalf of these departing Members.

I am pleased to recognize my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the dean of our delegation, my good friend and distinguished Member, Congressman STOKES, for hosting this special order this evening on behalf of our departing Ohio Members. I do not know how many other States are going to lose 20 percent of their delegation, but we are certainly going to experience a loss come next January that will be irreplaceable to us.

It gives me great pleasure tonight to commend my colleagues who will be departing, but also great sadness for those of us who will remain, because their friendship will now be more distant.

First for DON PEASE, a member of our delegation with great seniority, who incidentally was born in Toledo, OH, and graduated from Scott High School and has had such a distinguished career here, and his wife Jeanne, whom I have seen many evenings walk with him down the dimly lit corridors of this Congress, a couple that seemed to be able to handle this job and a marriage and a family better than most I know, and I think they are an example to all of us.

To DON, whom I consider to be one of my closest friends in the Congress, what a loss you will be to us. Your knowledge on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Trade Subcommittee of what the 21st century is going to be all about will not be replaced.

I do not care how many Members get elected here and who gets appointed to that committee, they will not replace DON PEASE. Your knowledge of trade, the trade adjustment assistance program, you have been its champion now when others, including this administration and the one before, tried to zero it out. Without your presence we would not have that in place for the millions of citizens across this country who have been able to keep their homes and

families together when their jobs have been moved elsewhere or completely eliminated from the face of the Earth.

All of your careful effort on unemployment compensation legislation, your ability to understand those complex formulas that elude most Members not on the committee, and your ability to try to provide decent service to our Nation's unemployed workers through our bureaus of unemployment compensation, an irreplaceable set of knowledge that you hold in your head, will leave that committee.

The gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], such a fine member herself, referencing your work on China, I know firsthand the patience that you exhibited far beyond my ability to exhibit patience with the Japanese parliamentarians, trying to actually open a dialog. My heavens, I watched you labor in those sessions with good humor. I think you would make a fine trade ambassador for this country, and I hope that the Clinton administration does not look further than Lorain, OH, when they need real talent to put out there on the trade front for our country.

I think that the fact that you were a journalist before coming here, a skilled writer and a fine researcher, have helped to contribute to this institution in a way that others really do not.

I certainly will miss you. I will miss Jeanne, and I know she will be glad to have you back under more normal circumstances than sitting in the Longworth Building offices. But I wish to say thank you on behalf of the citizens of our community, our State, and our country that you have so ably served while here. God bless you and your family.

To DENNIS ECKART and his wife Sandy and his little son that I watched take the oath of office with his father here a couple of times, your great leadership on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and in so many of the internal forums that we have here, our congressional campaign efforts and so forth, we were given much selfless service by you, and we are appreciative of your work in our delegation.

When I think of RCRA, forever I will remember you and the importance of the environment in resource recovery and all of the provisions you helped write into the law and all of the ideas you have as we move into the next century. What a loss to us as a State your departure truly is. The leadership you have shown on telecommunications, your ability to understand some of the most complex legal issues that come before that committee, whose jurisdiction is so broad, and your absolutely impeccable demeanor and your knowledge of the issues where one could go to you and you would always tell us in very straightforward terms what was contained in a given vote.

□ 2030

We wish you well. You are very young. You have a long future ahead of you, and we expect to see the name ECKART in several forums in the years ahead.

And to my friend ED FEIGHAN, a classmate, and his wife Nadine, I remember the first White House dinner we went to together after your election. We thank you for your service here in the arcane areas of foreign affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary. And for your absolutely unwavering commitment to the Brady bill, toward trying to bring some reason to what happens across this country. We will miss your good humor.

I will miss watching you eat all those chocolate bars back in the Cloakroom and still maintaining your fine physique throughout. And we will miss the intelligence of ED FEIGHAN and his absolutely dogged determination on issues where he took the lead in this Chamber.

Finally, to CHARLIE LUKEN, a former mayor of Cincinnati, son of a former Member, Tom Luken, who was absolutely overjoyed upon your election and swearing in to this Chamber, we wish you well as you move home to Cincinnati and to devote more time to your family and to your personal affairs in Cincinnati.

We are sorry we could not have more opportunity to serve with you and to get to know you better, but I am sure with your incredible talent that you will put it to work in many locations that will benefit the citizens of our State and our country.

I thank the dean of our delegation for sharing some of his time with me this evening. We wish all these fine, fine Members Godspeed.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her contribution here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as dean of the Ohio Democratic delegation, I can say quite honestly that the individuals whom we honor this evening are more than deserving of all the accolades that have been spoken here this evening. Over the years they have labored on behalf of their constituency and our region.

I am honored to have had the opportunity to serve in the Congress with DON PEASE, DENNIS ECKART, ED FEIGHAN, and CHARLIE LUKEN. Their service, leadership, and expertise has been greatly appreciated.

On behalf of the Ohio Democratic delegation, I extend my best wishes to each of them.

I also would be remiss if I were not to take just a moment to also say what a pleasure it has been to get to know over the years Sandy Eckart, Nadine Feighan, and Jeanne Pease. I have never had the pleasure of meeting Marcia Luken, but I have had the opportunity of knowing these other three wives very well.

They have been an integral part of everything that their husbands have stood for in this body. They have been their companions; they have been great representatives of their husbands' constituencies right here in Washington and back in their congressional districts.

It is not unusual at all on any given morning to see Jeanne Pease making the breakfasts around here with DON PEASE and diligently going through these Halls just as earnestly and conscientiously as he does.

So I think their constituents can be proud of the fact that while these men served them so well here in the Congress, their wives and their families were also serving them with an equal amount of dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to express my appreciation to many of the other colleagues in this body who have submitted their statements for inclusion in the RECORD.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE LUKEN entered Congress 2 years ago with an excellent working knowledge of his constituents and the industries in his district. He also understands how the policies decisions in Washington could have a very real effect on Cincinnati.

His positions on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Government Operations were helpful in insuring that the voices of his constituents were heard on the national policymaking stage.

Listening to and responding to the concerns of his constituents was always one of CHARLIE'S strong points. This skill was honed by his three terms as mayor of Cincinnati. While in this position, he responded to the needs of the people by reducing crime. He also crafted fiscal policies which kept Cincinnati solvent while other major cities were beginning to go into debt.

It is a shame that the sun is finally setting on the Luken dynasty on Capitol Hill. Nevertheless, I am confident that a new and broader horizon exists for CHARLIE LUKEN in the future. Good luck and goodbye.

Mr. Speaker, EDWARD FEIGHAN has made an indelible impression on Congress and Ohio over the last decade. He had an impressive beginning in the 98th Congress when he was named chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Task Force on International Narcotics Control. He was the only first-term Congressman during this session to hold a chairmanship. He has used this position to push for tougher economic pressures against nations that are the source of illegal drug exports to the United States.

Congressman FEIGHAN also extended his record of protecting the citizens of Ohio, during his tenure. Prior to coming to Washington, he served, along with me, in the Ohio House. During his stint in the Ohio House, EDWARD concentrated on housing issues. In fact, he chaired the Subcommittee on Housing.

EDWARD FEIGHAN has made a career out of making Ohio and the Nation better places. It is my hope that he will continue in this vein after he leaves the Hill.

ED—good luck and goodbye.

Mr. Speaker, since DENNIS ECKART first entered Congress, he has been viewed as a

leader amongst his peers. He was elected freshman whip and named one of the outstanding new House Members by U.S. News & World Report in his first term.

With such a propitious start, it is hardly surprising that he has gone on to be an influential Member of Congress. I believe one reason for this is a penchant for thorough investigation into all sides of an issue before embarking on his mission. Furthermore, he has always been willing to break away from party lines in order to cast a vote for what he believes is correct. These characteristics have earned him much respect from his colleagues. I personally regard him as an excellent foil, a dedicated ally, and a laborious colleague.

DENNIS, ever mindful of his national influence on the Energy and Commerce Committee, has always remembered the needs of his fellow Ohioans. He has done an excellent job of finding a balance between his activist environmental stances and the industrial base of his constituents in Cleveland. In doing so, he has crafted innovative legislation which resulted in techniques such as pollution credits, which ease the burdens on industrial businesses while creating a cleaner environment for Ohio.

DENNIS, as a fellow Congressman and Ohioan, I will miss you. Good luck.

Mr. Speaker, Ohio and the Nation will be losing a good friend and hard worker in Congress when DON PEASE retires. He has managed to use his long tenure and positions on influential committees to balance out the needs of the Nation with those of his constituents back home. I, for one, am thankful for his presence and his work, since our districts border one another and have very similar interests.

He has used his position on the Committee on Ways and Means as podium from which to protect the needs of Ohio's citizens. He has also employed his influence in Congress to protect the interests of Ohio. For example, when Federal wetlands regulations began to threaten the industries of his districts, he became involved. DON tried to strike a balance between the needs of the environmentalists, landowners, and developers.

DON has also made international human rights one of his top priorities. He has often encouraged linking a country's eligibility for valued U.S. trade benefits to its respect for human and worker's rights. He has most recently embarked on this tactic with regards to China's eligibility.

DON, as a fellow Ohioan, I will miss your friendship and leadership in the future. Goodbye and good luck.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished colleague, DENNIS ECKART, who is retiring from the House of Representatives after serving Ohio's 11th District.

During his 12 years in Congress, DENNIS accomplished the difficult task of fulfilling both constituent needs and national concerns. Nowhere is this more evident than in his tireless efforts to strike a balance between pressing ecological problems and the concerns of his constituency. During the 101st Congress he fought for the passage of the Clean Air Act and also led the way for legislation that forced the Federal Government to comply with its own solid and hazardous waste regulations. However, he was also sensitive to the economic needs of Ohio.

I very much appreciate the support DENNIS gave me over the years on a number of issues important to me and to my constituents. I am particularly grateful for his personal attention to a bill I introduced this year to save the Dayton Area Health Plan which provides health care to low-income residents in my district. With his assistance, the bill was quickly enacted into law.

DENNIS is a long-time colleague who served with me in the Ohio General Assembly and I will miss him in Congress. He will be remembered by all as an honorable, ethical man who served the House of Representatives with dignity.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, during my tenure as chairman of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, I have had the opportunity to work with a number of bright and fine individuals. And, over time, many of these friends and colleague have grown and contributed greatly to the committee.

One of these fine individuals is DENNIS ECKART.

The day DENNIS finally decided that he was not going to seek reelection to the next Congress, I attempted to persuade him to stay. I reminded him that he had made many fine contributions to the committee and the Congress—and to me personally. He told me that he couldn't remain in Congress because of his mounting frustrations with certain aspects of the electoral process and that he, quite frankly, had other things he would rather do.

This is why it is difficult to say goodbye to DENNIS. He is not the kind of person you can lightly dismiss and just send on his way. Since his first term in Congress in 1980, DENNIS ECKART was chosen by U.S. News and World Report and Congressional Quarterly as one of the outstanding new House Members. The National Journal dubbed Dennis as one of 13 rising stars noting that his "influence with energy Members transcends what his seniority would otherwise bestow."

DENNIS cleared that quote with me before he used it.

In all seriousness, DENNIS has been a first-rate member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and his contributions will be remembered by its entire membership on both sides of the aisle. DENNIS was a major player in making changes to a number of pieces of legislation before the Energy and Commerce Committee. In particular, I would like to note his superb legislative ability, during the committee's consideration of superfund reauthorization legislation, in crafting language and developing the strategy to reform management of dangerous hazardous waste sites. His persistent efforts also resulted in major improvements in legislation authorizing the sale of Conrail.

But where I saw DENNIS at his best was during the committee's tumultuous revision of the Clean Air Act. I cannot think of too many other Members, other than DENNIS ECKART, who was so intensely scrutinized from both the environmentalists and industry. This was most evident on the acid rain reduction section of the legislation, where DENNIS had the unenviable duty of trying to balance the needs of his Ohio constituency with his strong desire to write a bill our friends in the environmental community could tolerate. He took a number of hard hits from both sides—but his skills as legislator, negotiator, and salesman thrust him into the role of a master juggler who played a key role in engineering an acid rain provision that accomplished the goal of reducing sulphur dioxide while protecting the options of his midwest electric utility ratepayers.

While serving in this institution, DENNIS has had a life outside the Energy and Commerce Committee. He is a member of the Small Business Committee, where he chairs the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Deregulation, and Ecology. Since 1987, he has served as cochairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and was elected this Congress to serve as 1 of the 12 regional representatives to the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and also serves as vice-chairman of the Northwest-Midwest Congressional Coalition.

In closing, I want to say with all sincerity that DENNIS has been a great friend and a highly-valued colleague who will be greatly missed. I know that after walking through the doors of this Chamber for the last time, that it will not be the last we will hear of DENNIS ECKART.

We will see DENNIS on the high ground, where he's always remained while a part of this institution, probably using his unique talent at improving legislation or public policy.

I will miss DENNIS, and he will always be remembered.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor CHARLIE LUKEN, a fellow colleague and Member of the Ohio delegation.

Mr. LUKEN is retiring after serving one term and he will be missed in Congress. As a new Member of Congress, he brought enthusiasm and fresh ideas to this institution at a time when this Nation was ready for change. Although he served only 2 years, CHARLIE LUKEN has a long history of public service. He served Cincinnati well as a city council member from 1981 to 1984 and as mayor from 1984 until he was elected to Congress in 1990 to succeed his father, Thomas Luken.

CHARLIE LUKEN is a lifelong resident of Cincinnati, the city in which I was born and raised. My mother and sister reside in Cincinnati and hold CHARLIE LUKEN in the highest regard, as I do, for his dedication to the city and the citizens of Cincinnati.

I had the opportunity to work with CHARLIE LUKEN before we were both elected to Congress in 1990. In 1984, the Ohio Department of Mental Retardation and Developmentally Disabled was facing considerable problems, and CHARLIE, as mayor, worked with me to coordinate hearings in Cincinnati to overhaul the department. I commend him for the courage and leadership he showed during that time.

In addition, CHARLIE LUKEN was a good friend to me during my first days as a fellow freshman Member of Congress. I have had the opportunity to work with CHARLIE LUKEN on a number of local projects, particularly those which affect southwestern Ohio, and I appreciate his insight and input. He has continued in Congress, as in his previous offices, to work on behalf of the constituents of the First Congressional District of Ohio.

CHARLIE LUKEN has also made an impact with his work on the Banking and Urban Affairs Committee, and I have enjoyed working with him on the Government Operations Subcommittee on Energy, Environment, and Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I have greatly enjoyed serving my first term in the U.S. Congress alongside a fellow Ohioan, CHARLES LUKEN. He has a strong record of serving the city, State, and Federal Governments with dedication and I wish him the best as he begins his career in news broadcasting.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring the Congressman from Ohio's First District, CHARLES LUKEN.

I have had the pleasure of working with Mr. LUKEN on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and he has served as a bright newcomer on my Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation, and Insurance.

Many of us knew his father, Thomas, during his seven terms in this House, but CHARLES LUKEN has distinguished himself on his own here, both as a member of the Banking Committee and as a member of the Government Operations Committee. Prior to his service here in the House, he had established a fine record as a city council member and three-term mayor of his native Cincinnati.

As the chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, I commend CHARLES for his many legislative contributions to the subcommittee, and for his personable outlook and fresh approach.

As he leaves the Congress to assume other responsibilities, I wish for CHARLES LUKEN good luck and Godspeed in the years ahead.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to thank my fellow member of the Ohio congressional delegation, LOUIS STOKES, for taking this special order to collectively honor four Ohioans who are leaving Congress at the end of this session. I am grateful for your leadership in this matter, and I know that our other members are as well.

With this special order, we are recognizing the service and the outstanding legislative contributions in the House by CHARLES LUKEN, DONALD PEASE, DENNIS ECKART, and EDWARD FEIGHAN. While their service in the Congress is varied with regard to the number of years they've served, they nevertheless have the common bond of being extremely conscientious legislators who have consistently devoted their energy and abilities to the best interests of the citizens they represent.

Each came to Congress with an impressive history of public service: CHARLES LUKEN was an effective member of the Cincinnati City Council and served the River City as its mayor. DENNIS ECKART, DONALD PEASE, and ED FEIGHAN all served Ohio well as members of the Ohio General Assembly before coming to Washington. In each case, these men brought an appreciation for government at the grassroots with them to the Nation's Capital. In each case, they clearly understood the demands Washington places on local and State Government to abide by rules and regulations that oftentimes prove to be more burdensome than helpful.

In addition to their vast experiences in public service, each man we're honoring with this special order includes in their background involvement in civic organizations which have helped to promote the economic and social well-being of the communities in which they reside and work.

In DON's case, I know he came to Congress extremely well prepared: He obtained both his undergraduate and graduate degree from Ohio University in Athens, which is in the heart of the congressional district I have been privileged to serve for the past 26 years in Congress. DON has proven to be a tremendously important member of the House Ways and Means Committee and his sharp eye on the Federal budget as a member of the Budget Committee has always been welcomed and deeply appreciated.

CHARLES LUKEN, too—in just one term—proved his worth as an effective member of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee and the House Government Operations Committee. ED was a valued member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee during the Nation's most trying experience in recent years—the Persian Gulf war. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, he applied his legal background and expertise on many occasions in the consideration of legislation important to Ohio.

DENNIS was a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee during the consideration of some of the most important environmental legislation brought before the House. While I might have differed with this assessment of some of that legislation, I respected DENNIS' ability to make a point, take a position, and defend it in the face of what had to be significant odds, at times.

Mr. Speaker, the census has reduced Ohio's voices in the Congress by two. Ohio is going to have to adjust to that fact. In addition, Ohio will have to adjust to the loss of these four Members and I am sure that their constituents will miss their solid representation in the House just as they will be missed by those remaining here. I want to express my personal thanks to all four men—DENNIS, DON, CHARLES, and ED—for a job well done.

Thank you very much and may I wish all of you the very best.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining the Ohio delegation today to honor our colleagues DENNIS ECKART, ED FEIGHAN, CHARLES LUKEN, and DONALD PEASE.

I am sure that their contributions not only to the people of Ohio, but to all the people of the United States whom they have served during their tenure in the Congress will be long remembered and much appreciated. As they venture forth on new paths of endeavor, our best wishes go with each of them for a long and prosperous life.

I want to take his opportunity to single out ED FEIGHAN and to express my most sincere appreciation to him. ED and I have served together with the Committee on Foreign Affairs for years now, so I am well acquainted with the dedication and attitude of service that he has always brought to our Foreign Affairs deliberations. His leadership as chairman of the task force in the fight against drugs and to promote an international approach to the enforcement problem will continue as a benchmark for years to come.

I want to tell ED and all of you here today how much his work and input was appreciated by all members of our committee. ED was also very active on both the Europe and Middle East and the Africa subcommittees. In addition, he did considerable work as a member of the Helsinki Commission through the years.

My best wishes to ED. We will miss him and the Congress will miss him. Best of luck and Godspeed.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the tribute to my distinguished colleagues from the State of Ohio, who will be leaving us after so many years of faithful service. Among them, they have 40 years of experience on Capitol Hill. Their record of achievement should serve as a shining example to the people of Ohio, to their colleagues, and to those who will have the privilege of succeeding them in office.

DON PEASE, with whom I have had the honor of working closely on our efforts to reduce the Federal budget deficit, has served with distinction in this House for 16 years. I would like to offer my public compliments to DON for his unstinting work, his keen insight on fiscal, tax, and economic issues, and his sound judgment as a Representative of the people. DON has been a valued colleague on the Budget Committee, and his contributions to our deliberations and actions have been invaluable.

DON'S quiet courage and long hours of analysis enabled him to produce serious efforts to resolve our most intractable issues in the face of the familiar opposition from his more callow colleagues. He has been one of the few to grasp the nexus of economic, tax, and budgetary issues and to show Members on both sides of the aisle what hard choices are needed and what steps must be taken.

I salute you DON, for your character, perseverance and record of accomplishments, and I wish you, your wife, Jeanne and your daughter, Jennifer, the best of luck in all your future endeavors.

DENNIS ECKART has received many accolades this year on and off the Hill in which he is invariably described as a promising future leader. But let us be very clear about DENNIS' tenure here. He has more than fulfilled his potential. DENNIS ECKART has been an outstanding Congressman and advocate for the people of Ohio. His contributions to our Nation's environmental laws have been manifold, marked by intellectual acuity and steady, concentrated effort. I would like to thank DENNIS for his expertise and achievements in this area of the law. Environmental cleanup proponents are losing a valuable ally in DENNIS ECKART, a man who never shied from close examinations of administration positions and personnel on behalf of the environment and the public health.

Through his dedication, culminating in the last several weeks, DENNIS helped to pass several pieces of legislation which will be critical in preserving our precious water resources and in holding the Federal Government and private businesses to the same high standard. His work on the Clean Drinking Water Act, the Great Lakes Research and Management Act, and the Superfund law will protect and preserve the environment for generations of Americans to come. I am sure that DENNIS will continue to contribute his talents to the service of the public trust, and I am grateful for this

chance to pay tribute to his fine record in the House.

ED FEIGHAN has spent over 2 years in the service of the public trust, starting with his election to the Ohio General Assembly in 1972. As a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, ED sponsored the Brady bill, which passed the House last year. Long an advocate of gun control legislation, his efforts in this area will make our Nation's streets safer. ED is a kind and good man of notable integrity and probity, and I want the world to know that he has served with distinction and dedication. No one ever worked harder on behalf of his constituents. Thank you, ED, for your contributions to the Congress. I would like to extend my best wishes to you and your family as you embark upon a well-deserved new career.

Finally, to CHARLIE LUKEN, I want to say that it has been a pleasure to work with you on occasion these past 2 years. CHARLIE'S energy and enthusiasm is matched by his judgment and intelligence. In 2 years CHARLIE has managed to make serious contributions to the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, and has established a record of which he and his constituents can be proud. It has been a pleasure and privilege to have worked with CHARLIE LUKEN.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our distinguished colleagues and good friends, DENNIS ECKART, ED FEIGHAN, CHARLES LUKEN, and DONALD PEASE.

DENNIS ECKART was first elected to Congress in 1980, and was quickly recognized as a talented and able legislator. He has been an extremely effective member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and has successfully guided numerous pieces of legislation through the Congress, including improvements to the Superfund program, the Safe Drinking Water Act, legislation to assist in retraining dislocated workers, and the Great Lakes Management Act, which seeks to remove toxins threatening the quality of the Great Lakes. He also wrote many key provisions in the landmark Clean Air Act, including sections to curb urban smog and acid rain.

DENNIS has also served with distinction on the Small Business Committee, where he chairs the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Deregulation, and Ecology.

Before coming to Congress, DENNIS served three terms in the Ohio House of Representatives, and was an assistant Lake County prosecutor prior to that. He graduated cum laude from Xavier University in Cincinnati, and was a 1974 graduate from the Cleveland Marshall College of Law of Cleveland State University.

DENNIS is leaving Congress to spend more time with his family, and also because of the legislative gridlock that has taken hold in Congress. the U.S. Congress and the American people have certainly benefited from his dedication and hard work, and I wish him the very best for the future.

ED FEIGHAN was elected to Congress in 1982, and has provided the people of Ohio's 19th District with able service ever since.

ED is perhaps best known for his tireless work in the House to win passage of the Brady bill, legislation to mandate a national 7-day waiting period for handgun purchases. His interest in combating firearms violence dates back to his service in the Ohio House of Representatives from 1973 to 1979, and was spurred by an incident in 1984 when a gunman went on a rampage in a Cleveland public library, killing and wounding several people.

The passage of the Brady bill in the House was a notable achievement for ED. It was, as he put it, "a chance to save some lives * * * a chance to prevent some of the carnage on America's streets." I hope that Congress will pass this common sense initiative to provide the American people with a needed safety net to prevent criminals from obtaining handguns through retail outlets.

In addition to his skilled work on the House Judiciary Committee, ED distinguished himself on the Foreign Affairs Committee as well, earning a strong reputation as an ardent human rights activist.

ED's soft-spoken, down-to-earth style has earned him deserved praise. He has been an able legislator and a credit to this institution, and I wish him the very best.

CHARLIE LUKEN has only been with us for a short period of time, but he has quickly demonstrated his keen abilities as an effective legislator. He has distinguished himself on both the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee and the Government Operations Committee.

CHARLIE was born in Cincinnati, and has devoted much of his life to public service. He received a bachelor of arts degree from the University of Notre Dame and a law degree from the University of Cincinnati College of Law. He served on the city council from 1981 to 1984, and was elected mayor in 1984, and served in that capacity until he took office in the House of Representatives in January 1991.

CHARLIE LUKEN is but one of many good, decent people who are leaving Congress for various reasons. I for one will be sorry to see him go, and I wish him, his wife Marcia, and their three children the very best for the future.

DON PEASE was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1976, and served the people of Ohio's 13th Congressional District ever since.

DON was born and raised in Toledo, OH, and attended Ohio University where he received a B.S. In journalism and an M.S. in government. He also attended the University of Durham, England, on a Fulbright Scholarship, and he has been awarded two honorary doctor of law degrees, one from Ohio University and one from Oberlin College.

DON served in the U.S. Army and later became the editor-publisher of the prize-winning Oberlin News-Tribune. His public service began in 1961, with his election to the Oberlin City Council, followed by a decade of service in the Ohio General Assembly.

In Congress, DON has served with distinction on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Science, Space, and Technology Committee, the Ways and Means Committee, and since last year, the Budget Committee.

DON demonstrated a strong commitment to human rights early in his career, leading the successful drive in Congress to ban United States coffee imports from Uganda in protest against the genocidal regime of Idi Amin.

Later on, DON worked very diligently to make improvements in the U.S. Tax Code, serving on the conference committee for the landmark Tax Reform Act of 1986. He has also focused his efforts toward programs that will assist American businesses to compete in the global marketplace, and was a major force behind the passage of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988.

DON has demonstrated a sincere commitment to the well-being of the American worker. He will leave Congress this year, but he will be able to look back upon a notable and distinguished legacy of accomplishments. I want to extend to him, to his wife Jeanne, and their daughter my very best wishes for the future.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues well know, it is difficult for a day to go by that we are not reminded of the generally unfavorable impression the American people have of this institution. While this, in itself, is disturbing, it is particularly so when one considers that many of their criticisms are justified. Of those, perhaps most concerning is the belief that the public interest has fallen victim to partisan politics.

For the most part, the Energy and Commerce Committee has been an exception to that assessment. In taking on enormous legislative tasks of paramount importance to the American people—superfund, clean air, rail strike, et cetera—its members have repeatedly risen above the political gridlock to produce responsible, balanced, and bipartisan results. In each of these instances, DENNIS ECKART established himself as a leader.

For to DENNIS ECKART, a common goal takes precedence over a common party affiliation. Over the course of the last 5 years, I have had the opportunity to work closely with DENNIS on an issue of mutual importance: Environmental compliance at the Nation's Federal facilities. A strong ally in this effort, he proved unselfish when it came to taking credit for his successes. Instead, he was more concerned with the results.

Far more than a capable colleague, however, DENNIS is a friend. His departure marks a loss not only for the committee, but personally for those who have gotten to know him. Most important, his leaving will cost Congress one of its best arguments against the thought that we in Washington care more about politics than policy.

I imagine, given his youth, potential, and commitment, that DENNIS ECKART and public service will not be divorced for long. On behalf of the American people, particularly those who need their faith in Government restored, I certainly hope that is the case.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, amid charges that confusion and caprice reigns in government these days, DON PEASE has always brought reason, deliberation, and common sense to the proceedings of the House of Representatives. For that reason all of us will surely miss DON when he retires at the end of this Congress.

DON set high goals for Congress and he worked to fulfill them. As a former newspaperman, he was dedicated to openness in the governmental process. Yet, as an experienced legislator, he never let process get in the way of efficiency.

DON'S work on the tax bill in 1990 is an example of his sense of fairness in the Tax Code. It also stands as a monument to his ability to work with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle as well as the administration.

DON and I served together on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Though neither of us still sits on that committee, we have continued to work together on issues related to international human rights.

DON will be remembered by his constituents for tireless service, listening sessions, and town meetings. Here, he will be remembered for his modesty, professional demeanor, and keen humor. The Nation will miss him for his dedication to good government and his ability to put his ideas into action.

Fortunately, DON's work will continue when he teaches political science at Oberlin. There he will be able to instill into future generations the same knowledge and respect he has shown this institution for so many years.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to four of my Ohio colleagues who will retire at the end of the 102d Congress. They are Congressmen DON PEASE, ED FEIGHAN, DENNIS ECKART,and CHARLIE LUKEN.

"One of the standing jokes in Congress," a scribe once wrote, "is that the new Congressman always spends the first week wondering how he got there, and the rest of the time wondering how the other Members got there."

This observation was found in the pages of the Saturday Evening Post nearly 100 years ago. Yet, I would suggest that it is a statement worth examining as we salute these four men today.

First of all, at least in the case of CHARLIE LUKEN, we learn that we should amend this observation. CHARLIE has served his one term in Congress during the most turbulent and frustrating time this institution has seen in many decades. His retirement reminds us that, in this day and age, a Member of Congress not only wonders how he got here and how other Members got here, but he also spends his time figuring out how he can get out of here.

Second, as a relatively new Member of Congress myself, it has never been a mystery to me how people like CHARLIE, DENNIS, ED, and DON earned a spot in the U.S. Congress. While I sit on the opposite side of the political aisle, I know that these four gentlemen have served the people they represent with admirable diligence, keen intellect, and exemplary commitment.

I have known these gentlemen for many years. I served with three of them—DON PEASE, DENNIS ECKART, and ED FEIGHAN—in the Ohio Legislature. I remember each of them then as I would characterize them now: Hard-working, honest, with the interest of the people they represent always at heart.

When I was Ohio Senate president, I had the good fortune of meeting local elected officials from every corner of our State. It was in that capacity that I had the opportunity to work with CHARLIE LUKEN. While he was mayor of Cincinnati, I could always count on CHARLIE to represent his community in a reasoned, professional manner.

Mr. Speaker, DON, DENNIS, ED, and CHARLIE have seen many issues through a different lens than I have. This partisan divide does nothing to mitigate the regard I have for each of them. It is with this in mind that I take this opportunity to offer a personal, going-away wish to each of these four gentlemen.

To DENNY ECKART, I wish you the best of luck in your new role as a television commentator in Cleveland. Now you will get a taste of real power.

To CHARLIE LUKEN, I wish you a future in which you do not look back on your 2 years in Washington in the same light Terry Anderson thinks of his years in Lebanon.

To DON PEASE, I take note of the fact that your home in Oberlin will, because of redistricting, lie just near the border of the congressional district I represent. So today I would like to make you an honorary constituent, and want you to know my door will always be open to you. Whether or not you consider that an honor is another matter.

And finally, to ED FEIGHAN, I wish you the comfort that comes from never again having to explain the shape of your district, a geographic phenomenon no less mysterious than the rings around Saturn.

I wish all of you—DENNY, CHARLIE, DON, and ED—the very best in the days ahead. I hope you and your families enjoy the pride that comes from knowing that you have given your all and left your mark in the public arena.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a fellow member of the Ohio delegation, DENNIS ECKART, and his 12 years of exemplary service to this body of Congress.

DENNIS ECKART was elected to Congress after serving as an assistant Lake County prosecutor and as an Ohio State representative for 6 years. He has often been recognized as a star in Congress and with good reason. He was elected to a leadership role during his first term in 1980, to serve as freshman whip, and during his second term he was selected as a member of the powerful Energy and Commerce Committee.

His leadership on the House Energy and Commerce committee will be missed. He has worked to protect the interest of his industrial district in Cleveland, while also striking an equitable balance with the environmentalists. He has authored a number of measures to improve our Nation's drinking water, the quality of the Great Lakes, and the management of the Superfund Program.

I have had the opportunity to work with DENNIS ECKART on Ohio projects and have a high level of respect for him. We share a mutual friend, Denny Wojtanowski of Columbus, with whom we both have enjoyed working over the years.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank DENNIS ECKART for his hard work in the U.S. Congress on behalf of the citizens of Ohio's 11th Congressional District. I wish Mr. ECKART the best of luck in his future, I am sure he will be met with continued successes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, one of the satisfactions of serving in this body has been the excellent cooperation that has characterized the Ohio delegation. I do not know of one instance wherein there has been a division on any issue important to Ohio.

There is always strong bipartisan support for projects and policies that benefit Ohio regardless of which district is directly benefited.

DENNIS ECKART, ED FEIGHAN, CHARLES LUKEN, and DONALD PEASE have all been very valuable members of the Buckeye team. Because of the influential committee assignments of DON, DENNIS, ED, and CHARLES, the Ohio delegation has influence that gives each member leverage that enables Members to achieve benefits for their constituents in individual districts.

The retirement of these four Members will be a great loss to Ohio and the Nation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing Congressman DON PEASE of the 13th District of Ohio for his 16 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives.

The 13th District, where factory workers predominate, could not have chosen a better Representative than DON PEASE. He has taken the concerns of the blue-collar workers—not just from his district, but from all over America—and made them his number one priority. During his service on the Ways and Means Committee, he has worked with vigor and dedication to protect the industrial economy of his district and the jobs of his constituents as well as all Americans.

DON has also demonstrated a marked ability to see both sides of an issue, a skill he learned perhaps during his days as the editor of the Oberlin News-Tribune. Republicans and Democrats alike are familiar with his mastery of the art of compromise without which no bill could become public law. A limit on tax deductions, the Pease plan for renewing trade relations with China, and the push for international labor standards all came about as a result of his legislative dexterity.

DON PEASE has compiled an excellent record of achievement during his service in the Congress. As he leaves to assume other responsibilities, I congratulate him and wish him well in all of his endeavors.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, when DON PEASE leaves the Congress, it is the American people who will be the great losers.

I have known DON for his entire congressional career and have had the privilege of working with him. He is a fine, clear-thinking person who takes his responsibility seriously. And, fortunately for all of us, he has the skills to handle the challenge. He is conscientious in his consideration of the issues, and he is diligent in seeking good solutions. He is a gentleman—a thoughtful, considerate person, and he has contributed much to all of us in his years of service.

DON and his wife Jeanne are a wonderful couple. They work well together, and they strengthen each other. I will miss DON PEASE as a friend, but I will miss him even more as a fine, constructive legislator.

Martha joins me in wishing DON and Jeanne the very best for the future.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. EDWARD FEIGHAN, a fellow Ohioan who will retire at the end of the 102d Congress after five terms as a Member of the House of Representatives.

As a lifelong resident of Lakewood, OH, ED FEIGHAN has a long history of faithful public service. In 1972, he was elected to the Ohio General Assembly where he served for 6 years. In 1978, he was elected to the Cuyahoga County Board of Commissioners on which he served until his successful bid for U.S. Representative of the 19th Congressional District of Ohio in 1982.

During his first term in Congress, ED FEIGHAN was appointed as the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Task Force on International Narcotics Control, the only freshman

Member appointed to a chairmanship during that session of Congress. With this chairmanship and his membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has taken a tough anti-drug stance and pushed for strong policies toward countries which are major sources of illegal drug trafficking.

ED FEIGHAN has been a champion of handgun control legislation throughout his 10 years in Congress. He was a sponsor of the Brady bill to mandate a national 7-day waiting period for handgun purchases and worked hard to gain support for the measure which passed the House of Representatives last year.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Commission on Cooperation and Security in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission, Mr. FEIGHAN has demonstrated his dedication to human rights issues. This has transferred to his local constituent service where he has been successful in assisting local ethnic families in obtaining emigration rights for their families in the Soviet Union.

Mr. FEIGHAN will be missed by the constituents of the 19th Congressional District and by his fellow members of Congress. I would like to wish ED FEIGHAN the best of luck with his new restaurant business. Being a restaurateur myself, I know that he will be as successful in the restaurant business as he was in Congress.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the congressional labors of DONALD PEASE will long be remembered in both the House of Representatives and the House Ways and Means Committee on which we both serve. For over a decade and a half he has served his Nation and his State well. DON has decided to retire at the conclusion of this 102d Congress.

DON PEASE was first elected to Congress 16 years ago. Before that he gained legislative experience while serving in the city council of his native Oberlin, as well as the Ohio State Senate and House of Representatives.

Conflicts between the press and legislative councils are not unknown to him. He has been on both sides of the fence in this area. His background, besides revealing legislative knowledge, also shows that he has held the titles of editor, coeditor, and copublisher of the Oberlin News-Tribune.

As a fellow member of the Trade Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, I viewed DON PEASE as one who sought a solution to this Nation's trade problems. We have disagreed on a number of matters, but I have always acknowledged his desire to search for an answer to trade difficulties.

It should be noted that DON also served his country in the U.S. Army in 1955 to 1957.

DON's retirement will bring to an end a distinguished career which spanned 16 difficult years.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor 11 years of distinguished service to this House by my friend, DENNIS ECKERT of Ohio.

DENNIS has a record of accomplishment in this House of which he has reason to be proud. His contributions as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee have been numerous. His tireless work to forge a compromise on clean air legislation were critical to helping the passage of that landmark legislation through the House. His efforts to increase accountability in the nuclear industry when accidents occur is also of vital importance.

DENNIS has well served his 11th District of Ohio, and the country with integrity. I am pleased to join with his constituents and our colleagues, in expressing my sadness that DENNIS has completed his time in the House. I wish him well in whatever new and exciting challenges await him.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing Congressman EDWARD FEIGHAN of the 19th District of Ohio for his 10 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives.

His vigorous and unswerving efforts to restrict access to handguns have in large measure been responsible for passage in the House of the Brady bill which mandates a 7-day waiting period on handgun purchases. Other measures which Ed has championed to thwart criminals include standardizing the requirements for bullet-resistant vests and reducing the illegal use of drugs.

In his position on the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has worked diligently to aid his Eastern European constituents, to assist troubled regions in the Third World, and to fight for international human rights.

When the 19th District was created in 1982, the voters in that district selected ED FEIGHAN to represent them. During the subsequent decade, their confidence in him has been more than amply justified.

As he retires from the Congress, I extend to ED my congratulations and best wishes for continuing success in all of his future endeavors.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor DONALD PEASE as he prepares for his retirement after 16 years as a faithful Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. It is an understatement to say that he will be missed.

DONALD PEASE has a long history of dedicated public service, beginning in 1961 with his election to the Oberlin City Council. He then spent 10 years in State politics serving as a State representative and State senator until he was elected to Congress in 1976.

DON PEASE has been a strong and influential force within the Ohio delegation. He is to be commended for bringing this delegation together to work on projects that benefit the State of Ohio. Through his leadership, the delegation has met on a regular basis. He has been successful in creating a more cohesive environment among the Ohio members. His presence will continue to be felt long after his departure.

DON PEASE currently serves on the Budget and Ways and Means Committees. Through his work as a former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and as a member of the Trade Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, he has earned a reputation as a champion of human rights. He has linked U.S. trade policy to a country's human and worker's rights, and is presently urging Members to consider China's progress in the human rights arena when deciding whether to extend most-favored-nation trading status to China.

In addition to his work to improve human rights, DON PEASE is also an advocate of tax reform. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, he has been a supporter of lowering the capital gains tax as well as general reforms to make the tax system more equitable for the middle-class worker.

DON PEASE has served the 13th Congressional District with honesty and integrity. He worked to bring economic development to the area and aid in his district's recovery from the recession. He secured $8.7 million to complete the Route 250 bypass project and worked with the local school board to obtain a much needed $1.7 million grant. In addition, he has been instrumental in securing Federal funds for a number of local projects, thus demonstrating his responsiveness to his constituents.

I have greatly enjoyed having the opportunity to work alongside DON PEASE. We have had numerous discussions on issues of which I have thoroughly enjoyed his insight and intelligence. I would also like to take this opportunity to say that Mrs. Jeanne Pease and her presence in Washington has also been a pleasure. Mr. Speaker, I wish DONALD PEASE the best of luck in his retirement from the U.S. Congress.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker I rise to recognize a distinguished colleague from Ohio, ED FEIGHAN, who will be leaving the House of Representatives after 10 years of service.

ED will be remembered as the man who had the courage to fight for his convictions. This is especially true in his work as the leading sponsor of the Brady bill when he refused to back down despite some disappointments and strong opposition. ED has also been a strong advocate for the nation of Israel. He argued successfully for United States funds to help Israel with the resettling of Soviet Jews in 1990 and again in 1991. As a former seminarian he has even taken his concern for Israel to the Vatican, asking for full diplomatic recognition of the Israeli Government.

ED FEIGHAN will be remembered as a skilled legislator who served the 19th District of Ohio with honor. I will miss ED and the determination that he brought to the Ohio congressional delegation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing Congressman DENNIS ECKART of the 11th District of Ohio for his 12 years of distinguished service to the House of Representatives.

During his first term, DENNIS merited a whip's position, and subsequently, was named a regional chairman on the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

During his service on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Mr. ECKART compiled an impressive record of accomplishments, working to improve the industrial economy through measures to provide antipollution credits and safety enhancement incentives while at the same time protecting our Nation's environment through passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments and similar bills. Those of us in the House who have watched DENNIS in action truly admire his grasp of the complicated technical issues pending before the Commerce Committee.

DENNIS ECKART's positive and balanced approach to reaching a consensus on controversial legislation will be missed, but at the same time he leaves a legacy of solid environmental legislation on which the Members of the 103d Congress can build confidently.

In the years ahead, I wish for DENNIS continuing success in all of his endeavors.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in saluting 9 years of distinguished service to this House by my friend ED FEIGHAN of Ohio.

ED has assembled a record of legislative accomplishments of which he has reason to be proud. I had the opportunity to work closely with ED on a number of crime-related initiatives. His tireless efforts on behalf of sensible gun control measures transformed the Brady bill from an impossible longshot to a household expression. ED's leadership and tenacity was invaluable to the momentum of this critical legislation and I enjoyed working with him. ED's concern about crime and violence in America is genuine and his dedication is complete.

ED has served with effectiveness and integrity. He well represented the constituents of his district, which I had the pleasure of visiting with him. I am pleased to join with his constituents, and my colleagues in the House, in expressing my sadness that ED has completed his service in the Congress. I wish him the best in whatever new challenges lay ahead.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, CHARLES LUKEN, who is retiring from the House of Representatives.

CHARLIE's term as a Member of Congress caps a distinguished record of public service to the people of Ohio. He started his career in public office as a member of the Cincinnati City Council and was later elected mayor. Though he will be leaving elected office, CHARLIE's next job, as a Cincinnati television news anchor, will keep him in the public eye.

In giving a reason for retiring from the House, CHARLIE stated that he did not like being away from his family while representing his constituents in Washington. I am very sympathetic to that reason.

I wish CHARLIE success in his new career.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to EDWARD FEIGHAN who will be retiring from the Congress at the end of the year. EDWARD FEIGHAN has served this Nation with distinction as a Member of this body for 10 years.

Through his work on the Committee on the Judiciary, EDWARD FEIGHAN has helped move this Nation's business forward. Although I did not serve with him on that committee, I nevertheless know of his reputation for preparation, attention to details, and passionate belief in the principles he holds.

EDWARD FEIGHAN also played an important role on the Foreign Affairs Committee. His commitment to human rights is well known and well thought of. His retirement marks yet another significant loss to that panel which will lose so many of its fine members at the end of this year.

My wife, Nancy, joins me in extending our best wishes to EDWARD FEIGHAN and his family. We wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to DON PEASE who will be retiring from the Congress at the end of the year. DON PEASE has served this Nation with distinction as a Member of this body for 16 years.

Through his work on the Committee on Ways and Means, DON PEASE has helped move this Nation's business forward. From his position on Ways and Means, DON PEASE helped to shape tax legislation so it would help the working man and woman. As one who shares his inclination to protect the little guy, I want to salute the gentleman from Ohio for his outstanding efforts over the years. His voice on trade issues and other key concerns will certainly be missed next year.

And although it is fashionable in some circles to denigrate this institution and its Members, our colleagues who remain behind and our successors would do well to look to the career of DON PEASE as one to emulate. The essence of the Congress is for Members of different views to come together to discuss the issues, hash out the differences, and forge public policy that incorporates the best elements of the varying positions. DON PEASE contributed to that process.

My wife, Nancy, joins me in extending our best wishes to DON PEASE and his family. We wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to DENNIS ECKART who will be retiring from the Congress at the end of the year. DENNIS ECKART has served this Nation with distinction as a Member of this body for 12 years.

Through his work on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, DENNIS ECKART has helped move this Nation's business forward. Although I did not serve with him on that committee, I nevertheless know of his reputation for commitment to issues of concern to those of us from the Northeast and Midwest. As the founder and former cochair of the Northeast Midwest Congressional Coalition, I truly appreciate Mr. ECKART's skill as a legislator and an advocate for our region of the country.

It has long been my philosophy that Members with different views should come together to discuss the issues, hash out the differences, and forge public policy that incorporates the best elements of the varying positions. DENNIS ECKART contributed to that process. His insight and leadership will be missed.

My wife, Nancy, joins me in extending our best wishes to DENNIS ECKART and his family. We wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

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

There was no objection.

VACATING OF SPECIAL ORDER AND REINSTATEMENT OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my 60-minute special order tonight and, in lieu thereof, be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

A TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM BROOMFIELD

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep appreciation and respect for our distinguished ranking Republican or our Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. Following 8 years of service in the Michigan Legislature, BILL has served on our Foreign Affairs Committee for over 30 years—longer than any Republican since the founding of our party in 1854. BILL has served as ranking member of our committee since 1975. He is one of only three Members of Congress to serve as the Republican leader on the committee for nine terms since the founding of our Great Nation.

BILL BROOMFIELD has worked with 8 Presidents and 10 Secretaries of States. He has always been a strong advocate of bipartisan foreign policy. BILL has participated in more than 20 interparliamentary conferences and his experience spans decades of involvement in the formulation and implementation of our Nation's foreign policy.

In 1967, BILL BROOMFIELD was named by President Johnson to serve as a U.S. Ambassador to the 22d General Assembly of the United Nations.

The world has changed dramatically since BILL BROOMFIELD first came to the Congress. The Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and the East Bloc exist no more. The world is increasingly free, increasingly democratic—the cold war is over.

I firmly believe that these great changes in our world, changes which mean a preeminent role for the United States are changes which BILL BROOMFIELD helped significantly to bring about.

One of BILL's latest foreign policy accomplishments was his outstanding stewardship of the Russian aid bill through the House and then subsequently through the conference process. BILL can be proud of his work on this important measure.

Many of us worked closely with BILL throughout the years. His prudence, his wisdom, and his friendship will be sorely missed. We know BILL will enjoy spending more time with his lovely wife, Jane, his children and his grandchildren.

We will miss BILL's sage counsel on our Foreign Affairs Committee, but we know he will always be there for us to call on him for advice when the going gets rough. I join all of our colleagues in thanking BILL for his outstanding service to our Nation. We wish him the very best of good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I am looking forward to hearing the special order of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] on some of the scandals around here, and then I am looking forward to doing a special order on some of the scandals involving national candidates that have never served in this Chamber like running for the Presidency.

I just wanted to join the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to say that without 1 ounce of exaggeration, BILL BROOMFIELD is one of the finest quality Americans and patriots that it has been my honor to serve with in this Chamber over a 16-year span.

□ 2040

No matter how dark the period of history, he was always in a good mood, a positive mood, positive about America, positive about what we could do in foreign affairs, positive about the impact of this Chamber with resolutions of either condemnation or congratulation to emerging democracies around the world, or in the case of condemnation to the despotic regimes we have seen come and go over the course of this century.

BILL told me he was going to be watching the special order of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] tonight and my special order, so I know he is listening.

I was shocked to just learn that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] have served longer than any Republicans since the party was founded in Ripon, WI, in 1854, and I just hope that in this crop of freshmen coming in here in both parties that they have one-tenth of the dedication and the love of country and the love of family and love of history and love of this institution that WILLIAM BROOMFIELD has had. We are surely going to miss this quality gentleman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his kind remarks, and I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for allowing us to proceed out of order.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity today to honor a good friend, a responsible legislator, and a respected citizen, Mr. WILLIAM BROOMFIELD.

Since his election to Congress in 1956, and his appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee in 1961, Mr. BROOMFIELD has been a Member commanding respect in the House of Representatives, from the White House, and from dignitaries around the world. Having served as long as my good friend, BOB MICHEL, these two men share the distinction of having served longer in the minority than any other Congressmen in history. So I suppose these two gentlemen have established a new threshold for pain.

Just to put his longevity in perspective, when Mr. BROOMFIELD took office, John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State. In all, he has served with 8 Presidents and 11 Secretaries of State. Mr. BROOMFIELD has always believed in a bipartisan foreign policy, which explains the excellent reputation of the Foreign Affairs Committee today. I had the opportunity to work with him during my years on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I sought his counsel and advice on many critical issues. I guarantee that men of his stature and character are few and far between in this day and age.

In January, Mr. BROOMFIELD will be completing his 16th term, and unfortunately for this country, his excellent service as a Member of the House of Representatives. We would all be wise to emulate his actions, and work not just for one or another party, but for the good of the Nation. His family's gain is this country's loss. And we will miss him dearly.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate with my fellow colleagues in this special order this evening. It is a privilege to offer a few words on behalf of my trusted friend, BILL BROOMFIELD.

BILL announced earlier this year that he was going to leave Congress to devote more time to his family. I was saddened by this announcement, for as a Member of Congress since 1971, I have grown to admire BILL for his judgment, respect him for his views, and appreciate him for his friendship.

BILL is in the unique position of having witnessed the beginning, and the finale of the cold war. He has served under eight Presidents and has negotiated with some of the most powerful leaders of our time. Throughout these years, BILL led legislative efforts in Congress to ameliorate our relations with friends and foes alike, and knew that strength and honesty are two integral elements in every negotiation. Since those first days in Congress, his tenure has been marked by a clear and concise comprehension of the intricacies of foreign policy.

In the last years, the world has experienced some of the most dramatic events in the history of mankind. We have seen dynasties fall, regimes shattered, and democracies flourish in countries which had only known authoritarian repression. And increasingly, we are presented with revisionist accounts of what has happened in this 20th century. While some of it may be end-of-the-century angst, other analysis has offered us a balanced perspective of our global community in the last several decades. That analysis has shown that the leadership of people like BILL who believed that compromise is different than giving in, and that strength and the ability to fight can be a catalyst to peace, has been instrumental in creating our new and safer world order.

And now while in retrospect, it is deceptively simple to cast our foreign policy successes over the last four decades as inevitable, we would do well to remember that our successes stem only from the expertise, understanding, and diplomacy of statesmen such as BILL BROOMFIELD.

On a more personal note, BILL is a gentleman of the first order, and is a throwback to an era when poise and scholarship characterized the ideal public servant. BILL is such a servant. Time and time again, BILL served not only his constituency in Michigan, but also the national constituency of American citizens. The Nation will miss his scholarly, reflective, and thoughtful approach to international relations. His understanding of the world and the volatile interplay among nations is an understanding that can never be replaced and will be lacking when Congress convenes for the 103d Congress. I believe it is due to the efforts made by BILL BROOMFIELD and a handful of others like him that we can say today that the Soviet Empire has fallen and his fight for freedom around the world has now permitted former Warsaw Pact members to embrace the ideals of democracy and liberty.

BILL, we will miss you around these corridors, but know that you will enjoy time spent with your family. And while you're back in Michigan, I hope you will remember that your legacy will live on in these hallowed Halls, and we are truly grateful for your many achievements. As someone who has worked with you for the past 20 years, I wholeheartedly say, "well done, thy good and faithful servant."

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly with mixed emotions that I join my colleagues in saluting my good and dear friend, and Michigan colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD. Carol and I are delighted to wish him and his lovely wife Jane all the very best during retirement years that, I hope, will be as pleasant as the years of friendship we have shared.

But I share with many of my colleagues, and, I am sure, foreign affairs specialists in governments around the world, the sense of loss which his leaving will visit upon this body's contribution to sound U.S. foreign policy. For 30 years BILL BROOMFIELD has listened, and digested, and contributed to the foreign policy and the foreign affairs structure of the United States. In the recent past, as the ranking Republican on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, his steady insight has been invaluable as the Nation has witnessed the fall of communism and the rise of a new era of freedom around the world.

His coming to Congress during the administration of a general who both brought victory on the fields of war and warned of the tyranny of an unsettled peace is a fitting beginning to a career which contributed, in no small measure, to ending that tyranny and sowing fields of peace and prosperity for nations around the world.

I have, of course, a special affection for BILL as a colleague and mentor from Michigan. His decade in the House before my arrival prepared him to be a wise and generous counselor—and a leader in our delegation over the years. The combination of his prudent diplomatic skills and wise judgment have been a true well of inspiration for the consideration of my efforts to well and ably represent not only the people of Michigan's Ninth District and our State, but the Nation.

BILL BROOMFIELD is the man in whose image the decorum of this House is reflected: A gentleman, a thoughtful man, and a man of God, family, and country. This body will miss his wise counsel, the Nation will miss his leadership, and we, most of all, will miss him. Again, Carol and I hope that he and Jane will enjoy a long and happy retirement secure in the knowledge that he and they have served well.

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues to recognize the many accomplishments and impressive public service record of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD is an individual of high principle and abiding conviction who has the strength of his convictions and the years of experience to back it up with action.

He has been a steadying influence in the area of foreign policy as the ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee since 1975.

In a body that has often been described as 435 individuals who want to be Secretary of State, Mr. BROOMFIELD has had the fortitude to resist efforts by some to try to run our foreign policy out of the Capitol Building, but at the same time, he has never been willing to be a rubber stamp for any administration.

In the best sense, and to the benefit of the Nation, Mr. BROOMFIELD has been an honest broker in the process of foreign policy development in a democracy.

That is a very difficult task, because it encompasses two often conflicting principles—the responsibility of representative government to reflect the will of the people, on one hand, and the absolute necessity that we speak with one voice, as one nation, when we deal with other nations.

Mr. BROOMFIELD has walked this fine line with skill and with a well-honed sense of our place in the global community of nations.

And, throughout these years of service in the area of foreign policy, Mr. BROOMFIELD has never lost touch with the needs of his constituents in the 18th District of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank our colleague from New York, Mr. GILMAN, for his leadership in organizing this special order.

I join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in recognizing the many accomplishments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], and join with them also in wishing him all the best.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in honoring our esteemed colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD, of Michigan. BILL BROOMFIELD has served in Congress with distinction since 1956. I am told he is the third longest-serving Member in the history of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I am not surprised that he has achieved such a milestone.

For more than 30 years, he has been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has been a pleasure for me to serve with him on the committee for 28 of those years. BILL has been an effective legislator and has been fair and thorough in his oversight work. His wit, his frankness and his wise counsel have helped him and helped the committee. His steadying influence has helped to bridge differences and to build effective coalitions that have strengthened American foreign policy. His long service and active participation in the committee will be missed by all of us.

BILL BROOMFIELD has time and again made important contributions to critical and sensitive foreign policy debates—on the Middle East, on issues throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, on Yugoslavia and on the crisis in the Balkans. He has served with 8 Presidents and 10 Secretaries of State. Many of them have sought his counsel and advice.

BILL can take pride in his many accomplishments. He can look back on a career with a full measure of satisfaction and a sure sense of a job well done. He will also leave us with an incredible asset—signatures of scores of world leaders with whom he has met during the last three turbulent decades. This is a treasure for any family and a recognition of the hundreds of hours BILL has spent with guests of this Nation seeking the counsel of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Today, we salute BILL and Jane Broomfield. As a team, they have brought honor to the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and this institution. Their energy and quiet grace will be missed. We wish them well in retirement, and hope our dear friends BILL and Jane will stay in touch with us.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a tremendous honor to join with my House colleagues in this tribute to our good friend and outstanding legislator, BILL BROOMFIELD. BILL, as we all know, announced his retirement from the House Last April, and I must admit that it seemed that things around here, ever since, have not—or will not be—the same.

We will miss his leadership. That is a foregone conclusion. He is the outstanding ranking minority member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and his contributions to our Nation's success in the difficult Persian Gulf conflict cannot be overstated or praised enough. His counsel during that situation was widely—and wisely—sought, and I know that millions of Americans are extremely grateful for his part in bringing that conflict to a successful and swift conclusion.

BILL noted that he has witnessed dramatic changes in the world in the past 36 years—the post-World-War II era, the Korean conflict, the Vietnam experience, Watergate, the fall of the Soviet Union, the significant changes in Europe and the awesome impact of the space age and its global influence on technology. While BILL might say that he's been fortunate to witness such events, I might offer that he has been a part of making history. He has been a part of the efforts undertaken by our Nation to make the world safe and to assure a sound future for out children and our grandchildren.

BILL BROOMFIELD is a doer. He has served Presidents back to Dwight Eisenhower and his counsel has been sought by those in the White House ever since. I know he has agonized over some of the difficult decisions he has had to make. But BILL would simply say that tough decisions and difficult choices come with the turf. It's part of the job—what Harry Truman always referred to in his comments about not kitchens.

I consider myself a fortunate person, indeed, to include BILL among my best friends in the Congress. He's been a neighbor during recent years, with his office just down the hall from mine in the Rayburn Building. We're both leaving this great institution shortly. I wish BILL the very best in retirement and I hope that his legacy is carried on by those who endeavor to make the Congress a body of, by and for the people.

BILL BROOMFIELD is the definition of honor in Government and integrity in serving our citizens.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, the world significantly changed over the last 36 years, but one thing has remained constant for the residents of Michigan's 18th District—the diligent representation of WILLIAM BROOMFIELD, who is retiring following this term.

Since 1956, BILL distinguished himself on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, as ranking Republican member for most of that time. Serving under the tenure of eight different Presidents since he first came to Congress, BILL witnessed and impacted numerous changes making the world safer for democracy. He brought a tremendous knowledge and understanding to the Foreign Affairs Committee in shaping U.S. foreign policy.

His expertise and work on foreign policy did not cause him to lose focus on important issues facing his district and the Nation. He faithfully has provided excellent constituent services and has been rewarded by reelection to the House 17 times. In addition, BILL has fought for a reduction in wasteful Government spending, winning recognition from citizen's groups.

I have appreciated the chance to serve with BILL and join my colleagues in offering him best wishes for the future.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, for our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM BROOMFIELD, the past 36 years have indeed been interesting times. But it has always been his nature to see the blessing as well as the curse. The opportunity as well as the danger.

Reflecting on his career, Representative BROOMFIELD said

> Little did I know when driving to Washington in late 1956 to begin serving in Congress that I would be sitting across the table from hundreds of world leaders such as Chaing-Kai-Shek, Deng Xiaoping, Mikhail Gorbachev, Queen Elizabeth II, Margaret Thatcher and Anwar Sadat, not to mention eight Presidents * * *.

Starting in 1956 Representative BROOMFIELD was witness to events ranging from the suppression of the Hungarian revolution to the final collapse of the Soviet Empire. The building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 to the destruction of the symbol of oppression in 1989. He has watched from his vantage point on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the rise of Castro and the Cuban missile crisis. We hope that from the vantage point of a well earned retirement he will soon see the end of communism in this hemisphere.

He has taken a special interest in solving the tragedy of Cyprus. In 1990 he was awarded the Silver Cross by the Patriarchate of Constantinople for his fearless advocacy of religious freedom, human rights and special justice for all mankind.

Throughout his legislative career, Representative BROOMFIELD has stood for a bipartisan approach to foreign policy. He has carried forward the idea, expressed by Arthur Vandenberg, that politics should stop at the water's edge. As a freshman Member I was grateful for his advice and seasoned judgment.

As he and DANTE FASCELL both leave us this year, we know that we may never see their like again. We wish you a long, healthy and happy retirement with your wife, Jane, your daughters and grandchildren. At the same time we promise to strive for the standards you have set in this House.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague BEN GILMAN in paying tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman BILL BROOMFIELD, who will not be returning for the 103d Congress. I consider it an honor and a privilege to call BILL BROOMFIELD a close, personal friend.

BILL and I have served together in this body for three decades, and have seen a lot of changes. But one thing that has remained steadfast through the years is BILL's wise counsel which was always given in a calm, fair-minded manner.

It is truly a shame that BILL never had the opportunity to chair the Committee on Foreign Affairs since we Republicans have been in the minority for his entire tenure. If given the opportunity, I am confident that he would have continued to work with both Democrats and Republicans to forge good police policy, just as he has done as the ranking Republican. BILL BROOMFIELD's desire to seek practical solutions makes him the epitome of the statesmanship.

BILL BROOMFIELD and I have shared many experiences over the years including sitting together through countless historical addresses to joint sessions of Congress. As Members of Congress we sometimes get caught up in the various legislative and political battles that are constantly being waged here, but we often lose sight of the history that we witness and help to shape. When I think back on the countless historic addresses of the last three decades, such as the *Apollo 11* astronauts, various world leaders, and the yearly State of the Union Addresses, to name a few, I recall sitting next to BILL BROOMFIELD and listening to his expert commentary. Together, we have played our role in history.

Mr. Speaker, BILL BROOMFIELD is one of the finest men ever to have served in this body. And though his leadership and guidance will certainly be missed next year, BILL can retire knowing that he leaves this body having helped to make this country and the world a better and safer place to live.

My wife, Nancy, joins me in extending our best to BILL, his lovely wife, Jane, and their family for a healthy and happy retirement. For a man who has devoted so much of his life to the Nation's business, he has earned the right to spend more with his family.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, when a good friend decides to retire from the House, it is always difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact. But when that friend happens to be a House classmate of yours, the loss is all the more hard to take.

BILL BROOMFIELD and I were Members of the freshman class of 1956 and I have long benefited from his counsel and his example. Since 1981, as minority leader of the House, I have had the opportunity to work closely with BILL on foreign policy matters ranging from strategic arms reduction to the attempt of Communists to take over Central America. As ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee he has always demonstrated an informed understanding of the issues, a desire to seek workable solutions, and a commitment to basic American values.

Foreign policy is not the easiest area for a Congressman because—except for a few cases—there is no built-in constituency, no direct political payoff for making tough calls on foreign policy issues. Most Americans are not as concerned with foreign affairs as they are with domestic, paycheck matters. Except in times of great national peril, it is difficult to convey to voters the link between a strong American position in the world and a strong domestic economy—but the link is there, and leaders like BILL BROOMFIELD understand that. BILL BROOMFIELD has known that if we are to remain strong and free and competitive in a world economy, our foreign relations have to be conducted with care.

BILL, it has been an honor working with you. As your House classmate of 1956, I just want to say that you and I have been privileged to witness and play a role in a dramatic period in American history. You have done so very much to make certain that during this time of international turmoil and change, the values and the interests of our Nation were promoted and protected around the world.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, and my dear friend, WILLIAM BROOMFIELD.

First elected to Congress in 1956, BILL has provided the country with distinguished service for 36 consecutive years. As the ranking minority member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, BILL has brought a unique measure of wisdom to the foreign policy process. His service has spanned virtually the entire cold war, and he has provided numerous Presidents, Secretaries of State, and national security advisers with sound, commonsense advice on foreign policy decisions.

There is no questioning the fact that BILL's foreign policy expertise has been a valuable asset to this country. He has served on numerous international and parliamentary conferences, as well as Presidential commissions. He was appointed by President Lyndon Johnson to serve as a U.S. Ambassador to the 22d United Nations Assembly. He has also focused considerable attention toward resolving the ongoing conflict over Cyprus. In 1990, he was awarded the Silver Cross of the Order of St. Andrew of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in recognition of his fearless advocacy of religious freedom, human rights, and social justice for all mankind.

In 1992, BILL was awarded the Periclean Award by the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association in recognition of his more than 30 years of non-partisan leadership on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

BILL has also provided very able service to the House Small Business Committee, and has been recognized by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for his work that has helped create an environment in which businesses large and small can prosper.

BILL's career in public service began in 1948, and he served for 8 years in the Michigan House of Representatives and the State Senate. He was youngest speaker pro-tem of the house in Michigan history, serving from 1953 to 1954. He also has the distinction of serving longer in Congress than any Republican in the history of the state.

BILL has decided to retire at the end of the 102d Congress to spend more time with his wife Jane and his children and grandchildren. He leaves behind a lasting legacy of distinguished service and achievement. This institution is losing a great friend and a fine legislator. I wish him and his family the very best for the future. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I feel a sense of both happiness and sadness today as we pay tribute to a wonderful human. BILL BROOMFIELD will be retiring at the end of this Congress in order to spend more time with his wife, children, and granchildren.

I certainly feel happy for my good friend from Michigan because his retirement means he will be able to spend more time with his wife, children, and grandchildren. However, it is with a touch of sadness that I realize we here in Congress will no longer be working with one of the House's most respected Members.

I have had many wonderful experiences working with Mr. BROOMFIELD, most notably on issues affecting Greece. In fact, his work on behalf of Greece and Cyprus has been recognized by many organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being toastmaster for the biennial AHEPA meeting here in Washington. BILL was honored with the Periclean Award for 1992. Here is the citation that accompanied the award.

For his exemplary contributions during a lifetime of service to our country and to humanity, for more than 30 years of nonpartisan leadership on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for his untiring efforts in promoting the longstanding friendship between the United States and Greece, and his support for the rule of law for everyone, including Cyprus, it is with greatful appreciation and recognition, therefore, that the order of AHEPA does herewith present to United States Representative William Broomfield the AHEPA Periclean AWARD for 1992.

For all your dedicated years of service BILL, I thank you.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity of this special order to say a few words about my good friend and esteemed colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD, upon his retirement from the House of Representatives. I have had the great pleasure of knowing BILL for 12 years that I have served in the House. On numerous occasions over the years I have sought BILL's insight on matters of importance to the Nation's foreign policy, relying on his abundant wisdom accumulated from serving 36 years in Congress. As one of the two most senior Republican Representatives, BILL's advice frequently has been depended on by those of us with less seniority.

As ranking minority member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, BILL has helped shape foreign policy during some of the most tumultuous years of American history and has worked with eight Presidents. A World War II veteran himself, he has watched our Nation's young soldiers go off to foreign soil to fight in the name of freedom, most recently in the Persian Gulf. He has seen the collapse of communism, the breakup of the Soviet Union, and the fall of the Berlin Wall. He has been a strong supporter of aid to Israel, and the rights of Soviet Jews, meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev to present a list of Jewish refuseniks to him.

As a fellow member of the North Atlantic Assembly Delegation, I have enjoyed spending time with BILL on our trips overseas to the

NATO Assemblies. Those trips have given me the chance to get to know him and his wife, Jane, away from the pressures of Washington. I must admit that the announcement of his retirement shocked me as well as most of his colleagues. Not only was BILL the 50th of our colleagues to voluntarily depart the House this Congress, but I was selfishly saddened at the prospect of losing such a well-respected colleague to the allure of retirement.

There can be no doubt that BILL has earned his retirement after dedicating 36 years to serving his constituents. I hope that he and Jane enjoy spending some well-deserved time together and with their children and grandchildren. But it is also my wish that he won't become a stranger to these marble Halls. Those of us who return next year, as well as the many new Members of the freshman class of the 103d Congress, will always be in need of some of his well-seasoned advice.

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend and colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD, who is retiring at the end of the 102d Congress after 36 years of outstanding public service.

I should like to thank my colleague from new York, Mr. BENJAMIN GILMAN, for sponsoring tonight's special order in BILL'S honor.

As BILL has the most seniority of any Republican Member, he has a long list of achievements. Throughout his three decades in Congress, BILL served on the Foreign Affairs Committee. His wisdom has guided us through critical times, and his expertise will be sorely missed. In addition to his work on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I thank BILL for his efforts on the Small Business Committee.

At this time, I should like to offer BILL my very best upon his retirement. He has earned the deserved respect of all of those who have had the pleasure of working with him in this body. I know that our colleagues join me in thanking him for his dedication to the State of Michigan and to the Nation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing Congressman BILL BROOMFIELD of Michigan for his 36 years of outstanding service to the House of Representatives.

As the senior Republican Member of this body, along with my good friend BOB MICHEL of Illinois, BILL BROOMFIELD has served this House as a model of intelligence, creativity, integrity, and dedication to the people of the United States of America. Since he first came to Congress from the Detroit suburbs in 1956, BILL BROOMFIELD has served his constituents honorably and effectively.

As the ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD has helped to maintain a bipartisan front against Communist aggression from the dark days of the cold war through the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. At the same time, he has advanced the cause of human rights throughout the world.

I am certain that BILL BROOMFIELD'S dedication to principle inspired his courageous opposition to President Bush's China policy following the 1989 massacre in Tiananmen Square.

Without seeking attention for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD challenged President Bush again in 1990 for failing to consult with Congress on the issue of war in the Persian Gulf.

Beyond his invaluable work in the House, Mr. BROOMFIELD has participated in many vitally important programs and organizations, including the United Nations, NATO, and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. And, as we honor Rosh Hashanah this week, we should remember that the freedom-loving people of Israel have long known BILL BROOMFIELD as a trusted friend.

Congressman BROOMFIELD unquestionably ranks as a man whose knowledge, experience, and sound judgment have earned him the respect and admiration of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. But what impresses me even more is the fact that he has never allowed his foreign policy work to distract from the needs of his constituents in Michigan's 18th Congressional District. For nearly four decades, Congressman BROOMFIELD has maintained close ties with his constituents. He has responded forcefully to questions ranging from Social Security to highway construction—not to mention foreign affairs. I credit Mr. BROOMFIELD'S success in Congress with his ability to balance local concerns against problems in faraway lands.

Mr. Speaker, BILL BROOMFIELD—along with myself and many other colleagues—has announced he is retiring at the conclusion of the 102d Congress. I am extremely proud to have served with this gracious, dependable, and sincere man who symbolizes so much of what it takes to serve this Congress with honor.

I would very much like to wish Mr. BROOMFIELD a happy retirement, and I extend to him my sincerest congratulations on his many contributions to the United States of America.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am pleased and honored to rise with my colleagues to pay tribute to my good friend from Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD.

In his 36 years of continuous service in the House of Representatives, BILL has become known as one of the hardest working Members of Congress. For 32 of those years, he has been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, becoming its vice chairman in 1975. BILL's expertise and experience in the field of foreign relations are unparalleled, and his counsel is widely respected on both sides of the aisle.

BILL served in the Michigan State House of Representatives, rising to become the youngest Speaker pro tempore in that body's history. He has also served as a U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. General Assembly, and has received honors and awards too numerous to list for his meritorious public service.

BILL is fond of pointing out that he, along with BOB MICHEL, has served longer as a member of the House minority than any other Member in the history of the House of Representatives. It is sad that someday, when the Republican Party finally regains the majority in this great institution, BILL won't be around to see it.

I have been privileged to know BILL BROOMFIELD for my entire career in Congress. The State of Michigan is losing a wonderful advocate on Capitol Hill, and we are all losing a good friend. His record of service is one to which we all should aspire, and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a generation of Americans have witenessed the effective, if often quiet, congressional efforts of Michigan's WILLIAM BROOMFIELD. For over a third of a century he has done an outstanding job of representing his constituents in Michigan. And now he nears his voluntary retirement from the House of Representatives.

BILL BROOMFIELD'S legislative history goes back to 1948, when he was first elected to the Michigan House of Representatives, where he rose to speaker pro tem before seeking, and winning, election to the Michigan State Senate.

If most of us feel BILL BROOMFIELD has been here as long as we can remember, it is because he has been. He was first elected to this Chamber in 1956. No current member of the Republican Party has served longer in the House than BILL. And everyone acquainted with his record knows that he has served well during that span which began nearly four decades ago.

No one is better qualified to speak of his nation's foreign policy than BILL BROOMFIELD. He will leave office as the vice chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, a committee he joined in 1961.

BILL BROOMFIELD has played an important role during his service here in forwarding the interests of the United States in international diplomatic dealings as affected by congressional action.

He can say with pride that he didn't permit political considerations to influence his foreign policy decisions. Bipartisan was more than a word to him—it was the direction of his foreign policy reasoning. On more than one occasion, he left the ranks of his party's leadership to follow a foreign policy he believed to be more proper.

He has not sought headlines over the years as he worked diligently in the foreign policy arena that was filled with headline hunters.

All of his colleagues will miss BILL BROOMFIELD after he leaves this Chamber. And the country will miss his leadership.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my fellow colleagues in saluting 36 years of distinguished service to this House by my friend BILL BROOMFIELD. In this magnificent institution, BILL has been an institution in his own right.

BILL has served the foreign affairs committee, to which he has devoted most of his career, with integrity, wisdom, and effectiveness. We have all witnessed remarkable changes in the world. The history unfolding before our eyes is sometimes too extraordinary to fully comprehend. BILL'S vision and experience have been invaluable to the Foreign Affairs Committee and his country through the cold war to the Persian Gulf war.

In his 36 years, BILL never forgot his constituents of the 18th District of Michigan, and he has served them well. I am pleased to join with his constituents, and our colleagues, in expressing my sadness that BILL has completed his service in the Congress. Yet, I know he will enjoy the time with his family and grandchildren.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to our friend BILL BROOMFIELD, who is retiring from Congress after 36 years of distinguished service. It is a bittersweet occasion, for even as we bid him fare-

well, we also acknowledge that this House is losing one of its most respected and effective Members.

BILL's career in Congress has spanned the tenure of eight Presidents and decades of shifting political winds. But through it all, he has been a rock-solid voice of reason and sound judgment, especially regarding foreign policy. His outstanding service as ranking Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee has been marked, as our colleague BEN GILMAN observed, by "wisdom and prudence," qualities that are sadly becoming all too rare in this institution.

BILL's great personal warmth and decency are well-known to all, and although he refrained from heated rhetoric, the Almanac of American Politics noted that he was often passionate in debate when the moment demanded it. There is no question that on many occasions, his wide-ranging knowledge of issues and sound reasoning helped move this House and the Congress in the right direction on matters of domestic and foreign policy alike.

The people of Michigan and of our Nation have benefited greatly from BILL BROOMFIELD's contributions in Congress, and all of us who have been fortunate enough to work with him and call him our friend will deeply miss him. As BILL retires to spend more time with his family—his wife, Jane, and his children and grandchildren—I join every Member of this House in wishing him the very best of health and happiness. He leaves behind a proud legacy of statesmanship and leadership.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this special order honoring Bill Broomfield, our good friend from Michigan who is retiring at the end of the 102d Congress.

BILL BROOMFIELD, no doubt about it, is one of the outstanding gentlemen serving in this Congress and he has a world of friends on both sides of the aisle and throughout America. Although a staunch Republican, BILL is the kind of person who relates well to everyone and if we had more members like this I believe that we could accomplish much in a bipartisan manner. BILL BROOMFIELD has been an outstanding ranking minority member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and working with its outstanding chairman, my colleague DANTE FASCELL from Florida, has been instrumental in giving us leadership in international relations for a longtime. BILL will be sorely missed because of his expertise in foreign affairs.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate our colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD, for his many years of service to America. He is a person of high integrity, understanding, and ability who has been a great asset to this institution and a good role model for those who follow. I know that this is a tremendous loss of the people of his congressional district as well as for the Nation. My wife, Nancy, has gotten to know Jane Broomfield and both she and I have the greatest admiration for this couple. We wish God's greatest blessing upon BILL, Jane, and their family.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member is especially pleased to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] to pay special tribute to a very distinguished departing Member of this body, Representative WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD of Lake Orion, MI. He has been a Member of this body longer than any other currently serving Republican, a distinction he enjoys with our distinguished minority leader. For 36 years BILL BROOMFIELD has served the Nation. For 32 of those years, he has served as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. In time he became the ranking member of that important committee, and it is in that capacity that this Member came to observe and work with our distinguished colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD.

BILL BROOMFIELD'S tenure on the Foreign Affairs Committee has coincided with some of the most dramatic moments in the history of U.S. foreign policy. He served on the committee through much of the cold war. As a junior member he witnessed the United States involvement in Vietnam unfold. He witnessed what has been called the decade of decline in the 1970's. Then in a leadership role he was in there for and part of the great American resurgence in the 1980's. And, has been a leading force as we have witnessed the return of democracy to Eastern and Central Europe.

Mr. Speaker, the issues that are considered by the Foreign Affairs Committee stir great passion, and are oftentimes divisive. Often it has seemed that there is no room for compromise between the supporters and opponents on issues of U.S. foreign policy. But BILL, together with former Chairman Clem Zablochi and Chairman DANTE FASCELL, would work tirelessly to forge a proper bipartisan consensus when it seemed that no such consensus was possible. At times he took a high profile public leadership role, but on many other occasions he often acted quietly and behind the scenes, eschewing the limelight while organizing support for a crucial policy or position. Few people realize, for example, the absolutely critical role BILL BROOMFIELD played in forging a consensus in support of the President's recent decisive and successful actions in the Persian Gulf. Without BILL BROOMFIELD'S efforts, it would have been much more difficult to gain and maintain the positive relationship between the executive branch and the Congress during the period around Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm.

Having been the ranking Republican on the Foreign Affairs Committee while we had presidents from both political parties, BILL BROOMFIELD repeatedly demonstrated first-hand, the importance of a bipartisan foreign policy. His actions have been guided by a commitment to principle, combined with a desire to reach a consensus. In this, his service paralleled another great Michigander, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. Our distinguished colleague BILL BROOMFIELD said the following about his famous Michigan predecessor: "Senator Vandenberg pointed out that bipartisanship is not only good patriotism, but the best kind of Republican politics, as well. But I also agree with him that we should not be afraid to offer vigorous and vigilant criticism, when and where deserved."

Mr. Speaker, in this Member's 10 years of service on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have gained an enormous and ever-growing respect for my ranking member. BILL and his talented staff have been enormously gracious and always helpful with their time, talent and energy. His leadership, support and guidance have been invaluable, and for these and many other reasons this Member is very appreciative. While all of us will certainly miss his presence as ranking member, I have no doubt that present and future American leaders will continue to seek out BILL BROOMFIELD for his insights and advice on foreign policy and national security matters. Thus, I fully expect that BILL BROOMFIELD will continue to make very important contributions to our Nation. BILL, your Nation, the Congress, and this Representative is indebted to you for your dedicated, and highly effective public service. You can know in leaving the House that the United States of America is stronger and better because of your legislative contributions. No legislator can ask for a greater reward.

BILL, I wish you and your lovely wife, Jane all the best in the years ahead.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our friend from Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD. And while we all may regret the circumstance that makes this special order possible—BILL's Retirement—this is also an opportunity to give BILL the accolades he richly deserves.

The world has turned over many times since BILL BROOMFIELD came to the House of Representatives nearly 36 years ago. By virtue of his long service on the Foreign Affairs Committee, BILL has seen it all. He served his country and the cause of freedom during one of the most tumultuous periods in human history.

Throughout these 36 years, BILL adhered unswervingly to the principles of containment, peace through strength, and bipartisanship in foreign policy. It was these principles that enabled the free world to win the cold war. And it was the commitment of people like BILL BROOMFIELD who kept hope alive.

If there is one example that best typifies BILL'S leadership, I think it would have to be his efforts 10 years ago this summer—in 1982—to defeat the so-called nuclear freeze. That concept—the freezing of United States and Soviet Nuclear Forces at levels which would have guaranteed a strategic advantage to the Soviet Union—was one of the most dangerous and ill-conceived propositions ever debated by this House.

Unfortunately, it was supported by far too many Members who should have known better. But BILL BROOMFIELD was never fooled. He saw the nuclear freeze for what it really was—bogus arms control and a de facto accommodation to Soviet power.

BILL led the effort to defeat the nuclear freeze. He marshalled the arguments against it, planned the floor strategy and the amendments that gutted it, and managed the debate. If that was the only thing BILL had done in his 36 years in Congress, the country would owe him a debt of profound gratitude. Instead of some half-baked nuclear freeze, our country now has genuine and far-reaching arms control agreements in place. Such are results of peace through strength.

If there is one word that describes BILL BROOMFIELD'S 36 years in Congress, it would have to be "consistency." BILL did the right thing, supported the right policies, and put the national interest first—with consistency.

Contrary to popular notions in some fashionable and frivolous circles today, the free

world's victory in the cold war was never a sure thing. BILL BROOMFIELD always understood that the cold war could only be won after a long struggle. He never gave up—and he never ceased to remind his colleagues of the stakes involved in winning that struggle.

BILL, yours has been a career well spent. You can retire from this great house, which you love so well, secure in the knowledge that you have earned the respect of your colleagues and have gained an honored place in the history of this great institution—the people's House.

BILL, you will be missed. But you have served our country well. And you deserve a happy, healthy, and prosperous retirement with Jane, your children, and grandchildren.

Godspeed, good friend. And don't stay away—come back and visit your old colleagues. We will always be glad to see you.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, It is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to our retiring colleague from my neighboring State of Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD.

Being the senior member of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, BILL has certainly seen a lot of changes in the world over the years. Who could have possibly expected when he was first elected to Congress in 1956 that he would see the downfall of communism in the West with the demise of the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc countries as well as the demolition of the Berlin Wall.

BILL has served with 8 Presidents and 10 Secretaries of State from both political parties. As the ranking Republican on the important House Foreign Affairs Committee, BILL has always been an advocate of the policy that partisan politics should stop at the water's edge and America should present a unified front on foreign policy. He is highly respected on both sides of the aisle and by leaders of nations throughout the world for his knowledge of foreign affairs and his reputation as a consensus builder on highly complex and often controversial issues.

BILL is a hall mate of mine. I have walked past his office to go vote for 10 years. We frequently run into each other. On one occasion several years ago I said to BILL, it sure would be nice to be chairman just once. He said it certainly would, Mr. Chairman. Since then he calls me Mr. Chairman and I call him Mr. Chairman. The title sounds great and would certainly fit in BILL'S case. But regretfully it is a goal neither of us will ever realize.

The people of the 18th District of Michigan are indeed fortunate to have BILL as their Congressman. His absence from the House will leave a void that will be heard to fill, and he will be sorely missed by both Republicans and Democrats alike. It has been a great honor for me to have served with BILL in the House and it has been a privilege to call him a friend.

My wife, Marjorie, and I want to wish BILL, Jane, and the rest of the family the very best in the years to come.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the gentleman from Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD. BILL has been a fair and effective ranking Republican for our Foreign Affairs Committee, and a stalwart member of the Small Business Committee. I count myself doubly lucky for being able to serve with him on both of these committees.

On the Foreign Affairs Committee, BILL has fought hard to promote the cause of freedom and the interests of the United States. He came to this Congress during the height of the cold war, and through his significant efforts to support the foreign policy of Ronald Reagan and George Bush, was able to be present for our final victory in that twilight struggle. The only shame is that he never got the chance to be chairman of that committee; a task he would have fulfilled very well.

I am so very sorry that when the 103d Congress convenes next January, BILL BROOMFIELD will not be there to provide his able leadership, wise counsel, and good fellowship. But he is leaving for the best reason I can think of, to spend more time with his wife Jane and his family. Good luck and Godspeed BILL. We'll miss you.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague, BILL BROOMFIELD. BILL is the kind of friend everyone needs—intelligent, thoughtful, experienced, always ready to help with good counsel, and advice whenever you need it.

When I was first elected to Congress and assigned to the House Foreign Affairs Committee in 1974, BILL had already made his mark in the international arena. His service in Congress and on various international commissions and delegations had given him the expertise and knowledge that was to prove so vital when he assumed the vice chairmanship of the committee a year later. His steady hand and stalwart support of democracy provided an unwavering beacon for nations caught in the grip of tyranny. During his tenure as ranking Republican, new democracies sprouted in Central and South America, Central Europe and the former Soviet Union. The Berlin Wall fell, and freedom flourished.

Working with Presidents Reagan and Bush to implement the peace through strength policy, BILL expertly guilded the committee and Congress through difficult negotiations with our allies and our enemies on arms control and international security, helping to restore the United States to a position of respect throughout the world. It's no exaggeration to say that because of BILL'S work, generations of Americans today can sleep sounder and safer than previously.

Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to sum up in a few words the long career of a true statesman, or to thank a friend for the guidance, support and kindness he has provided through the years. I only know that my life has been fuller and my Nation safer because of BILL BROOMFIELD, and I will always owe him my deepest respect and friendship. Norma joins me in saluting you and Jane, BILL, and wishing you the best in all that you do.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on the subject matter of the special order just taken.

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

There was no objection.

NEW DISCLOSURES ON HOUSE BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BROOMFIELD

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his special order on behalf of BILL BROOMFIELD. I, too, want to go on record as being complimentary of BILL BROOMFIELD for his years of service in the House. BILL BROOMFIELD has brought to this House a distinguished career, and he is someone who will be sorely missed in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, what I am about to do is difficult for me, but I have come into information about the House Bank scandal which sheds new light and which I believe I would be negligent not to discuss with my colleagues. The more I learn about the scandal in the former House bank, the more disturbed I become. I say that in sadness, because I now believe that the mismanagement of the House bank has resulted needlessly in the destruction of valued political careers and has compromised the integrity of this House, but I also believe that we have not been told the whole story about the House bank.

I believe the House leadership knew as early as December 1989 that activities in the House bank could embarrass the House and that overdrafts amounted to short-term loans. The importance of that latter point is that the recent conviction of a House post office staffer was based on her overdrafts which became, in effect, short-term loans financed with taxpayer money. If similar activity occurred in the House bank, it raises the specter of potential criminality.

Let me say that I know of no Member of Congress who specifically committed a criminal act. What I do know now is that the General Accounting Office suspected potential criminal problems of some kind, and so informed House leaders. I emphasize that I know that now because it has taken me months to acquire the documentation for what I am about to reveal.

What is apparent is that all of the talk about Judge Wilkey's investigation being a political witch hunt without any legal foundation is simply unfounded. It is certainly clear from the data I have gathered that serious questions, including questions of potential criminality, do exist.

I have tried to handle the information in my possession responsibly. I wrote the Speaker, raising questions which occurred to me upon reviewing the material I received. He was good enough to answer, but did not address the specificity of my questions.

In the course of tonight's discussion, I will talk about the letter and his re-

sponse, but let me begin with the information provided me by the GAO as a basis for spelling out my concerns. The GAO, in a letter to the former Sergeant at Arms, Jack Russ, provided a draft report on their audits dated April 3, 1991. The importance of that financial audit and this draft is language that was included in that draft audit that says, and I quote:

Further, bank officials have not taken action to suspend or terminate any account holders, even though many of these account holders have demonstrated a continuing pattern of cashing checks when there are insufficient funds in their accounts to cover the checks. This indicates that the check cashing procedures are not being consistently enforced. Also, account holders are receiving what amounts to interest-free short term loans when they overdraft their accounts and do not have to pay for this privilege.

I want to repeat that last sentence.

Also, account holders are receiving what amounts to interest-free short term loans when they overdraft their accounts and do not pay for this privilege.

The importance of that statement as it appears in the draft report is that in fact it was the opinion of the auditors of what was going on in the House bank, and never appears in the final draft.

The GAO, in their errata sheet, explains that they removed that particular sentence, and let me read to the Members their explanation. They said:

Also deleted was a statement that account holders of insufficient fund checks had received interest-free loans. Because GAO lacked information on the circumstances behind each check, agency reviewers concluded this generalization was too broad and could be misleading. However, GAO felt it important that a statement be added to specify that no penalties were imposed on account holders who overdrew their accounts.

That is what took place. That is what GAO claims. Now, I want to go to what I wrote to the Speaker in this regard, give you his response, and then indicate why I believe that both the errata sheet and the Speaker's response are inadequate as an answer to this particular problem.

Understand, I am raising this issue about that line that was deleted because that line implies criminality. It implies the potential criminality based upon the same set of circumstances that ended up having a member of the House Post Office staff convicted just recently.

Here is language from my letter to the Speaker with regard to this matter. I wrote to the Speaker and said:

What disturbs me is that the language of the draft report referring to a criminal violation does not appear in the final report. I am told that the deletion took place after discussions with House officials, including members of your staff. Is that true?

The errata sheet provided by GAO describes the changes occurring because the auditors themselves reconsidered. That reconsideration, I am informed, took place under pressure from the House. Is that true?

Furthermore, the auditors were asked to retract a position that had been personally communicated to you months earlier by the Comptroller General. What was done to pursue this indication of criminal activity at that time?

Public statements made thus far indicate that the concerns of the Comptroller General were responded to by asking the Sergeant at Arms, Jack Russ, to correct the problem, this despite the fact that the letter contained a long list of Russ's personal overdrafts amounting to $104,825. How is it an appropriate response to GAO's concerns to turn the solution over to someone who may be in criminal violation himself?

The Speaker wrote back to me answering those questions in this way:

The GAO routinely provides a draft copy of its report to an institution it inspects, thereby affording an opportunity for comments. Whether the GAO then makes changes lies wholly within its prerogative and independent judgment. I presume such was the case with respect to the reports to which you refer.

In fact, with respect to the language you cite about the overdrafts, which GAO edited, GAO has explained in its internal memorandum you provided to me that "because GAO lacked information on the circumstances behind each check, agency reviewers concluded this generalization was too broad and could be misleading."

You charge that criminal activity took place with respect to overdrafts by account holders at the former House bank. I continue in the strong conviction that no overdraft by a Member of the House constituted a criminal act. As you know, the Attorney General's Special Counsel, Judge Malcolm R. Wilkey, has already written the vast majority of Members with one or more overdrafts letters which inform them that the Department's review of their records and practices of the former House bank had led him to conclude that there was no basis for pursuing any further inquiry regarding any possible criminal violation with respect to their accounts.

Further, the process of furnishing such letters continues.

□ 2050

Now all of that sounds blissful except that the problem is that the Speaker, of course, did not respond to the specific questions that I raised.

You will remember that I raised the question of whether or not the House in any way participated in discussions, whether House officials including members of the Speaker's staff participated in discussions about the draft report. The Speaker does not answer that question. I further asked whether or not the reconsideration that is in the errata sheet took place under pressure from the House. The Speaker does not answer that question. I further raised the question of what was done to pursue the charges which I am about to talk about of the Comptroller General when he made similar kinds of charges months earlier. The Speaker does not answer that question. I further asked an appropriate response to turn it over to an official to solve the problem who may have problems himself. I did not receive an answer to that question.

So none of the specific questions that I asked were answered and, in fact, my charge that there may be criminal conduct in the bank was never specifically answered either, except that the Speaker says that he continues in the strong conviction that no overdraft by a Member of the House constituted a criminal act. However, that does not speak to the question of whether or not there may be criminality in the bank that goes beyond Members.

But I want to go back to the fundamental point here, whether or not GAO auditors were right in assuming that the overdrafts amounted to short-term loans, and whether or not someone thought that was a problem. Evidently, it was felt it was enough of a problem to pull it out of the final report. But this is not the first time the House had been informed of such a condition and such a charge.

In fact, the Speaker received a letter on December 19, 1989, from the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Bowsher. In that letter, which has been reported on in the press, but one line in that letter has not been focused upon, and that line is, and I quote, "During this time," referring to the time when depositors received credit to their accounts in the House bank, it says, "During this time, the makers or depositors of these checks have what could be considered an interest-free loan from the House Members' deposits at the bank."

So back in December 1989 the Comptroller General himself raised this question of interest-free loans in the House bank. Again, I go back and say interest-free loans are a problem because they constitute the same criminal class as was recently indicated in the conviction of a House staffer at the House post office.

The point that I raise with regard to the Comptroller General is the auditors in 1991 were saying nothing different than what the Speaker heard directly from Mr. Bowsher in 1989. And I want to also make another point. And that is that Mr. Bowsher regarded this letter as so serious that he met personally with the Speaker at that time and members of the Speaker's staff and informed him of the serious nature that he believed this letter constituted.

Now what happened? In 1989 after this information was revealed to the Speaker, that is what I referred to in my letter as a situation where having been informed of the situation the matter was turned over to the Sergeant at Arms to solve.

Now I struggled with that particular concept because it does not exactly strike me that that is what you would typically do in these kinds of cases, particularly when included as a part of the letter from the GAO were a list of checks from the House bank which had been overdrafted by staff people in the House bank. Included in that, as was mentioned in my letter, was a list of $104,000 worth of checks, a little better than $104,000 of checks that had been

overdrafted and returned to the Sergeant at Arms himself. It is an interesting list of checks, and it is something that raises real questions. It was something that raised questions when the Ethics Committee investigated.

On one particular day, for example, Mr. Russ had returned to him, and this is July 27, 1989, had three checks returned to him amounting to $5,000, $11,000, and $9,000. Two of those checks, after they had bounced once, he attempted to put through again, and again the $11,000 check and the $9,000 check were again refused payment on August 11, 1989.

Now what disturbs me about those checks, and what I believe lies at the base of why they could not move outside the scope of the House, was that the information I have is that those checks were written to cover gambling debts of Members in the House of Representatives. Now that is a disturbing aspect of all of this because I believe that that is the reason why then the criminality could not be pursued any further.

I can give specific check numbers. The check numbers were check 1365, check 1367, and check 1378 were the checks that were returned to the House Bank on July 27. Beyond that, there was a $10,000 check, No. 1394 written on 8/22/89, on August 22, 1989, that was returned. That was the date it was returned. It also then was rejected. And then on September 6, 1989, this $10,000 check was again rejected. Again, the information that I have indicates that those checks were in fact to pay gambling debts of Members of the House of Representatives.

That may explain why the matter could not be pursued any further than it was, and why there was an attempt, in my view, to cover up the extent to which Members' overdrafts amounted to short-term loans.

Now the question that arises is how do I make the case that these were in fact short-term loans of a nature that could cause a major problem. To that I go to another document that I received recently from the GAO which is the job file from the GAO when they looked at the situation within the House Bank. In that job file I learned that there was a special account known as the general ledger account 53. General ledger account 53 was the account into which Members were entered when they went past the 1-month latitude in their overdraft at the bank.

Now understand how this system operated, and what we have been told all the way along up until now was that this really was not overdrafting because what Members were doing was they were overdrafting their accounts, but actually they had money coming to them and so, therefore, it was not really an overdraft in the truest sense of the word. They were simply getting a little bit of money in advance, and it was all paid for at the end of the month. And in most cases that was probably true, and there probably is no question that that does not involve any kind of criminal activity because of the nature of the way the House operated. But what is interesting is general ledger account 53 called Members' unpaid checks.

□ 2100

Let me describe or let me read to you how the auditors describe general ledger account 53. They said:

> The checking services provided for the Members differs from other financial institutions in that the Members may write checks on their accrued salaries during the month even though that salary will not be physically deposited in the House bank until the 1st of the subsequent month. Members' unpaid checks held over from the previous month are charged against the respective Member's account on the assumption that they will be cleared by the Member's salary transfers on the 1st of the month. Where any Member's salary transfer amount will not cover their unpaid checks, such check amounts are removed from the Member's account and reentered in general ledger account 53, Members' unpaid checks.

Now, why is that important? Well, because what that suggests is that there was a ledger account where Members had overdrawn their accounts to an extent further than what they could pay for out of their month's salary, meaning that this was a draw against taxpayers' money in the appropriated account held at Treasury.

Now, how do I know that? If I go into the job file again, I find that particular account described. It is account No. 4831. Let me read to you what the auditors say in the job file.

> Generally deposit funds are funds in the Members' checking accounts that are handled by the House bank and placed in the Treasury. A separate checking account, symbol 4828, is maintained for these moneys. The designations 'disbursing funds' or 'appropriated funds' refer to an entirely separate set of accounts which are maintained at the Treasury to account for the appropriations and disbursements for Members' salaries and mileage. Checking account symbol 4831 is maintained by the Sergeant at Arms with the Treasury for withdrawals of these moneys. Appropriated funds are funds appropriated for the payment of Members' compensation, mileage, and gratuities to widows or widowers and heirs of deceased Members. The Sergeant at Arms acts as disbursing officers for these funds, using checking account symbol 4831 for disbursements. For those Members who desire the service, salaries are transferred directly into the House bank deposit fund, checking account symbol 4828, monthly. This is accomplished by the bookkeeping department, whose entry totals must tie to salary control totals developed monthly by the Sergeant at Arms. For those Members not desiring this service, their salary checks drawn on account 4831 are delivered to them or their designated depository through an arrangement between the House bank and the House Postmaster.

Now, the importance again of that statement is that the drawdown from the Treasury is on a monthly basis into these various accounts which means that anybody who is over that monthly period is in fact having their loan, if you will, secured by the taxpayers. That does not meet with Federal law, and that raises severe questions. And that is my concern out of all of this is that thus far we have not had an adequate explanation to the House for the fact that we were informed of these kinds of circumstances early on in December of 1989.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Would the gentleman just yield for a clarification of his statement?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. As I understand the gentleman's remarks, he is saying that when it appears as though a check is applied to the outstanding checks, when the Congressman's paycheck, if, indeed, it does not cover the outstanding indebtedness to the Sergeant at Arms or the so-called bank, that the shortfall is transferred to a different account?

Mr. WALKER. Yes. What happened was that at that point, if they did not have money to cover it, it was put in this general ledger account 53 named "Members' unpaid checks."

Mr. RANGEL. And so when the Member got their bank statement then that overdraw would not appear on that statement?

Mr. WALKER. Well, none of the overdrafts appear on any Member's statements.

Mr. RANGEL. I think the gentleman is making a great contribution, because I think it is important to a lot of Members who are not aware of this transaction which you received, and, therefore, what happens is that they receive a statement indicating they are not overdrawn, and so it appears as though they are in better financial status than it actually was.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman may not have been here when I made my original remarks. I said one of the reasons I am making this statement is because I believe that the mismanagement, and this is what I said earlier, that the mismanagement of the House bank has resulted needlessly in the destruction of valued political careers and compromised the integrity of the House. The gentleman is exactly making my point.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield further? I think the gentleman is making a great contribution. Will the gentleman yield further?

He said he has sources of information as to why these overdrafts took place. In other words, it seems as though the gentleman received information as to the spending habits of the Members, you know, gambling, women, drink or whatever.

Mr. WALKER. No. I did not mention women or drink. I do believe that there

is testimony at the ethics committee, and that there is information which has been developed which would, in fact, indicate that checks that I mentioned, and I mentioned specific checks, were used to pay gambling debts of Members.

Mr. RANGEL. You know, this is a very serious accusation. I assume the Member in the well would not have this cloud hang over all of the Members that are in the Congress unless he was prepared to state for the record his source of information.

Mr. WALKER. My source of information is the fact that I have the specific numbers of the checks that I believe, I have every reason to believe, were written for that purpose.

Mr. RANGEL. When you say you have every reason to believe, unless you are a bookie or unless you are involved in the transaction, you know, I know you would not want to embarrass your colleagues here. Right? I mean, not deliberately. And so, therefore, if I were to get in the well and to say that I believed that you used money for a purpose, you would have every right, as a gentleman, to ask me what is my source of reaching that belief, and since I have had 63 checks that may have come under that category, I would hate for my wife to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and ask was I gambling merely because you said that somebody was gambling and misusing the bank funds.

So if you really are saying that you just believe this, but you do not know what you are talking about as a fact, I think that would be enough to amend the record.

Mr. WALKER. No; I do know that this is a fact.

Mr. RANGEL. Oh, you do know it is a fact?

Mr. WALKER. I am very confident of the factual nature of what I have said, and I have also indicated that it is not my purpose to use this to accuse any Member of any activity, but I do believe that this is a very serious charge. I would agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. RANGEL. It is a serious charge.

Mr. WALKER. But it is something where if, for example, if the gentleman would join me in asking that the transcripts of the House post office investigation and the House bank investigation be made public, I think at that point we could clear this matter up. I believe that there was information developed there that will corroborate this point.

Mr. RANGEL. Is the gentleman suggesting for the public record that you are making statements that are in fact privileged information concerning your colleagues? Is that what the gentleman is suggesting?

Mr. WALKER. No; I am not making that statement at all. I am simply saying that I believe that this information does exist. I believe that everything I said here is factual, and I believe it goes to the heart of what I regard as a very strong odor of mismanagement at the House bank, and I am attempting to try to work through why it was what the House was not given, if the gentleman will allow me to make my point, why the House was not given the information in a timely manner, why this matter was not handled in a way that did not end up embarrassing hundreds of Members of Congress and did not end up destroying, in some cases, political careers. I believe that there had to be underlying reasons as to why this information could not be dealt with in a responsible manner, at the time it was first developed, and I am telling the gentleman that my understanding of the situation is that it is, in part, tied to the fact that an investigation and a handling of the information at that time would have revealed this pattern where the House Sergeant at Arms was drawing personal checks in order to pay Members' gambling debts.

Mr. RANGEL. My only question to you is: Did you reach these conclusions based on privileged documents or private documents that are not public? That was my only question.

Mr. WALKER. I have seen no documents.

Mr. RANGEL. Then the information that you are sharing with us is public information?

Mr. WALKER. It is now.

Mr. RANGEL. It is either public or private. I am not trying to play games with you.

Mr. WALKER. Well, at the moment it is certainly public information. What was not public about it I have certainly just made public.

Mr. RANGEL. What you have made public is what you believe?

Mr. WALKER. That is right, and I will say that in large part we operate in the House based upon what we believe.

□ 2110

I have tried to document insofar as information has been made available to me, virtually all of the charges that I have made here. I have documented it with GAO materials. I have documented it with correspondence, and I do believe that everything that I have said constitutes a factual base.

Mr. RANGEL. OK, but your speculations are not a part of the public record.

Mr. WALKER. In my view, it is not a matter of speculation at all. I believe that every word of that is in fact true.

Mr. CLAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLAY. In your opening statement you state that the General Accounting Office has determined, and you read from a letter, that overdrafts amounted to short-term loans and that they were interest-free loans.

Mr. WALKER. That was in the draft.

Mr. CLAY. Yes. And then you emphatically stated that overdrafts constituted criminal acts. Now, the——

Mr. WALKER. No, the short-term loans do.

Mr. CLAY. Short-term loans.

Mr. WALKER. Yes. And the reason I say that is because you will remember that we have a House staffer who was recently convicted of exactly that, taking short-term loans from the post office that involved taxpayers' money.

Mr. CLAY. May I continue and ask my question?

Mr. WALKER. Surely.

Mr. CLAY. You emphatically state that these overdrafts constitute criminal acts.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I am saying——

Mr. CLAY. No, interest-free loans, they constitute interest-free loans.

Mr. WALKER. That is what I said.

Mr. CLAY. Short-term loans which, in your opinion, constitutes——

Mr. WALKER. Well——

Mr. CLAY. You have not heard my question. Will you listen?

Mr. WALKER. I just wanted to clarify. I do not want the gentleman to put his own interpretation on what I said. I said that the statement made by the GAO would, if taken at its face value, constitute a potential criminal activity, in my opinion.

Mr. CLAY. And you are an attorney, I assume?

Mr. WALKER. No, I am not.

Mr. CLAY. OK. Then the attorney investigating these so-called criminal activities, according to your opinion, has sent letters exonerating people who have had overdrafts of over 500 checks, 600 checks, 400 checks. Why would a U.S. attorney exonerate somebody who has committed a criminal act, according to your interpretation?

Mr. WALKER. Well, of course, I am not privileged. I have no idea. I have no contact with Judge Wilkey whatsoever. But I will tell you that I do not know that any Member who had his accounts in general ledger 53——

Mr. CLAY. No, no, the overdrafts you say would constitute a criminal act.

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. CLAY. Some of these people——

Mr. WALKER. Understand, because of the nature of the House bank, there is a lot of discussion about whether once the accounts flowed from the Treasury into the Members' accounts, whether or not that did constitute a real overdraft. There is a legal question there.

Mr. CLAY. What are you constituting as a criminal act? The overdrafts which you——

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. CLAY. Which you say constituted the act or the transfer to account 53?

Mr. WALKER. I am saying that the GAO raised that question.

Mr. CLAY. No, you said—the GAO did not say there were criminal acts.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, they did. They said——

Mr. CLAY. You said there were criminal acts.

Mr. WALKER. Receiving what amounts to interest-free short-term loans when they overdraft their accounts and not have to pay for the privilege.

Mr. CLAY. Wait a minute.

Mr. WALKER. I am saying to you——

Mr. CLAY. Well, tell me where the GAO said there were criminal acts.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I am saying——

Mr. CLAY. Please read—you have inserted it into the RECORD.

Will the RECORD tomorrow show that the GAO said these were criminal acts, or did you interpret them to be criminal acts?

Mr. WALKER. All I am simply doing is taking what has already been a conviction for a criminal act of another Member of the House—of a member of the House post office and saying——

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. And saying this is in exactly the same league as that particular item.

So I think it does amount to a very serious charge and one would have to wonder, one would have to wonder why so much effort was put in taking that language out of the draft report if indeed it did not constitute a problem for the House.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the gentleman yield

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. SCHUMER. For one further question.

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. SCHUMER. Because I think the gentleman is talking about apples and oranges. If I am wrong, let him correct me.

He is saying that the GAO, in draft language, for reasons—I am sure the gentleman has made corrections to his initial draft of statements too, for no nefarious reason. So it is quite a leap to say——

Mr. WALKER. Well, if the gentleman was here, he would have——

Mr. SCHUMER. If I may ask my question.

Mr. WALKER. Let me make my point, however—he would know that I also indicated the reason why this particular revision was so strange is because the Comptroller General, himself, had written exactly the same charge about 15 months earlier, and that was never retracted. And in fact it exists on the record.

I would be happy to yield.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, then the gentleman ought to quote the Comptroller General and not the GAO. But my question is this——

Mr. WALKER. The Comptroller General heads the GAO.

Mr. SCHUMER. Yes. No, you are quoting a GAO report there.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, and the Comptroller General is the head of the GAO.

Mr. SCHUMER. Yes.

Mr. WALKER. And he is the one who wrote the letter to the Speaker making exactly the same charge.

Mr. SCHUMER. Then quote the language from the 15 months previously.

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, this is my point to the gentleman: The gentleman is saying that language in the draft report said that what was done in the House bank was the equivalent of short-term, interest-free loans.

Mr. WALKER. I am saying it has that potential, that is right.

Mr. SCHUMER. That is what the gentleman is saying. Then he goes on to say that his analogy is that it is a criminal act because an employee of the House post office had interest-free loans and that was—he was indicted or convicted.

Mr. WALKER. Convicted of that.

Mr. SCHUMER. Right. Were those interest-free loans from the same House bank?

Mr. WALKER. No, they were from——

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, then I—I mean the gentleman is making a flawed analogy. He is saying apples equals oranges, pears equals bananas, therefore apples are bananas. That is not logic by any stretch of the imagination. And I would say to the gentleman——

Mr. WALKER. I love where the gentleman is coming from. But the fact is——

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, the gentleman is——

Mr. WALKER. In fact, the Federal law, the Federal law covers not only the post office activity, it covers other activities as well. It is the general law that says you cannot take interest-free loans out of taxpayer money.

Mr. SCHUMER. Yes, and the House bank——

Mr. WALKER. That applies to the House Post Office, it appears to the House bank.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is the House bank established to be taxpayer money?

Mr. WALKER. Well, if the gentleman bothered to listen——

Mr. SCHUMER. I have listened.

Mr. WALKER. Instead of a diatribe, if he started to listen to—what I am saying is that——

Mr. SCHUMER. That is a broad stretch, I would say to the gentleman, a broad leap that one ought to be very careful before making, because when you accuse someone of criminal activity, at the very least you ought to lay out that there is quite a difference between a loan from the House bank and a loan from taxpayer funds.

Mr. WALKER. I am sure that is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. SCHUMER. I think that would be most people's opinion.

Mr. WALKER. Well—have I yielded to the gentleman?

Now, I have been trying to be patient here, but the gentleman continues to interrupt me.

Mr. SCHUMER. Well, we have been quite patient here, too, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. But it is my time, it is my time. So let me say to the gentleman that I was referring him to General Ledger Account 53, because that is obviously an account where Members did not have the money assigned to them, where it was in fact backed by Treasury money. That is the whole point of this job file.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would simply—if the gentleman would yield for one final comment, and then I will let him go on with these leaps in logic which, at least in my opinion, are great leaps in logic—that you still have not made the case that the House bank was taxpayer dollars and that is the whole thrust of the gentleman's argument. But he passes right over that, at least until questioned.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would allow me to get to it, I would be happy to further inform him, but let me say to the gentleman that the——

Mr. WHEAT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALKER. I am going to yield over here on this side first, but instead of interrupting me, you know, would you let me finish a sentence along the way? Since it is my time.

Mr. WHEAT. Well, you raised——

Mr. WALKER. I would say to the gentleman that I do not believe that if I paraded a witness onto the floor, that the gentleman is going to believe me. I mean he has made up his mind. He does not like the information I am presenting to the House. I understand that but——

Mr. WHEAT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. But the information that is in my possession, I think the House deserves to know about the nature of this mismanagement.

Let me yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who has been very patient.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman. I hesitate, as a first-term Member, to jump into the middle of this heavy jurisprudence and arguments and all the lawyering that is going on here. But I heard the gentleman earlier say: Is it true and did you read and quote from your statement that the Sergeant at Arms wrote something like $104,000 worth of interest-free checks?

Mr. WALKER. Let us be clear here. Some of those were duplicate amounts because they were checks that were bounced on a couple of different occasions. They were very large amounts,

and they were checks that were not paid for on a couple of different reasons. My point is not the $104,000 as much as it is that a number of those very, very substantial checks were written to pay gambling debts of Members of the House.

□ 2120

That is the basic point I am making.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Has the Sergeant at Arms testified before the Ethics Committee or has he been called before the Ethics Committee?

Mr. WALKER. He was called before the Ethics Committee, and I think his gunshot wound occurred the day before he was to appear at the Ethics Committee. I am not aware that they ever took a sworn deposition from him.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. The Sergeant at Arms resigned or left the Sergeant at Arms position which oversaw the bank some months ago?

Mr. WALKER. That is my understanding, that is right.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Is he in fact on the House payroll today and being paid by the taxpayers in any capacity?

Mr. WALKER. I really do not know. He may be, but that I do not know.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Where would one address that question?

Mr. WALKER. I assume to the Clerk.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I would ask one further question.

It is difficult in going through the maze of transactions, almost a year ago when this first started, for us to tell whether or not tax funds were being used in this matter.

I know there have been statements that there were no tax funds involved in the House bank, and of course we know there were certain tax funds involved in the operation and collection of overdrafts and so forth. But what happened if Members' deposits did not cover the overdrafts in the House bank at any given time?

Mr. WALKER. That is the point that the gentlemen on the other side do not want to acknowledge and do not want to understand.

The fact is that what happened when Members' salaries would not cover the overdrafts that they were already responsible for, those things were entered into this general ledger account 53.

Now, it is interesting to me that Members of the Ethics Committee evidently did not have this material before them and did not even consider general ledger account 53. It is not included in the House Ethics Committee report in any way, shape or form; however, here it is in the job file of the GAO.

Now, general ledger account 53 is important, because what it means there are Members who are then listed as people who do not have the money to cover the overdrafts already in place.

Somehow those moneys are being covered. Those moneys are being covered out of Treasury accounts. There is no pool of money there for them to be covered. As I read earlier from that same account, that pool of money only comes monthly. So therefore, Members who are overdrawn for more than a month are being backed by taxpayer money. That is the question here.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a point of clarification?

Mr. WALKER. I will in a moment. I think I have been reasonably generous, and I will in a moment.

Mr. WHEAT. All right.

Mr. WALKER. The point being here that this was a fairly unique institution. In any other bank in the country, this kind of practice would certainly constitute criminal activity. The only reason why it did not perhaps do it here, even on those who overdrafted for the first month without paying for the privilege, without any kind of interest payments, is because of the rather unique nature of the House bank as a cooperative arrangement; but you cannot have a cooperative arrangement of moneys that you do not have. The moneys that were there that were the funds deposited to the Members' salaries, that is one thing.

The accounts that are in House general ledger account 53 did not have any salary money to cover them. So therefore they had to be covered by the taxpayer's money on account in the Treasury. That is the point I am making.

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALKER. Sure. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WHEAT. The gentleman has raised so many points, I hardly know where to begin, but this general ledger account 53 disturbs me for a moment, because I have read this entire account of how the House bank operated. I have learned a great deal more about how banks operate and how banks did not operate, because the House bank was, as we know, not a bank, than I ever hoped to know.

But one of the things I was always clear about, or at least I thought I was clear about, is that there was always at all times a surplus of Member funds on deposit in the House bank, perhaps not for each individual account, that is how these individual so-called overdrafts occurred. But collectively, was there not always a surplus of funds in the House bank?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I do not know about a surplus.

Mr. WHEAT. Was there ever any point in time that the gentleman is aware of when Treasury funds were used in order to pay checks?

Mr. WALKER. Does the gentleman want an answer?

Mr. WHEAT. I would like to have an answer. I have seen the answer in the public press that this never happened.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman keeps talking and will not let me answer.

Mr. WHEAT. I am more than willing to hear the gentleman's answer.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. The GAO auditor, I will tell the gentleman what they said about the deposits in the account to which the gentleman referred.

For those Members who desire the service, meaning service in the bank, salaries are transferred directly into the House bank deposit fund checking accounts, symbol 4828, monthly. This is accomplished by the bookkeeping department whose entry total was tied to the salary control totals developed monthly by the Sergeant at Arms. For those Members not desiring the service, and it goes on to say that they are sensitive to the other kinds of institutions.

Well, the point being here that the moneys were transferred out of the Treasury into the particular fund account each month.

The point is that these Members who had their funds in the general ledger account 53 did not have monthly moneys to cover that.

Mr. WHEAT. Now, the gentleman is losing me. Try to work through it very carefully and very slowly with me, if the gentleman would.

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. WHEAT. Let us say we had well in excess of a majority of the Members who were paid through the Sergeant at Arms, a huge number of Members, perhaps 300, perhaps even 400 Members, and all of this money went into the Sergeant at Arms, and this constituted the entire arrangement of funds that were in the Sergeant at Arms bank.

Mr. WALKER. Transferred monthly.

Mr. WHEAT. Was there ever any time with these funds transferred in monthly when there was a deficit in the bank as an entity?

I know there were individual accounts that were overdrawn, but was there ever a deficit for the entire institution?

Mr. WALKER. I do not know; but the point is that the institution was still not in a position of being able to cover those moneys with anything other than taxpayers' money or they would not have had the general account No. 53.

Mr. WHEAT. The gentleman is saying there was always a surplus of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). The gentleman from Pennsylvania controls the time.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, and every time I attempt to speak, the gentleman attempts to talk over me.

Mr. WHEAT. I have one very simple question.

Mr. WALKER. I think the Chair has some responsibility to maintain order in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] controls the time.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair. Now, if the Chair would please maintain order, it would be very much appreciated. I have been very happy to yield to the gentleman——

Mr. WHEAT. I think we can maintain order between the two of us. May I restate my question to the gentleman?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman keeps saying he wants to restate the question, but then he never wants to listen to the answer. He continues to talk over me when I go to answer. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman again for a question. I would appreciate, however, if the gentleman then would not try to talk over me when I attempt to give my answer on my time.

Mr. WHEAT. I will be happy to stick with those ground rules, but obviously I have not been stating my question well, because I have never gotten a specific answer to the specific question, the same kind of thing the gentleman complained about in the letter to the Speaker, that the gentleman did not get an answer with specificity. That is what I am looking for

Mr. WALKER. In that letter, I did not get any answer to any of my specific questions.

Mr. WHEAT. What the gentleman is suggesting is that somehow these funds or these checks in General Ledger Account No. 53 were covered with Treasury funds, because there was a shortfall in funds.

Mr. WALKER. No; I did not say there was a shortfall in funds.

Mr. WHEAT. Well, then, is the gentleman aware of any statement anywhere that suggests there was a shortfall of funds in the bank that would have required that these checks or any other checks in the bank be covered with Treasury funds?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I do not know that, no. I am not aware of any such thing.

Mr. WHEAT. That is the question.

Mr. WALKER. All right, fine. I have answered that I do not know, but I will tell the gentleman, I have just answered an irrelevant question.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman interested in an answer? May I tell the gentleman the answer?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] still controls the time.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair suggests that we follow the procedure. If the gentleman wants to yield time, then yield it.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I am certainly trying to be generous with the yielding. These gentlemen do not seem to wish to follow the procedures here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all of those speaking on this special order, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has remaining 12 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Let me see if I understand what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is saying. All the money has come from the U.S. Treasury, the taxpayers?

Mr. WALKER. Right.

□ 2130

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. They come in and were administered through the House bank for payment of one's salary on a monthly basis.

Mr. WALKER. And a lot of that money coming in was previously earned since we are basically paid 1 month late.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Yes. But if I went past my 1 month's earnings, and there were not sufficient funds, what we in fact had to do was to reach into the Treasury account and, in fact, make an early withdrawal.

Is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. No.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. All right.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, did my colleagues hear my answer? I said, "No."

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Explain to me.

Mr. WALKER. Now, as I said, I said, "No." That is not the case. But the fact is that those that were in account ledger No. 53 were in fact people who were well overdrawn, so, if we take their individual account, something had to be securing their individual account.

Now these folks all want to claim that what was securing their individual accounts was money from other Members, that the gentleman and I were securing their accounts. I will say that the House bank never told anybody that. There was never a time when anybody was told that my money that was kept on deposit in the House account was being used to do everything from covering other Members' overdrafts to covering gambling debts. No one ever suggested that that is the way the House bank operated.

But now, having had problems in the House bank, they now want to claim that we had this big cooperative and there was this big pool of money there. The fact is the way the House bank operated was that the individual Members' accounts were drawn out of the Treasury.

Now what I am suggesting is that any Member whose salary did not cover it, who ended up in general ledger account No. 53, was not being necessarily secured by other Members' money, that it may well be that it was being covered by money on account in the Treasury, and, if my colleagues read the job file, they find that that is exactly the pattern which certainly could be in place here.

Now, as my colleagues know, I would appreciate having officials answer a lot of these questions. The fact is that the officials have not wanted to answer. When I raised questions of this type with the Speaker, he gave me generalized responses, not specific responses. We have not had anybody come forth to explain.

The Select Committee on Ethics very nicely narrowed the scope of its investigation so that we could not get to some of these questions, and I think that we have got some serious questions that have occurred, and particularly, as I say, when my colleagues look at the GAO materials, and they look at the attempts that were made to scrub the GAO materials of any hint of this kind of activity, they do in fact have a major problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the source is. Could the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] tell the Members of the body what the source of his information is that Members used the so-called House bank to pay gambling debts? Could he tell us the source?

Mr. WALKER. That is based upon talking to principals who were involved in the investigation.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, "Do you know what I think, Mr. WALKER? You owe the House, every Member, every single Member of this body, an apology."

Mr. WALKER. Not if it is the truth, Mr. LEWIS, and I say to the gentleman, "Mr. LEWIS, it's the truth."

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. It is an insult to every Member of this body. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has issued a blanket indictment. It is a shame and a disgrace what he has done here tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] still controls the time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] and a number of Members on his side came to me and asked me specifically not to name names here this evening. Does the gentleman want me to begin naming names?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to explain the source.

Mr. WALKER. No, no.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. If it is privileged, confidential information, explain the source.

I ask the gentleman, "How did you get it and none of us have it?"

Mr. WALKER. I specifically said that I would not come to the floor, that I did not think that that was necessary as a part of my presentation here tonight about the problems in the House bank, to name names.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for a list of individuals. I am asking for the source.

Mr. WALKER. It seems to me that, if the gentleman wants the information, then he will have to understand then that I have to give then the totality of the information including the names. I do not really want to do that. I do not think that is necessary. I am simply telling the gentleman that, as a matter of fact, as a matter of truth, as a matter of speaking the truth on this issue, that it is clear to me that Members' gambling debts were paid by the specific checks that I cite.

Now, if the gentleman has different information than that, then I would be very pleased to receive it. But I do not think there is different information.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I say to the gentleman, "Mr. WALKER, it is strange to me that some people can get confidential information and others cannot."

Mr. WALKER. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Georgia, "Look, look. You folks were the ones that voted the other day to allow HENRY GONZALEZ to release top secrets out here in special orders. You all voted in favor of letting him do it. Now don't come to me and suggest that there is some level of confidence that exceeds the top secret information of the United States Government, and so on."

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] told us he got it from the CIA. Where does the gentleman from Pennsylvania get his information from?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I said that my information came out of the House Select Committee on Ethics information.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I know he only has a few minutes left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He has only got, just to be specific, 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Let me tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that, as a freshman who was enticed into the House Bank but who refused to open an account there, I was never told when I was being solicited, in effect, for the House Bank that my accounts were going into a cooperative that was being used to fund overdrafts, that I had the right to overdraft, that I would be ensnarled in some sort of situation that might impugn my character, as well as other Members of the House, and yet apparently that was known regularly by those who were participating in it.

Now I will tell the gentleman that it took us, the seven of us who were freshmen, 6 months to get just a little bit of information toward trying to see what was happening. It took a tremendous amount of public effort to get this matter actually brought forward and disclosed and to start a movement that actually gives us this much information as we have now.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is trying to get further information, and I would hope the whole House could cooperate in this.

Mr. WALKER. Well, it took me some months, I will say to the gentleman, to get copies of these GAO draft reports because I heard there were variances between the draft reports and final reports. When I finally got the draft reports, I found what I find to be a serious discrepancy between the two, and in particular this line was removed that obviously carries with it the potential of alleging criminal activity, and so that was, in fact, one reason why I think the House was not given these draft reports prior to this, and it has only been within the last couple of days that I was able to get the job file which further revealed the existence of this special general ledger account.

So, I think there are serious questions to be raised here. I do not pretend to know all the facts. I was not a part of the House Select Committee on Ethics investigation. All I have is a series of very serious questions based upon real data. I have got real data from GAO. I have real information. I am raising those questions.

I would love to have the Speaker of the House come to the well and answer those questions. I think that that would make a very clear indication of what the real circumstances are, and it would be, I think, a very useful thing. I think it would be a useful thing to have the Speaker sit down with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHELL] and maybe a couple of others of us who have this particular issue, and hash out these things and find out.

I would be perfectly willing, within a private session, to talk about names of people who I believe are involved in the gambling activities that I talked about. I do not think that is the kind of thing that ought to be discussed because my effort here is not to impugn anyone. My effort here is to ensure that we know all there is to know about the House bank. I think up until now that we have only received a little bit of information. We have basically been told what the majority wanted us to know about the House bank situation. I think now, as we get more documentation, that we find out the realities of the House bank and that there was much more going on there than anybody had been led to believe.

So, I am taking the questions that I have, bringing them to the House floor, telling people what I believe the circumstances were based upon a large amount of evidentiary material that I have in my possession.

□ 2140

Some Members obviously are upset with the idea that anybody would come to the floor and speak the truth as he knows it. I cannot help that.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WALKER. Sure.

Mr. RANGEL. First of all, I think we are all in accord that many Members of this House, even those that have been here many years longer than the freshmen, did not know that other Members' accounts were covering a shortfall in their accounts, and you have said it.

Many of us never even had the slightest idea that if the account was short, that it would be transferred to some other cockamamy account which you have a number for.

Mr. WALKER. Not all accounts were though. I am not suggesting all accounts were. If you never went over in one month, you never got into general ledger account 53.

Mr. RANGEL. But if you went over several months——

Mr. WALKER. At that point you would be in general ledger account 53.

Mr. RANGEL. No notice was given that you would go into the special account. I am only going into the question of the allegation of criminal behavior, because I think the three of us on this floor, and you said earlier in your statement that many Members never were protected, you said, by the leadership because they never knew.

Mr. WALKER. That is right.

Mr. RANGEL. If you never know, how in the heck could you be involved in criminal activities? Really, if you did it for any purpose and you never knew you were violating any House rules, if you never knew you were violating the laws, I ask the gentleman in the well what difference did it make what you used the money for?

Mr. WALKER. Well, I think it is very clear. The gentleman has just helped make a case, and I thank him for it, that it is probably the reason why Judge Wilkey is clearing so many Members. He is probably coming to that conclusion too. That does not mean, however, there may not have been criminal activity there and at some point we are going to find a few Members or non-members who are involved in banking activities charged with certain crimes connected with the bank.

My point is simply that I believe there was criminal activity in the bank, and I believe that therefore the investigation by Judge Wilkey is entirely appropriate, unlike remarks I have heard on the floor on several occasions indicating that they thought that Judge Wilkey was on some kind of political witch hunt. I do not think

that is the case at all. I think we have enough documentation here now to know that there is a real potential for criminal activity in the House bank.

Mr. RANGEL. The gentleman in the well said he had no knowledge, that Members had no knowledge of the fact their overdraw would throw them into a special account.

Mr. WALKER. That is right.

Mr. RANGEL. Your speculation of criminal behavior or what that money was used for is where most of us really take issue with you.

Mr. WALKER. I understand that.

Mr. RANGEL. You have no basis to speculate when what you are saying is that Members should have known how the accounts were being used. That is what hurts.

Mr. WALKER. I am saying that the GAO makes allegations which I think the House should be informed of because they at least border on criminality.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE FRANK ANNUNZIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in tribute to a Member who has served an honored and distinguished career in this House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO]. It has been my pleasure to have served with him for 18 years not only as a Member of Congress, but also as a member of the Banking Committee.

Mr. ANNUNZIO chaired first the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee and then the Financial Institutions Subcommittee with a flair that few Members could imitate. His hearings were often designed to ensure that the point he was trying to make was made in an unforgettable way.

In 1987, he had introduced legislation authorizing the minting of commemorative coins to raise money for our Nation's Olympic athletes. Most chairmen would have been content to simply bring in some Olympic officials to testify on the need for funding for Olympic teams. Other chairmen might have brought in some Olympic athletes to testify.

But FRANK ANNUNIZO was no ordinary chairman. He brought in Olympic athletes, all right, but they did more than just testify. For 1 day, the Banking Committee hearing room was transformed into an Olympic gymnasium. Olympic athletes whirled, leaped, and turned through the air, performed gymnastic feats on the balance beam and parallel bars. The space in the hearing room, which is usually occupied only by the sounds of witnesses and Members, was filled with astounding gymnastic performances. Needless to say, the legislation subsequently sailed through the House and Senate without a slip. Sale of the coins raised $23 million for our 1988 Olympic athletes.

That was not the only hearing at which the gentleman from Illinois used something out of the ordinary to illustrate a point. During the 1982 recession, he held a hearing on the effect that high interest rates were having on the economy. Not unusual, he had a witness from the Federal Reserve testify. But to illustrate his point that the Fed's tight money policy was hurting small businesses, he had a scoreboard in the hearing room. The scoreboard was labeled, "The Business Bankruptcy Scoreboard," and it was set to zero. As soon as Chairman ANNUNZIO brought the hearing to order the score changed to one. The chairman announced that the clock would keep track of the number of businesses that failed during the course of the hearing, based on the rate of business bankruptcy filings at the time. Every few seconds throughout the hearing, the count on the scoreboard increased by one. The scoreboard was a powerful reminder to all in the room of the effect that the Federal Reserve's tight money policies were having on America's main streets.

Mr. ANNUNZIO has long been an advocate of interest rate ceilings for consumers. A number of years ago, he held a hearing on whether the Federal Government should preempt State usury laws. He argued that the Federal Government should not preempt State laws. A witness before the subcommittee was arguing that the marketplace should determine interest rates, or consumers would suffer because credit would be cut off. The chairman said to the witness, "Well, you know that without usury ceilings interest rates could go way up." The witness replied that he was aware of that. With that the gentleman from Illinois reached underneath the podium and took out a large box.

"I want to show you what will happen if usury ceilings are lifted," said Mr. ANNUNZIO, "Interest rates will go way up." With that he opened the lid of the box and a balloon labeled "interest rates" shot out of the box and went to the ceiling of the hearing room.

The photograph of the gentleman from Illinois and the interest rate balloon ascending appeared in newspapers throughout the Nation.

Mr. ANNUNZIO has never been afraid to fight for what he though was right, especially when it came to defending the common man. His fights for consumers over credit card interest rates are well known. His tenacity in the battle over the 1984 Olympic coin program shows that one Member with strong convictions can make a difference.

In 1982, the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, under the direction of Peter Uberroth, was riding high. The committee was seeking a coin program to raise money for the Olympics. Rather than approach Congress or the gentleman from Illinois, who was then the chairman of the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee struck a deal to market the coins privately.

The U.S. Mint would be turned over to the marketers. The Mint would assume the risks, and the marketers would reap the profits. Very little money would ever reach the athletes.

Washington's finest lobbyists were hired to have Congress ratify the plan. The administration endorsed the plan, the Senate promptly ratified it, and the then-chairman of the Banking Committee endorsed it. A steady stream of Olympic officials and athletes were brought to Washington to urge its passage.

Only one man stood in the path of this lobbying juggernaut—FRANK ANNUNZIO. He had looked over the plan and come to the conclusion that the Olympic athletes had been sold out. He was convinced that an Olympic coin plan that he devised would raise more money for the athletes by cutting out the marketing middlemen.

Since the program had been designed by the marketers to benefit themselves, FRANK ANNUNZIO had placed himself squarely across their path, and they were bearing down on him like an 18-wheeler 2 hours behind schedule.

But FRANK ANNUNZIO fought on. He hammered away, day after day in 1-minute speeches on the floor, that the athletes were being left out. He held hearings in which the ordinary coin collectors who were the marketers target came in and testified that they could not afford the marketers multiple coin programs. He publicized the marketers contract with the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, showing how the athletes would be shortchanged.

It seemed like his efforts would hardly matter. The lobbyists were working just as hard against him. They had an unlimited budget, and much greater resources on their side. The Senate had ratified their plan. The administration supported it. Finally, even the Banking Committee, at the urging of its then-chairman had cleared it for the floor. Now it was just a matter of time before it passed.

But FRANK ANNUNZIO did not give up. He organized a living-room lobby, ordinary citizens who pledged to buy Olympic coins from his program, and not from the marketers plan.

He went to the Rules Committee and convinced it to allow him to offer his plan as a substitute. Perhaps the Rules Committee was simply showing a courtesy to a subcommittee chairman, I do not know. But the committee agreed to give him his last stand on the floor of this House.

The day came for the floor debate. FRANK ANNUNZIO was a tiger. He spoke on the rule. He argued during general debate on the bill. He spoke passionately and from the heart when he offered his substitute.

And an extraordinary thing happened. Members hearing the debate in their offices started to take notice. Other Members on the floor for other business started to listen. And when it came time to vote, FRANK ANNUNZIO won. His substitute got 304 votes. Only 89 Members voted against it. That was less than the number of Members who had cosponsored the plan supported by the marketers.

Mr. Speaker, it was an extraordinary day. I have been in this House 18 years and have seen only a handful of occasions in which the floor debate actually changed the outcome of a vote, especially one in which all the lobbying is on one side.

FRANK ANNUNZIO had reached out and singlehandedly turned the Olympic coin program around. It was now a program that would benefit the Olympic athletes, not marketers. His lonely fight had ended in a glorious victory. He had broken the marketers and his program quickly became law.

And the result was just what FRANK ANNUNZIO had predicted. His 1984 Olympic coin program produced over $70 million to support American Olympic athletes.

In winning the Olympic coin battle, the gentleman from Illinois was recognized as the congressional coin expert. And that title was justified. In 1986, his coin program in commemoration of the Statue of Liberty and the contribution of immigrants to America raised over $75 million to help restore the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, the gateway to America for so many millions of immigrants to America.

This year Congress enacted FRANK ANNUNZIO'S final commemorative coin program—one commemorating the quincentennary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. As a fellow Italian-American, I was proud to be a cosponsor of that legislation.

Some people questioned whether these coins should be issued. They argued that Columbus was not even the first European to come to America. The Vikings and St. Brendon had their advocates. Here the wit of FRANK ANNUNZIO came to the rescue. "Others may have been first," he replied, "but when Columbus discovered America, it stayed discovered."

But even in this coin program, the gentleman from Illinois did not forget a topic close to his heart—education. FRANK ANNUNZIO started out as a teacher. The Columbus coin bill contains the aptly named Frank Annunzio Act, which establishes a Columbus Fellowship Foundation. The foundation will award Christopher Columbus fellowships to scholars working on discoveries which will benefit mankind. These Columbus scholarships will be an enduring legacy of FRANK ANNUNZIO.

Upon becoming chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee in 1989, FRANK ANNUNZIO was plunged into chairing the hearings and markups of the bills that were needed to resolve the savings and loan crisis that year, and the bank insurance fund crisis last year.

He handled the tasks with a smoothness and grace which Members on both sides of the aisle appreciated. Under his firm and steady hand, Members were given the opportunity to be heard, while he always kept the process moving along.

The gentleman from Illinois was not afraid to share the glory and the limelight with other Members of the subcommittee. He appointed task forces to focus on issues he deemed particularly important.

For example, he recognized that U.S. financial institutions must compete in the global marketplace. Under his direction, the Financial Institutions Subcommittee held hearings on international competitiveness. These were milestone hearings and included representatives from some of the world's largest and most active international banks. While he could have continued to monopolize control over this topic, he was aware of my interest and appointed me to chair the International Competitiveness Task Force.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 28 years this Chamber has benefited from having my good friend and fellow Italian-American from Chicago, FRANK ANNUNZIO, serve in the House. The next Congress will be a poorer place without him. I will sorely miss him.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Representative FRANK ANNUNZIO, the gentleman from Chicago, IL. I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my appreciation to this distinguished Member of Congress who over his 28 years in the House has contributed so much to this body. I feel particularly close to FRANK due to our shared Italian-American ancestry.

I had the pleasure of working with Congressman ANNUNZIO when I was on the Banking Committee and he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage. He held that position for 14 years and always took the issues before his subcommittee seriously. At the same time, his hearings were always fun. We never knew who would show up as witnesses.

Mr. ANNUNZIO has approached his goals with tireless dedication, be they truth-in-lending legislation or enactment of a bill for the Christopher Columbus Foundation. FRANK has been a strong opponent of unscrupulous debt collectors and credit card abuses, and he led the charge to "put the savings and loan crooks" in jail. He authored legislation to allow $1 million per day civil penalties for violations of bank fraud laws and he sponsored a bill passed by the House to permit revocation of the charter of financial institutions convicted of money laundering. The positions he has taken on these issues are indicative of the way he has spent his entire political career looking out for the interests of the common man.

To say that this Congress will miss FRANK ANNUNZIO and his commonsense viewpoint is a great understatement. In his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance, and of the House Administration Committee he has greatly contributed to his constituents and to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the House will feel the absence of FRANK ANNUNZIO very deeply. He has been an inspiration to us all, and I for one have learned from his example.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the truly great Members of this body, FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois, who will retire from the Congress at the end of this year. Not only are we losing a valued and distinguished colleague who has served in the House for 28 years, but the American taxpayers are losing an important ally. During his career, FRANK has been a leader on banking, consumer, coinage and law and order issues. He has been in the forefront on issues affecting the working men and women and the elderly of the Nation.

I have had the pleasure of serving with FRANK on the Banking Committee since coming to Congress in 1967. For many years, I served as the ranking minority member of the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee and the Financial Institutions Subcommittee while FRANK chaired those subcommittees. He was always fair to all members of the subcommittees, regardless of party or seniority.

As a Chairman, FRANK was a doer. He was a chairman who took up bills to get them passed, not simply to get headlines. He would work to compromise when possible so that a bill could move forward rather than die. It was always a pleasure to work with him.

His hearings were always informative, and often entertaining. He brought in masked debt collectors, credit card crooks, and money launderers to tell the subcommittee about the seamy side of their activities.

He released helium-filled balloons marked "interest rates" to make a point about rising interest rates.

At one markup he waved American flags and played patriotic music to make the point that an amendment that he was offering was an all-American amendment. Needless to say, the amendment passed.

I recall with fondness that at the time when automated teller machines first appeared, he scheduled a hearing in my home of Columbus, OH. He and I went to the Ohio State University campus one day and watched a steady stream of students walk up to the machine, put a card in, push some buttons, and walk away with cash. No student ever put money in though, they just kept taking it out. I guess they counted on their parents to replenish their accounts.

Looking back, we were probably lucky that no one called the police about the two suspicious-looking guys eyeing the students taking money from the ATM machine. Maybe everybody thought that we were the police.

As a result of those hearings in Columbus, we passed the Electronic Funds Transfer Act.

That legislation spelled out the important consumer protections which now govern ATM machines and other electronic consumer banking transactions. I will always be proud to have worked with FRANK ANNUNZIO in passing that forward looking legislation.

Four years ago, FRANK moved into a political firestorm as chairman of the Banking Committee's Financial Institutions Subcommittee. The savings and loan industry deposit insurance fund was collapsing, threatening the life savings of millions of Americans.

As chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, FRANK moved rapidly to stop the hemorrhaging. He ably directed the subcommittee to quickly approve the S&L reform bill that would reform, restructure, and revitalize the thrift industry—no easy task when being pulled from all sides. Through the consideration of hundreds of amendments he kept the bill moving. It was important that the bill not get bogged down, and he made sure that it did not.

FRANK then moved into other areas of concern in the financial services industry, pushing for more stringent laws to fight drug dealers by giving harsher penalties for money laundering and providing more funds to search out and jail S&L crooks.

He also investigated the Resolution Trust Corporation, the agency established to dispose of the assets of insolvent thrifts, in an effort to improve and streamline the RTC's operations. He stood out as a tough overseer of the Resolution Trust Corporation, arguing that the RTC was moving too slowly in selling off the assets. He had the courage to support funding for the RTC, so that the Government could honor its pledge to American depositors that the Federal Government would protect their deposits.

He prodded the Justice Department and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to be more vigorous in collecting millions of dollars of court-ordered penalties from convicted S&L crooks. He sponsored legislation to enhance the collection of court-ordered restitution from convicted financial institutions criminals. It was good legislation, and I joined him as the original cosponsor.

FRANK introduced and pushed legislation to revoke the charters of banks abetting money launderers. It has been a pleasure to work with him on this issue. With the passage of H.R. 6048 yesterday, the House has now passed needed money laundering legislation sponsored by FRANK ANNUNZIO four times since 1990.

FRANK left his mark on the House Banking Committee Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage which he chaired from 1974 until 1989. A colleague on the subcommittee once described FRANK as "the father of America's commemorative coin programs. Indeed, every commemorative coin program that has been enacted since 1981 carries FRANK ANNUNZIO's stamp upon it."

His coinage efforts have saved taxpayers funds and brought millions of dollars into the U.S. Treasury. His commemorative coin laws have raised millions of dollars for worthy causes. The Olympic coins raised more than $75 million to stage the 1984 games in Los Angeles and provided training for thousands of young men and women athletes and coaches.

He also was instrumental in seeking passage of a commemorative coin bill to raise funds for the Olympics to be held in Atlanta in 1996. The Statute of Liberty coin in 1986 raised $73 million to restore the monument and the immigration facilities on Ellis Island.

He was also the mover of numerous bills to recognize achievements and honored individuals such as Joe Louis, Adm. Hyman Rickover, Danny Thomas, John Wayne, and George and Ira Gershwin.

He also proudly played a role in spearheading the Polish Freedom Fighters and Polish Legions of American Veterans Federal charter bills for which he was adopted as "a son of Poland."

As he retires, I commend the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO, for his contributions to the country in the past, and for the outstanding model of public service he leaves for the future.

Mr. Speaker, Marjorie and I wish FRANK, his lovely wife Angeline, and all his family the best in the years ahead.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank our friend and colleague, JOHN LAFALCE of New York, for requesting this time to pay tribute to our retiring colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois.

It is always sad to note the pending retirement of a colleague and his experienced service to the Nation. But with the end of this Congress, FRANK ANNUNZIO ends his 28 years of service in the House, where he has helped represent the Chicago area with great distinction and care. One reason for his length of service among us, I believe, is that FRANK—one of the hardest working Members of the House in the last three decades—has remained close to his hard-working constituents.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, for nearly 50 years FRANK ANNUNZIO has been a powerful voice for working America, starting his advocacy career with the United Steelworkers in the 1940's and later as Illinois Gov. Adlai Stevenson's labor director. Here in the House, he has served with distinction on the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, and as chair of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve with FRANK ANNUNZIO, and to work with him to build a better America. Again, I thank our colleague, Mr. LAFALCE, for reserving this time. And I extend my congratulations to FRANK ANNUNZIO as he concludes his many years of distinguished service in Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, FRANK ANNUNZIO and I have served together from adjoining districts for 28 years. He is my good friend and it saddens me that FRANK will be leaving the House at the end of this session.

FRANK has been a most effective Member of this House and a consistent champion of the consumer and working men and women. He deserves much credit for his work on the Banking Committee and I think it is clear that the savings and loan debacle could have been avoided or greatly mitigated if the then-chairman of the committee would have listened to FRANK ANNUNZIO.

Working with FRANK has always been a pleasure, and I am proud of what we accomplished together for Chicago and our State. I thank him for his friendship and I know we will see him often as he begins a busy and productive retirement.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in recognizing the outstanding service of my departing colleague and friend, FRANK ANNUNZIO. While I am new to the U.S. Congress, my years in Illinois politics have made me well aware of FRANK's service to his hometown of Chicago, to Illinois, and to the Nation.

As a teacher, a businessman, and a champion of labor interests, FRANK acquired experience that has been indispensable in his later career as a U.S. Congressman. As an active participant in State politics in the 1940's and 1950's, he developed a valuable understanding of State government and its role.

Ultimately, however, FRANK ANNUNZIO will be remembered for his work as a Representative to the U.S. Congress from Illinois. His keen interest in, and understanding of, the inner workings of the House will be greatly missed by his colleagues here, and particularly those of us in the Illinois delegation. I wish I could have had the opportunity to work longer with the gentleman from Illinois; I have enjoyed the time that I had.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend, my colleague and neighbor in the Rayburn Building, FRANK ANNUNZIO.

FRANK is leaving the House after 28 years of dedicated and distinguished service to his constituents in the 11th District of Illinois and to our Nation.

I have enjoyed serving with FRANK and I have admired him for many years for his deep and abiding interest in the welfare of the average American consumer. He has been instrumental in passing legislation to protect consumers in a number of areas including credit and other financial affairs. I have no doubts that he has saved the American consumer millions of dollars.

He authored the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and the Fair Credit Billing Act, providing consumers with needed safeguards in their credit transactions. As chairman of the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee, he passed more consumer protection legislation than had ever been previously enacted.

He also provided very strong leadership on coinage matters and is highly regarded for his efforts in shepherding a number of successful commemorative coin programs.

FRANK ANNUNZIO is well-known and appreciated by coin collectors across the country.

I have appreciated FRANK's friendship over the years and I will miss his good company.

His accomplishments will long be remembered.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear friend and colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO, who will be leaving this body after serving a very distinguished career of 28 years. FRANK will be sorely missed.

FRANK began his brilliant career of public service in his home State of Illinois. After graduating from DePaul University in 1942 with a master's degree in education, FRANK joined one of the most important and noble of professions and became an educator, teaching in the Chicago public school system from 1935 to 1943. It was his outstanding leadership skills which led him to the United Steelworkers of America in Chicago, becoming their

legislative and educational director, and then to the Illinois Department of Labor to assume the position of director from 1949 to 1952. FRANK's many talents and great desire to serve the public continued to thrive and he was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964. It was here that I first became acquainted with my dear friend, FRANK ANNUNZIO.

It did not take long for FRANK to distinguish himself as a savvy, determined, and caring legislator. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, FRANK was instrumental and ingenious in passing consumer protection legislation and in authorizing commemorative coin programs, such as the George Washington half dollar, the U.S. Olympic coins, and the Statue of Liberty coins, as well as other major coinage legislation. Then, as chairman of the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance, FRANK tackled the many challenges facing the savings and loan industry. His outstanding legislative record leaves no doubt that his leadership and insight will be deeply missed.

FRANK ANNUNZIO is a thoughtful, warm, and generous man. In his 28 years as a Member of Congress, he has always been sensitive to the needs of his constituency in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois. He has continuously demonstrated strong leadership to benefit his constituents and our Nation. During these years, we have all, no doubt, profited from his guidance and determination.

FRANK, my dear friend, best wishes of happiness, great joy, and good health to you and your family in the many more years ahead.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is no more partisan time than a quadrennial election, but in the midst of this highly charged campaign I'd like to make a few bipartisan and thoroughly respectful remarks about a good friend of mine on the other side of the aisle.

FRANK ANNUNZIO is retiring after 28 very productive years in Congress. He was elected to Congress in the Johnson landslide of 1964. Where others first elected that year may have taken the massive Democratic victory as a mandate to turn the world upside down, FRANK wisely saw his victory first and foremost as a mandate to give the people of his district his close attention, hard work, and good judgment.

FRANK blends the best of the old politics with the best of the new. He is fiercely loyal to his constituents and he knows he was elected to represent their interests, not his. Yet despite his diligent work on behalf of his district he has not overlooked his duties here. On the Banking Committee he has represented the interests on the little guy with dogged determination.

Others will no doubt discuss his participation in the great banking issues of the era, but I'd like to mention an issue that others might overlook.

FRANK ANNUNZIO is one of the best friends that America's coin collectors have ever had. Over the years I have collected coins. It's an interesting, enjoyable hobby, and one pursued by many Americans. Coin collectors may not have the most powerful lobby in America, but we certainly have had the most determined legislator representing our interests.

It was FRANK ANNUNZIO, for example, who made sure that the coins commemorating the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles were minted by the U.S. Treasury and had the authority and prestige of the U.S. Government behind them.

Over the years FRANK has been a good friend, an occasional luncheon companion, and a source of thoughtful observations about the work we do in Congress.

FRANK is a man of strong loyalties—to his family, his church, his district, and his country. He is returning to his family and many friends and admirers in Chicago. Their gain is our loss. Like many of my colleagues, I will miss him.

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleagues in this tribute to my good and dear friend, FRANK ANNUNZIO, whom I had the privilege of serving with over the last 14 years. In his 28 years of distinguished service in the House, FRANK has been the voice of the voiceless—a real advocate and conscience for his constituents. Through his service, he has brought nothing but honor and distinction to his beloved State of Illinois.

He is known as a champion of consumer rights. In fact, there is a legend around here about his pennypinching ways while growing up in the 1920's. And his thriftiness prepared him well for his ultimate role on the House Banking Committee. As chairman of the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee, he passed more bills to protect consumers' rights than anyone else in that position. He exposed corrupt debt collectors, and fought against surcharges on credit card sales. He initiated the Electronic Fund Transfer Act to prevent electronic banking abuses.

When FRANK became chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, he had the formidable task of dealing with the savings and loan crisis. He played a key role in resolving the situation by initiating the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989. He wrote bills that would impose fines of up to $1 million a day for bank fraud laws, and permit the revocation of charters of financial institutions convicted of money laundering.

FRANK is known among coin collectors as the father of modern commemorative coins. When private businesses wanted to market Olympic coins in the early eighties, FRANK fought for the Treasury's right to sell the coins—and saved our country's taxpayers $70 million. FRANK's Statue of Liberty Commemorative Coin Act raised $74 million for the renovation of the Statue of Liberty—a task I am especially grateful for, since Lady Liberty is located so close to my home district in northern New Jersey. And FRANK has worked on another event which holds special significance for me—the 500th anniversary of Columbus' voyage to America. FRANK has written legislation which will create fellowships in honor of that historic journey, and they will be paid for by commemorative coins that are being issued this year. These fellowships would be an enduring legacy for the scholars of our Nation, and will serve as a testament to the outstanding public service of our most distinguished colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO.

I will miss his congeniality and his wise counsel, and his constituents will miss his many accomplishments on their behalf. I wish him Godspeed in his new endeavors. I know I express the sentiments of all those whose lives he touched that he will be "one tough act to follow."

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York, Mr. LAFALCE, for reserving this time to pay tribute to our good friend and colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO. FRANK will depart the House at the conclusion of this legislative session, completing 28 years of public service. He brings to a close a distinguished career as the Representative of Illinois' 11th Congressional District. His constituency and our Nation have benefitted from his tireless efforts.

FRANK ANNUNZIO came to the U.S. Congress in 1964. During his tenure, he has amassed an impressive list of legislative accomplishments and gained a reputation as a strong consumer advocate. As chairman of the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee, FRANK passed more consumer protection legislation than was ever passed before. He headed investigations to expose fraudulent debt collecting practices and criminalize credit card fraud. He is also responsible for the enactment of legislation, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, which prohibits discrimination in credit transactions, and the Consumer Leasing Act, which provides consumers with uniform disclosure and protection in long-term leases.

FRANK's tenure on the Consumer Affairs and Coinage Subcommittee has also been considered one of intense activity and accomplishments in the coinage legislation field. No other Member of this body has garnered as much influence in determining the kind of commemorative coins and medals that are made for collectors. The George Washington half dollar, the U.S. Olympic coins, and the Statue of Liberty coins are just a few of the projects which FRANK undertook during his chairmanship.

Mr. Speaker, a few years ago I worked closely with FRANK on the development of a Congressional Gold Medal to honor Olympic hero Jesse Owens, posthumously. Due to FRANK ANNUNZIO's efforts through his subcommittee, the legislation was signed into law and the lovely remembrance was presented to the family of Jesse Owens. I will always remember FRANK's strong support of this measure.

FRANK ANNUNZIO is hailed by many as a great legislator. Many of us in this body also consider him a good friend. Despite his legislative schedule, FRANK is always available for counsel or just a friendly chat. It has been an honor to serve in this body with FRANK ANNUNZIO. His service to his congressional district and to the Nation will always be remembered. I join my colleagues in wishing FRANK well and I am pleased to participate in this special tribute honoring him.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend and colleague for many years, Representative FRANK ANNUNZIO.

FRANK ANNUNZIO has ably served the people of Chicago's 11th district and the State of Illinois during his 28-year tenure in the House of Representatives. His varied experiences as an engineer, teacher, businessman, labor official, and director of the Illinois Department of Labor

have given him a unique perspective on the needs and concerns of his constituents. As a member of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions he has fought to improve the soundness of the Nation's banking industry. He has been a congressional delegate to the North Atlantic Assembly and a member of the Economic Committee of NATO and has dedicated himself to the achievement of freedom and democracy for Eastern Europe.

During his years of service, FRANK has received numerous awards including the Illinois Congressional Award, the Reserve Officers Association Minuteman of the Year Award, the Order Sons of Italy in America Marconi Award, the Polish-American Congress Distinguished Service Award, the Baltic Freedom Award and the Goodwill Industries Public Servant of the Year Award. I am sure, however, that he will hold his numerous accomplishments as a Member of this body as his finest achievement.

I, and the people of Chicago, will miss FRANK. I am sure, however, that he will continue to work for the betterment of Chicago in all of his future endeavors. I join my colleagues in thanking him for his friendship and dedication. Best of luck FRANK.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, to join our colleagues in saluting a fellow Member, FRANK ANNUNZIO, a staunch defender of the rights of the working class who has also dedicated his career to ensuring that the American public is aware of the many contributions made by the Italian-American community to our country. It has been a privilege to serve with FRANK, who came to Congress in 1965, having served earlier as Illinois secretary of labor. During his tenure in Congress, FRANK has endeared himself to the people of the 11th District of Illinois with his dedication to advancing consumer rights.

FRANK has always been sensitive to the needs of members of the working class and vigorously pursued a legislative agenda which sought to improve their lives. As chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, he tirelessly fought to bring credit card interest rates under control and succeeded in bringing this issue to our attention. After serving 14 years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, FRANK was thrust into the new role of chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance. He handled this move with the courage and zeal we have come to expect of him. FRANK has been a longtime advocate of savings and loans because of their role in financing home mortgages, particularly for wage earners who have trouble getting loans from commercial banks. He believes that savings and loans are institutions that belong to the average American, the common American, the middle-class American. In FRANK's role as chairman, he wanted to ensure the financial soundness of the S&L industry but also guarantee that S&L's would continue to serve average Americans. FRANK also pushed for stronger penalties for S&L fraud, including civil penalties of $1 million a day for violations. On any issue, no one can doubt where FRANK stands. He speaks boldly for what he believes and is always willing to confront complex issues with tenacity.

As an Italian-American, FRANK is acutely aware of the challenges ethnic differences pose to our society. As one of the founders of the National Italian American Foundation [NIAF], of which I am also a member, FRANK has been instrumental in increasing Americans' awareness of the contributions that Italian-Americans and their descendants have made in social, economic, and political circles. FRANK's devotion to enhancing our knowledge of these contributions is an integral ingredient of NIAF's success story. As a result of his toils, NIAF has been able to fund cultural and education programs and projects; award scholarships and internships; and monitor the media to ensure a fair and balanced portrayal of Italian-Americans. Annually, NIAF's gala awards dinner draws nearly 3,000 people from the United States and abroad. NIAF has honored such Italian-Americans as Antonin Scalia, Frank Sinatra, Joe DiMaggio, Lee Iacocca, A. Bartlett Giamatti, John Sirica, and Liza Minnelli, as well as Luciano Pavarotti and Sophia Loren. Every sitting President has attended the dinner since it was launched in 1975.

Throughout FRANK's service in the U.S. Congress, he has labored with dignity and fortitude. He will be remembered for his compassion for the issues which matter most to the working class, and his courage to speak out on such issues. His presence will indeed be missed by his constituents, Italian-Americans, and his colleagues. FRANK can be proud of his accomplishments, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Mr. LaROCCO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues from the Banking Committee in paying tribute to the retiring chairman of our Financial Institutions Subcommittee, Mr. FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois.

As a first term member of the Banking Committee, it has been my good fortune to be a member of Mr. ANNUNZIO's subcommittee and to experience him as a chairman.

Throughout this Congress, under Mr. ANNUNZIO's leadership, all of the members of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee have been treated honorably.

All of us—even the newest members—have been given the opportunity to speak, to have our ideas and our amendments considered, and to pursue issues of importance to us.

Mr. Speaker, FRANK ANNUNZIO has been a valuable Member of this body, and I join with my colleagues in wishing him a long, happy and productive retirement.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my mentors and great leaders of this distinguished body, FRANK ANNUNZIO. For 28 years, FRANK has been the consummate public servant watching out for the citizens of the 11th District of Chicago as well as for the working class, elderly and consumers throughout this Nation.

First and foremost, FRANK ANNUNZIO has always remembered from where he came as well as who sent him to Congress and he has been a man of the people. He was comfortable shaking hands of constituents, whether union folk, students or business executives and chatting over a cup of coffee at the neighborhood senior citizens center. His common touch with people is evident in Congress as well. He knew what taking the time to listen to the concerns of the private citizen would make him a far more effective public legislator, and this knowledge served him very well throughout his tenure.

FRANK's fervent protection of the common man against the evergrowing onslaught of powerful special interest lobbyists and big business representatives is evident in numerous pieces of legislation and policy he guided to enactment.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage for 15 years, he shepherded through the Truth in Lending Act, the Fair Credit Billing Act, the Consumer Leasing Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and the Electronic Funds Transfer Act. All of these bills made banking and business more readily understood, and protected the average consumer.

More recently, as chairman of the Financial Institutions Subcommittee, FRANK's leadership helped guide this Nation through the biggest financial disaster since the Great Depression by crafting comprehensive reform legislation and holding timely oversight hearings and investigations. Under his leadership, the subcommittee drafted the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act, the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring and Improvement Act, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act. All of these measures increased the safety of our Nation's savings deposits and decreased the likelihood of any future wide-scale financial disasters. These measures bear the stamp of common sense law that Chairman ANNUNZIO espoused.

FRANK'S impact could be found on far more than banking legislation. He helped reform the Small Business Administration, advocated the liberalization of archaic immigration quota systems, attached loan sharking and money laundering, and introduced numerous commemorative coin acts which raised hundreds of millions of dollars for the U.S. Treasury. He was also a faithful soldier and supporter of a strong Medicare and Social Security system.

FRANK has had two great loves in his life—his citizens and his family. For the past 28 years he has put a lot of time into representing his citizens. Now, he is going to go home and spend some quality time with his wife, Angie, and their three children, seven grandchildren, and one great-grandchild. I know that FRANK will not stop fighting on behalf of what he feels is right. As FRANK has been fond of noting lately: he is leaving Congress—he is not leaving the people. That's good news for all.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague, chairman and good friend, FRANK ANNUNZIO, who is retiring at the end of this year. FRANK is now in his 28th year of service and I am honored to have had the privilege of serving with him for 6 years on the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Reform, FRANK has afforded me the benefit of his wisdom and knowledge on issues that came before the committee and the House

that impacted the financial services industry. FRANK is truly a leader and it was under his leadership that we, as members of his subcommittee attempted to salvage the savings and loan industry from the brink of ruin, while at the same time holding those individuals who had abandoned their fiduciary responsibility accountable for their actions.

FRANK has dedicated his life to public service. His constituents and the Nation have been well-served by him. As his colleague, I will certainly miss FRANK and I pray that his life in retirement will be spent enjoying the company and comfort of his wife and family.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to pay public tribute to my distinguished colleague and good friend, FRANK ANNUNZIO. Many today will pay tribute to FRANK's innumerable accomplishments in his 28 years in the House, but I want to add to his high honors a few comments on FRANK's qualities as a colleague and friend. He is a man of great warmth, large heart, and steadfast loyalty. FRANK ANNUNZIO welcomed me to the House, as he as welcomed many, with generosity and good-humored instruction on the finer points of the House's politics and procedures, and my trust in his counsel and his word has never wavered.

I have had the privilege of serving with FRANK on the House Administration Committee, where he has greeted all issues with a commitment to fairness and collegiality and has contributed his valuable institutional memory to the work of the committee on all issues for years and years. I have valued his leadership on the committee, and I know that our colleagues share my thanks for his expertise and camaraderie.

After 28 years in the Congress, the sheer volume and quality of FRANK'S achievements overwhelm those of us who would honor him. Suffice it to say, then, that he is a great man, a great Representative of the people of Chicago, a great American, and a great friend. I thank him and honor him for his good works, and I wish him all the best in all the years to come as he enjoys a well-deserved and distinguished retirement.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO.

FRANK began his career in the House of Representatives in January 1965, the beginning of the great 89th Congress. As a freshman Congressman he participated in the enactment of some of the most important legislation ever passed, which established new programs to assist the elderly, the poor, and the unemployed, programs to improve our education system at the elementary and secondary levels, and programs to make a college degree more accessible to students. Throughout his 28 years in Congress, FRANK has continuously supported programs designed to help those most in need.

FRANK ANNUNZIO was a distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Administration who dealt fairly and honestly with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I will always be grateful for his many courtesies to me over the years. His help on many occasions made my life easier.

FRANK is also one of the Nation's most outstanding Italian-American legislators. His leadership in the House of Representatives is a source of great pride to all of us of Italian descent. As the dean of the Italian-American delegation in Congress, FRANK has been actively involved in promoting a strong relationship between the United States and Italy and contributing to a positive image for Italian-Americans.

I am honored to have served with FRANK ANNUNZIO, a man whose patriotism, loyalty, and dedication to the public good serve as an example to all Americans, and I am proud to call him my friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Chairman FRANK ANNUNZIO is leaving the House after 28 years of very able and dedicated service to our country and to the people he represents.

FRANK has a host of wonderful qualities, which he has shown us all here, but if I had one to pick out as most outstanding it would be his compassion for people who need help. He is one Congressman that has put at the top of his list of priorities making life better for those who are having a tough time and there are many of them. Congress will miss him greatly in the years to come, but America has been well served by him and he has earned the right to retirement in every way.

We all wish him Godspeed and a happy retirement for him and his family.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great losses to this Congress will occur when my good friend FRANK ANNUNZIO retires at the end of this session.

He has been a friend, a mentor and a role model for anyone who cares about people and their many problems. He has been a kind and generous colleague and one of the most knowledgeable Members concerning banking legislation.

This place will not be the same without him, and his warm cordiality. But he and his lovely wife, Angie, can take great satisfaction in completing many years of serving the people of his district with energy, compassion, and the universal appreciation of all who knew him as a Congressman and community leader and a friend. I wish FRANK and Angie many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANK ANNUNZIO. After 28 years here, FRANK has amassed an impressive record of achievements and the people of his district and of America have been well served.

This is a man who, it should be noted, had the foresight to see what was happening in the banking industry in this country and to try to warn us prior to the savings and loan crisis. It also should be noted how proud the Italian-American community is of him, and it is understandable that he has been so honored by them. In his work here, he has, indeed, brought honor on himself. It was a special pleasure for me to serve with him on the House Administration Committee, and to count him as a friend.

I know my colleagues join with me in commending FRANK and wishing him all the best in the future.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a good friend and colleague of almost a quarter of a century is about to retire from Congress. FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois will retire at the conclusion of this 102d Congress.

My path crossed that of FRANK ANNUNZIO in the early days of my congressional career. After my first election to Congress in 1969, I served on two committees with FRANK, the Banking Committee and the House Administration Committee.

Zio FRANCO—Uncle FRANK—was always sincere, considerate, and helpful, and did his best to assist a freshman Member during the initial period of congressional service.

While my committee work has taken me to other areas, Congressman ANNUNZIO remainded with the Banking and House Administration Committees. He will leave the House as ranking Democratic member of both committees, with a record of having served as chairman of the House Administration Committee during some of our more trying years.

We share another calling in common—we both taught history. Congressman ANNUNZIO was a civics and history teacher at Harper High School in Chicago in the early forties.

Civics and history lessons led to his becoming educational and legislative representative of the United Steel Workers of America. When Adlai Stevenson won election as Governor of Illinois in 1948, he turned to FRANK ANNUNZIO to serve as his director of labor.

He has never forgotten his labor background here in the House of Representatives—always a leader in drives to protect the interests of the American worker.

In recent year he has played an outstanding role in congressional efforts to solve the crisis of the savings and loan industry. He has been a leader, also, in the battle to straighten out the problems facing the banking industry.

FRANK ANNUNZIO's friendship will always be warmly remembered. He will be missed by all of us.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has served this house with great dignity and devotion for 28 years, my colleague, FRANK ANNUNZIO.

As chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, FRANK worked hard to protect the consumer, while considering the needs of large financial institutions. During his tenure as chairman of the House Administration Committee he oversaw the transition to the computerized system which has contributed to our increased efficiency.

When I came to Congress in 1972 FRANK was one of the first people I met. Since then I have come to know FRANK as a caring man who has selflessly devoted himself to the concerns of his Nation as well as his district. The people of the 11th District of Illinois have had an honest hardworking man representing them for the last 28 years.

FRANK has served this House and his constituents well. I am pleased to join our colleagues, in expressing my sadness that Frank has completed his service in the Congress. Yet, I am happy that he will now have more time to spend with his family.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in acknowledging the distinguished record of my fellow Illinoisan, FRANK ANNUNZIO, who will be leaving the House after 28 years of dedicated service.

FRANK has spent almost his entire life in service to his community and his state, as a public schoolteacher, legislative and educational director for the United Steel Workers

of America, director of the Illinois Department of Labor, a Chicago-area businessman, and finally as a Member of Congress. He has brought to each of these positions his strong dedication and down-to-earth manner that is true to his roots and the people he represents.

FRANK'S career is particularly distinguished by his efforts on behalf of consumers, especially his legislative work to regulate and prevent abusive practices by debt collection agencies and to criminalize credit card fraud. In addition, as an active Banking Subcommittee chairman, he became known, in one writer's words, as the "czar of the nation's coinage." He has also been an outstanding representative of, and spokesman for, Chicago's rich ethnic community of Italians, Poles, Lithuanians, Czechs, Slovaks, Ukranians, Romanians, and the many other peoples who have contributed so much to our Nation's strength and diversity.

I join every member of this House on saluting FRANK for his many years of service and in sending him our very best wishes for the future.

Mr. NEAL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, FRANK ANNUNZIO was one of the first people I met when I attended my first Banking Committee meeting many years ago. FRANK was kind and friendly to newcomers, and I recall that he gave me a lot of good advice about how the committee worked.

The thing I like best about FRANK ANNUNZIO, Mr. Speaker, is that you always know where he stands. He will tell you, in no uncertain terms, what he thinks about any matter. He is also a man of his word; if he makes you a promise, you can count on it.

FRANK has been a leader and a great influence on the Banking Committee for many years. He has worked to promote safe and sound banking practices. He has been vigilant in defense of the taxpayers. Mr. Speaker, no member of Congress has been a greater champion of the consumers of America than FRANK ANNUNZIO.

FRANK has worked hard to put the S&L crooks in jail and make them pay restitution. He also led the way in passing a bill to stop drug dealers from laundering their money through banks.

FRANK has rendered especially important service in his recent terms as chairman of the important Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulation and Insurance. I have been honored to serve with him on that subcommittee over the years.

As chairman, Mr. Speaker, FRANK is fair and even-handed. He is respectful of his colleagues' views and always eager to have them advance ideas and opinions. Because of FRANK, every member of the Financial Institutions subcommittee has had the opportunity to participate in the development of legislation.

FRANK also is admirably clear and plain spoken. He can cut through the jargon and gobbledygook with which we deal and get to the heart of the matter. That is no small gift around here, Mr. Speaker.

I have had the opportunity to sit beside FRANK ANNUNZIO in full committee sessions for quite a few years now. I am going to miss him. I have often drawn on his experience and expertise, and I will miss that, too.

FRANK, I wish for you a happy and satisfying retirement. I trust that you will stay in touch with your old colleagues and maybe visit them once in a while. We will miss you and hope to see you often.

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I rise to pay tribute to my good friend and distinguished colleague from Illinois, FRANK ANNUNZIO. For 28 years, FRANK has championed the causes of the working men and women of Illinois with strong leadership and dedicated service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Indeed, FRANK has dedicated his life to service for those who needed an advocate. Former Illinois Governor and two-time Democratic Presidential nominee, Adlai Stevenson—a man blessed with a great judge of character and widely known for his integrity—knew what he was doing when he appointed the youthful FRANK ANNUNZIO as Director of Labor for his administration in 1948. FRANK did not disappoint Governor Stevenson. He proved himself capable in that important post and in all other challenges he has faced.

From his days as a teacher of history to those as a legislative representative of the U.S. Steel Workers, FRANK developed a deep commitment to building a better future for the Nation and in protecting the interests of our working men and women. His impressive experience has served him well in his distinguished service as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

His contributions in the legislative areas of education, employment, worker's rights, and social services are key steps in the evolutionary path toward a greater American civilization. FRANK understood that a democracy cannot survive unless it grows. He believed if it did not stand for equal opportunity for all, then it did not stand for anything.

As his colleague, I am grateful for the 4 years I was privileged to serve in this body with FRANK ANNUNZIO. Time and time again, we have witnessed his diligent and tireless efforts on behalf of his constituency. We can all be grateful that FRANK ANNUNZIO chose to enter public service and did not back away from the battles that had to be fought in the name of liberty and justice for all. As important as the memories of those of us to know and have served with FRANK ANNUNZIO, is the legacy he is leaving for those who follow.

I am honored to have served with FRANK ANNUNZIO, a truly dedicated public servant. FRANK, my friend, I wish you Godspeed.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois Eleventh district. He has had a long and illustrious career in Congress. As a colleague and friend, I will miss him.

As the chairman of the Banking Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, he has been instrumental in shaping legislation to bail out the savings and loan industry. Previously he chaired the Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage and has served on the House Administration Committee. Without FRANK's perseverance, there could not be a Christopher Columbus coin nor would there be such camaraderie among the Congressional Italian-American Caucus. FRANK is proud of his heritage.

I feel fortunate to have served in Congress with FRANK ANNUNZIO. Illinois and the Nation will miss his earnest and intelligent leadership. I offer him my best wishes for success with his future plans.

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding Member of the House, Congressman FRANK ANNUNZIO of Illinois, who will retire at the end of the 102d Congress after 28 years of dedicated service. It has been my pleasure to serve alongside FRANK ANNUNZIO since I first came to the House in January 1977, and we have shared many a mutual battle as members of the House Banking and Urban Affairs Committee.

FRANK ANNUNZIO has been an outstanding and innovative legislator during his years in Congress.

Over the years, FRANK and I have worked together on a number of other legislative issues, ranging from intricate banking legislation to the exceedingly important matters faced by working men and women and the elderly citizens of this Nation.

When FRANK leaves the House, the Nation's little people will be losing a true friend. No one has spent as much time and effort trying to see that those in the United States who have a difficult time were able to have a voice in the Congress.

During his congressional career, FRANK has worked on investigations that ended loansharking in the military services, cleaned up the Small Business Administration, and exposed operations of corrupt debt collectors who took millions of dollars from the American public each year through threats and harassment.

He also led the fight to eliminate the national origins quota system for immigration which prevented many families from being reunited in America because of arbitrary rules and regulations.

From 1974 until 1989, FRANK chaired the House Banking Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage. It was during that period he became known as the father of America's commemorative coin programs. His efforts have saved taxpayers funds and brought millions of dollars into the U.S. Treasury. His commemorative coin laws have raised millions of dollars for worthy causes.

His most recent accomplishment was the culmination of a 3-year battle to establish a Christopher Columbus Fellowship Foundation from the proceeds of commemorative coins created to honor the 500th anniversary of the Italian explorer in the New World.

Called the Frank Annunzio Act, the measure authorizes the Treasury to mint gold, silver, and copper-nickel coins in commemoration of the arrival of Columbus in America. If all the coins are sold—and the mint began selling them last month—the Foundation will begin operations with an endowment of $51.5 million.

Considered a friend of consumers, FRANK has guided the passage of such legislation as the Fair Credit Billing Act, which protects the consumers against unfair and inaccurate billing practices, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, which forbids the denial of credit based on sex or marital status, the Consumer Leasing Act, which provides consumers with information about true cost and terms of consumer leases, and the Electronic Fund Transfer Act, which protects consumers against potential

problems encountered in electronic fund transfers, among others.

For the past 4 years, FRANK has chaired the Financial Institutions Subcommittee. Although I am no longer a member of that subcommittee, I have seen the results of his work in the full Banking Committee.

FRANK spearheaded the legislation to reform and restructure the savings and loan industry and held oversight hearings afterwards to learn whether the administration was carrying out the mandate of the Congress to straighten out the disaster which has been described as the worst since the Great Depression.

During the debate on the bailout bill in 1989, FRANK pushed for stronger penalties for S&L fraud, including an amendment that instituted civil penalties of at least $1 million a day for violations. Later, in the last Congress, he advocated funding for stepped-up Justice Department investigations of financial fraud.

I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to FRANK ANNUNZIO and wishing him and his family well. He will be greatly missed in this body. However, his record of legislative service to the Nation will never be forgotten.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAFALCE. 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. HAYES of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I am going to do an hour special order every night until we adjourn. It is about the Presidency. It is about honor. It is about courage. It is about an extremely important issue to me.

I have been asked by some of my colleagues to defer for another special order, because it involves a very dear man who, although he came from the opposite side of the ideological spectrum from me, we always got along. He was as hard working as anybody here. He was always a good gentleman in a debate.

I am speaking of Mr. TED WEISS of New York. We were about to work together on something for the first time in earnest, the women's breast cancer.

I am going to miss him because he was the key in that issue, and we were both born on the same island and the same city, New York City.

I think that whenever a Member passes on, particularly when he gives every last ounce of his energy and goes to his immortal reward while still serving, that every Member should do something they can to put aside their own mortal interests and honor the request for the family and the friends of our, I repeat, very dear Congressman.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt our special order, which I will speak on later. I just want to thank the gentleman from California. I think it shows the best of this body that Members from different ideologies can work together. And it shows his decency and compassion knowing that some of the family of the late TED WEISS have been waiting for his special order.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I assumed they were watching, and I tip my hat to them and would that every Member served as well and right up to the very last days of their life. I honor you for doing this special order.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his decency.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] proceed at this time, after which I will begin my special order.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE TED WEISS

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

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very good friend and a very dedicated public servant, Congressman TED WEISS.

I wanted to thank the gentleman for permitting me to proceed.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, just very briefly, I was afraid that some people who had been waiting for my special order would think that I am letting the gentleman swallow mine. I am going to wait around patiently, take as much time as you want. I will do mine tonight.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I really want to thank the gentleman because TEDDY's widow is here, along with his two sons. And we do appreciate his consideration because the hour is late.

And I do apologize to the family for them having to wait so long. The session was long today, and there have been some special orders before mine. And we do want to let them know our deep gratitude for the service that TED WEISS gave when he served in this Congress.

□ 2200

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Under the rules of the House, Members should refrain from referring to anyone in the gallery.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I rise, as I said, to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York, Mr. TED WEISS. His unexpected death a few weeks ago shocked all of us. The country will miss his leadership, and the State of New York will, as well. I will personally miss his friendship.

As a Congressman, TED WEISS served his constituents of New York's 17th Congressional District as capably and with as much dedication as any Member could ever serve, but more importantly, he conducted the responsibilities of his office with a level of integrity, honesty, and character that was of the highest standard.

It was my great privilege and pleasure to serve with TED in two important professional capacities: First, as the chairman of New York's bipartisan congressional delegation, I worked closely with him on matters affecting the State which both of us represent. He served as secretary of the delegation. When it came time to fight for jobs in New York, for equality in the distribution of Federal resources, TED WEISS was on the front lines. He was effective and he knew how to make things happen. Every member of our congressional delegation salutes him for his work and contribution over the years.

As the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I worked with TED in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations' Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, and he and I served the entire time that he was on the Committee on Government Operations, we served together, he as the chairman of the subcommittee, I as the ranking minority member of the committee.

Pharmaceutical companies trembled at the thought of one of his investigations. So, too, did the FDA officials from time to time. He pursued issues ranging from the approval of particular drugs to problems with those drugs; from the drug approval process itself to particular efforts for the treatment of such a dreaded disease as AIDS.

He was a lightning rod for public attention and debate on important issues. Some of his most recent work focused attention on the problems associated with breast implants and breast cancer, which has already been referred to by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and others, I am sure.

He was someone you hoped was on your side, for if on your side, there was no better ally. Against you, there was no more formidable adversary. He was an articulate spokesman, an inquisitive questioner, a skilled debater, an expert investigator. In short, he knew his stuff.

I also knew TED WEISS, the individual. I know from my own association

with him of his loyalty to friends, his commitment to family, and to his constituents. I know his compassion, which was boundless, especially for those in our society with inadequate food and jobs, little education, and not much opportunity. Those were the people he cared most about, and he cared about them deeply, and he was a champion for their causes.

My wife Nancy and I went up to the funeral services in New York City. At that time we were tremendously impressed by those who spoke and witnessed the life of this talented person, a man who was born in Hungary, who came to this country at a time when many people were fleeing Hungary, and he became the champion of the underdog.

Harry Belafonte spoke eloquently. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] spoke eloquently of his contributions. The gentleman from New York, CHARLIE RANGEL, of our delegation spoke eloquently, as did family members, and particularly the two sons, Stephen and Thomas. It moved my wife and I tremendously.

On the way back we shed tears as we thought about this rich life that had been taken away. We will never forget it, my wife and I, never forget the tributes that were paid to TED WEISS on that particular occasion.

I miss TED WEISS, and the Congress misses him. He was a great man and a great Congressman. His untimely death saddens me, as I know it does many others. I am here to pay tribute to him, to salute him for a job well done as a colleague, to thank him for all that he did for his constituents, and for the work that he did in the Congress.

To his wife, Sonya, to his two sons, Stephen and Thomas, both my wife, Nancy, and I offer our condolences, but we want you to know how much we value the times we had and shared with your husband and your father. We share in your grief and we wish you well.

I would say parenthetically that one of the things that we miss most in this House, we deal with people, and I dealt with TED almost every day when we were in session in one way or another, yet we do not have the time to really get to know the person and the family and to get to know, really, where they come from and what they stand for. Probably that funeral and the people that spoke there gave us more insight into the life of this stalwart warrior than any that I could ever imagine.

Again, we share the grief of the family and we wish them well.

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], who is the chairman or vice chairman of the New York congressional delegation and who was also there at the funeral.

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague. I not only have the honor to serve with my colleague, Mr. HORTON, from Rochester as vice chairman of the New York State delegation, but I have the honor to serve as chairman of the New York City delegation.

I have known TED WEISS for a long, long time. He was a young leader in the organization of the reform Democratic movement in New York City. I was a somewhat more aged leader, even in those days 25 or 30 years ago.

TEDDY brought a remarkable combination of skills that had been honed in the work place of America. He came as a soldier, with the skills of a GI. He came as a prosecutor, with investigatory skills, and he honed and sharpened his high intelligence to do a workmanlike job in investigating sometimes the very complicated backgrounds of the causes that he was engaged in.

He was a city councilman, and he knew and loved New York City. Then, finally, he became a Congressman in the decade of the seventies, so he had a wide variety of truly excellent skills.

We never would have predicted when TEDDY came to Congress, even with his rather unusual background, that his imagination and his intellect and his sense of compassion and commitment would have drawn him into the incredible variety of areas in which he dedicated himself fiercely, with incredible determination. I might say that TEDDY was a very mild and friendly and warmhearted person, never got personal, never got excited, but in his commitment to the causes that seized his imagination he was absolutely dogged and intrepid and committed with a high degree of determination, and the length and breadth of the issues that galvanized his imagination was really quite remarkable.

He was interested, as my chairman said, in the silicon breast implant. He was interested in agent orange. He was interested in the Medicaid bills. He was fascinated and committed to the question of human rights abuses, not only at home here, but around the world, in South Africa, in China, and in El Salvador.

He was totally dedicated to eliminating what he thought were the evils of racism and sexism in our country, including discrimination against gays, against all kinds of sexual and racial and ethnic discrimination. He was concerned with the problems of defense workers who were going to be let out of jobs as we downsized our defense establishment, and he fought for several years for a piece of legislation that gave them job training and skills upgrading so they could be integrated into the civilian economy.

He was rewarded for his efforts, and recognized for his efforts by a very great variety of organizations, including the Consumer Federation of America, the NAACP, and the Vietnam Veterans of America.

TEDDY was the consummate legislator who was dedicated to righting wrongs as he saw them in very professional, very effective, very hard-hitting ways. He did not just identify the wrong, he brought to it his whole tool bag of skills to right the wrong.

□ 2210

He was very result-oriented and he brought an incredible variety of talents and skills to make stick the remedies that he perceived were proper and appropriate.

Let me say that TEDDY in a way was the conscience of this House, in a very real way. There were a large number of Members that did not follow TEDDY down every path that he went. Probably the Manhattan West Side was one of the very few districts in the country that would have nourished a TED WEISS. It is ultra-liberal. It is composed largely of people who came here from abroad as a result of oppressions and persecutions of one kind or another, and TEDDY reflected that. And he reflected the highest intelligent, liberal, committed orthodoxy of a Manhattan West Side. And most Members did not follow him, as I said, on every road, but all Members respected him, admired him, and I think today cherish his memory deeply as I do. We all feel that TED WEISS made a remarkable contribution to this House in terms of the breadth of his views and concerns and the depth of his compassion, and the total decency, the total compassion, the total integrity and the total professionalism with which he approached all of the problems that aroused his conscience.

We revere his memory, and I want to tell his wife, Sonny Hoover, and the members of his family who are sitting in back of us, that TEDDY's memory will last for a long long time here. TEDDY's contribution will not be forgotten. TEDDY's memory will be deeply cherished.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORTON. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

Another area in which TED WEISS gave great leadership to the House was the chairmanship of the Arts Caucus, a large organization. I served with him in that capacity as a member of the Executive Committee of the Arts Caucus, and he did a great service in representing the arts in the House, and he worked with the Senate very closely. I know because I talked to JIM JEFFORDS and others, and his leadership is missed very much as far as the Arts Caucus is concerned.

Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it seems strange on a Wednesday night to be standing here in the well of the House talking about TED WEISS. Usually we were at dinner together. There were a group of about 18 or so of us who once a week got together and discussed things, and it was probably one of the nicest parts of being in the Congress, that dinner. And TED WEISS brought something to that dinner in the way of his thoughtfulness, and his compassion that I think we will miss more than we can put into words.

I wish to thank my colleague, FRANK HORTON, for calling this special order so that Members may publicly express our sadness at the loss of our distinguished colleague. I include myself as one of TED's many friends and admirers here in the House, and I appreciate having the opportunity to say a few words about him.

With the death of TED WEISS, the Congress has lost a great Member. I would not say that about everybody. TED served this body and his constituents in New York in this House very well during his tenure in the House of Representatives.

He was a man of integrity and conviction, often willing to stand alone on an issue he believed in. It did not bother him if he was one of three, or four, or five votes on something. If he thought it was right, he came out here and voted that way, and was willing to accept what everybody said about it. We know among ourselves, unfortunately, that this is not always an easy thing to do in this body. But throughout his 16 years in the House, TED expressed his belief in and fought for the policies that respected the rights of individuals and brought about peace. He fought for arms control and a just foreign policy in areas such as South Africa and Central America.

He fought for civil rights and tolerance in this country, and policies that truly benefited children and families, no matter what their shape.

His stance on these issues led many observers to declare him a great liberal, and he wore that badge with absolutely no apologies.

I knew about TED WEISS before I ever arrived in Congress. You wonder how somebody from Seattle could have known him. Many of my constituents said, "When you get to Congress, you watch how TED WEISS votes, and that will be a good way for you to figure out."

Actually, my colleague from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] mentioned one of the issues, conversion to a peacetime economy. TED was way ahead of the rest of the Congress. He dropped in his bill on conversion year after year after year, and everybody kind of laughed and thought what a far-out idea that is. And suddenly the Berlin Wall fell down and history caught up to TED. He was always ahead of history.

I personally worked with him most closely on policies to combat the HIV/AIDS epidemic. TED fought from the very beginning of this terrible epidemic in the early 1980's to ensure that the Congress paid attention when very few people were willing to learn about HIV/AIDS or to speak out on behalf of people afflicted with this illness. Many of his constituents were touched by the epidemic, and TED felt it was crucial to let every Member of this body know that AIDS know no class, no region, no ethnic, no religious boundaries. He fought for increased during in AIDS research and for stepped-up prevention and education efforts.

He and I cochaired together the Congressional Task Force on International AIDS. He joined me in examining the global epidemic and the U.S. response so that we could learn from what was happening in other countries where the disease had already had a devastating impact. TED WEISS's conviction on these issues and so many others was unwavering throughout his career, and he continued to champion them over the last few months, despite when it was clear to some of us at least that his own health was not as good as he sometimes led us to believe.

I think the greatest testimony to his dedication to his constituents and his work in the House was his overwhelming victory in the New York primary 1 day after his death. Most of us wonder how people would vote the day we died.

The people of New York and the House will miss TED WEISS's thoughtfulness, his integrity and his fighting spirit. And so will millions of people all over this country and the world who may never know of him. Congress needs these qualities perhaps now more than ever during these uncertain times. I hope we will all remember TED and what he has done for this great body.

Mr. HORTON. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and want to thank you, FRANK, for your leadership of this delegation for so long, and for taking out this special order for my friend, and the friend of so many of us, TED WEISS.

The thing I guess when you think about everything about somebody you know well, and I was privileged again to be one of TED WEISS's friends and part of the dinner group that JIM mentioned, and that I know TEDDY looked forward to every Tuesday night, and we liked it so much that it sometimes became Tuesday night, and Wednesday night, and Thursday night, but when I think of all of the many aspects of TED, and it is hard to figure out which ones you want to touch on and talk about with somebody you know well and somebody you respect and admire and love, and miss so much as TED, but to me there is one that just stands out above all of the rest. And it amazes me to this moment. That is that TED on the one hand had such fierce conviction, and yet was such a gentle man.

Madam Speaker, I have seen so many people, and I guess we all have, who love humanity in the abstract, and they fight hard for this group of people or that group of people, or another group of people, and they are really devoted people, and they are people we admire. And then the closer, and closer and closer you get to them, especially when you are in political life, you sort of see that something is sort of awry. I have never been able to figure it out myself.

□ 2220

And that is that while they love humanity in the abstract, when they deal with individual people, that love seems to be gone, and I am sure the psychiatrists or some others would have some explanation for it. And all of us have our foibles. I do not hold it against anybody, but TED was truly unique in that he was just as gentle and compassionate and caring about each individual he dealt with as he was about the people en masse he dealt with.

It never ceased to amaze me the combination of fierce dedication and gentleness, devotion to mankind, peoplekind, am I allowed to say mankind anymore, NANCY, mankind in the abstract, humankind, thank you, humankind in the specific.

Everything TED did had, and I think at his funeral one of the speakers mentioned this, and it may have been one of the children, he had a consistency through and through. The innermost part of TED's heart and brain radiated just outward, and it was clear to me all along that while TED fought very hard, had his frustrations and was certainly angry at times, he was a man at inner peace.

There were not the usual inconsistencies and discombobulations and things that were ajar in almost all of us, certainly in myself, that they were not there with TEDDY. And I think that, maybe more than anything else, made him the great public servant that he was.

I am sure it has been mentioned before, and I will mention it again, when TED WEISS went to the well of this House, people may have agreed with him, people may have disagreed with him. Nobody doubled that it came right from the heart, that there was not somebody calculating the ricochets, there was not somebody figuring out the angles. TED had that internal gyroscope which I think guided his life and guided his actions, and when he got up on the floor, people knew here there was a sincere man.

I remember it was late one night. We were all trying to get home. But TEDDY

felt that something was wrong, and he got up there, and he delayed the proceedings, because it was wrong. People were angry, and they wanted to go home, but nobody impugned why TED WEISS was doing it. They simply said, "That's TEDDY. He believes it. Nothing is going to stand in his way."

And, you know, it is a true gift. Maybe it had to do with, you know, TED's upbringing and all everything he went through at the beginning. Maybe it had to do or maybe it is just a gift from heaven that somehow God picked TEDDY to have his inner peace and consistency and beauty, but he had it. Everyone knew it, and everyone saw it.

I would just like to share one other moment. This was when I spoke to my wife, Iris, and she, too, was a friend and admirer of TEDDY's and of Sunny's; again, I said, "Well, what do you remember about TED?" And one thing that she remembered, and again just because he was a full person, but I just thought I would share it, because it meant something. One summer, I think it was in 1983 or 1984, we were in England. Iris and I took a trip ourselves, but we knew TEDDY was going to be there with Mike Timmeny, who was my AA, and then TEDDY's AA, so it may have been a little later than that. We decided we would meet at this place, and I think it is called Brown's. It was a hotel, and they were famous for having these scones with the clotted cream. TED had just finished one of his many operations on his heart. He once explained to me, and I guess that was what did him in, he had blood that made these chemicals that just did not stop making them. I am sure a lesser person would have lived to much less an age. But we went to Brown's, and he had finished one of these operations, and the waiter brought over these scones with the clotted cream. And TEDDY's face just lit up almost like a little boy, and he just went into that cream, which is sort of like butter, with almost reckless abandon. He had the same joy pursuing those scones that he did pursuing justice, pursuing peace, pursuing equality, but basically pursuing the sort of gentleness in humankind.

TEDDY, we will all miss you, but I still look up at that board, and many of us did, to see, "How is TEDDY voting?"; well, we still look up at that board and say, "How would TEDDY have voted?"

His deeds will live on, his memory will live on, and his beacon will live on, and that is a happy thought, because he left us all so much.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman very much. A beautiful tribute.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] very much, and I thank you very much for calling this special order about what I can say about, I think, for every Member in this body, our mutual good friend, TED WEISS.

You know, when you are in politics the way we are, and especially as privileged as we are to serve in this body, we have many thrills, many privileges that come to us in terms of meeting people, whether they are heads of state or whether they are people who have been pioneers in their own country in the struggle for democracy, especially lately meeting people of that caliber. There are many honors we can do in pursuing public policy, changing the law of the land to make life better for people.

But one of the greatest thrills that I will ever have in my life was the honor of being asked by TEDDY's family to speak at his service in New York.

Because of all the reasons that you have mentioned, and I heard the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER], and you, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], from my office, and the lovely remarks of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], for all of these reasons, the person that TEDDY was, this beautiful person, probably the best person in the world, it was such a thrill to be included among his close friends that day.

And, Mr. HORTON, I heard you earlier talk about the service that day when we were regaled with TEDDY stories by our colleague, Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. HORTON. I should have mentioned your name, too, because you sat right next to my wife, NANCY, and I.

Ms. PELOSI. And listened to you sing all of those songs.

Mr. HORTON. It was beautiful.

Ms. PELOSI. I was not saying it for that reason. I was just saying it was such an incredible service, to hear Harry Belafonte sing and hear stories about TEDDY, and what is interesting to me about services of that kind is when you go to a funeral, and I think this is probably a universal thing, you find out different things about your friend you might not have known. The family finds out about how a person is respected at work, and the people at work find out the truly important things, so much more about the person's family life, and which is really the true legacy, and it is in some ways cause for celebration.

It is always a cause for bonding people together who have shared the experience of knowing this very special person. And we told stories about, as well as TEDDY's family members telling stories, of when TED's family came from Hungary 50 years ago. Well now, it is about 54 years ago. But the day TEDDY came to the well and observed in his 1-minute that 50th anniversary of the arrival in this country of his family, and how he now represented the very area where they disembarked in New York and how proud he was and how he smiled, and his eyes twinkled when he told us that story.

I referenced at the service that I again saw that smile and twinkle when he saw the lines for his new district, because that had been preceded by all the Members of the New York delegation having much apprehension of what would come, but TEDDY was so pleased, because it meant that he would be able to serve those people longer and fight for the values that they cared about.

□ 2230

The gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] mentioned in his remarks about the arts caucus, because of TED WEISS' love of the arts, but also because of his love of free expression and the fight that he waged there. Also, his concern for the support of the arts that he thought our country should have.

In that discussion we talked about how remarkable he was as a leader that he even got MARTY RUSSO to become a member of the arts caucus, and how other Members of this body were, shall we say, impressed, surprised to hear MARTY go up to them and say, "Have you joined the arts caucus yet?" Now, that was not one of MARTY's typical places for focusing his activities. But, as Mr. SCHUMER said, MARTY was not standing in line for the Matisse Exhibit. He was doing that to build up the membership of the arts caucus for TEDDY and to help TEDDY get elected as head of the arts caucus. But it was unnecessary because TEDDY's friends were there to vote for him because they knew of his great commitment. I think the only other thing that could compare to it was to look down from that podium in the synagogue and see 60, at least, maybe 100 of our colleagues in yarmulkes. That was, I think, the largest gathering of Members of Congress in yarmulkes that I had ever seen, once again in TEDDY's name.

Madam Speaker, in the interest of time, I would like to submit a statement about TEDDY for the RECORD.

I join my colleagues today in mourning the passing of an extraordinary human being, TED WEISS. As we reach out to his family, we extend our sympathy and surround them with our love to try to help them through this very difficult time.

The institution of Congress can be a difficult place to serve. And yet, when I think of a guiding light here, I think of TED. He was ever a gentle man in a business that is so often brutal. He maintained his great sense of civility in an environment that can become heated and outright harsh.

One hallmark of TED's life and his public service was his undying commitment to helping those who others overlooked or simply ignored. His family's early flight from anti-Semitism contributed to his deep and abiding commitment to stopping man's inhumanity to man. For TED, human rights was his guiding principle.

His definition of oppression was not a narrow one—he saw and fought oppression in

many places, in human rights, in health care, in housing, and in the economy.

TED was known for his outspoken commitment to the truth. He was, at times, almost a long voice crying in the wilderness. Always, that voice was clear, strong, and unwavering.

In the world of politics, maintaining one's sense of balance and perspective is not easy for some. Yet, one of the things I admired most about TED was his firm grounding in reality. He knew what was right and what was wrong. Being in the minority on an issue did not sway him. Public opinion did not sway him. He spoke out, and voted his conscience. You could always count on TED to do what he believed was right. He was a moral leader who knew instinctively and intellectually what leadership really means.

As one of a relatively small group of progressive Members of Congress, TED had to fight a good fight. Over and over and over, he had to repeat, reshape, and reframe arguments to colleagues, for funding for AIDS research and care, for access to alternative therapies, for human rights at home and in other countries, for uncensored artistic expression, and against U.S. foreign policy aggression and invasions of other lands.

TED was also a kind, caring, and loving man to his family and to his friends. As an immigrant fleeing persecution and hatred, he learned how important refuge is and how life-sustaining a community can be. And, in one of the world's largest cities, rumored by many to be a tough place to survive, he thrived. TED through his work and his life, helped to create a sense of community that has sustained many who would otherwise have been cast aside.

His advocacy for people with AIDS, for example, was early, it was unrelenting and its results have been immeasurable. His work on behalf of human rights in Central America, in South America, and in Africa have assisted thousands who did not even know of his efforts. Yet those very efforts blossom daily in the continuing lives of people around the world who, because of TED WEISS, are overcoming government and government-sanctioned repression, bureaucratic obstacles, and intolerable oppression.

TED WEISS, above and beyond all of his other qualities, was readily recognizable character on Capitol Hill. He will be missed not only by those who knew and loved him, his absence will also be felt by the entire congressional community. What we can, and will do, to celebrate and to honor TED's life is to keep his ardent flame of commitment to human goodness alive. We will keep up TED's work until the oppressed are free, the sick are healed, and all children can live, not merely survive.

In his memory and out of love and respect, we will continue TED's work.

But I just want to make one observation in closing, and that is, of course, I extend my deepest sympathies to the family—to Sonja and the boys and Teddy's extended family—whom he loved very much and talked about a great deal.

I just want to share a thought that Congressman MILLER and I, our colleague, GEORGE MILLER, and I discussed when we entered the synagogue. You know, you are struck by so many things. It was packed and jammed, flowing into the street, filled to the rafters with Teddy's friends and admirers. The Governor of the State of New York, everybody you could think of in the political arena, the arts, and other areas, people who were his friends in the synagogue. There was TEDDY, who seemed big. The presentation, it seemed like it was.

He was draped in a flag. We all thought, "Right on, TEDDY." Even the flowers were a flag, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] would recall, red, white, and blue, the flowers were shaped like an American flag. Then he was draped in an American flag. I thought, "Right on, TEDDY. I don't know anybody in America who deserves to have that flag draped over him more than you do, for the fight you put up for the Constitution and for the right of every person in this country to be treated with full rights," and not only that, his dedication to human rights and the spread of democracy throughout the world.

We will miss him terribly, obviously. But he will always be with us.

I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentlewoman from California. Her comments reminded me, I think that is the first time—I have been in the synagogue many, many times, but that is the first time I have ever heard them sing "Amazing Grace." But it was beautiful.

Ms. PELOSI. Teddy was quite an ecumenical fellow.

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Madam Speaker, I would first like to thank our colleague from New York, FRANK HORTON, for requesting this time in tribute to our friend and colleague TED WEISS of Manhattan.

Madam Speaker, when TED WEISS passed away on September 14, he left a legacy of forceful advocacy for the least advantaged among us, the most determined among us, and the hopes of us all for a better America.

The people TED WEISS represented directly live in communities spanning the boardrooms of Wall Street, the cutting rooms of the garment center, the marquetas and shuls of Washington Heights, and the Williamsbridge neighborhood in the Bronx.

TED WEISS spoke here in the House on their behalf with great skill and affection throughout his 16 years in Congress.

But TED WEISS knew that to be a representative of his constituents also meant speaking out on issues that affected people who had never ventured anywhere near Spuyten Duyvel, the Cloisters, or Grant's Tomb. And in this sense of conscience, TED WEISS had a profound sense of why our Nation was founded, and what it meant to be an American.

One could argue, Madam Speaker, that he felt these truths as he did because, unlike most of us who serve in Congress—those of us who were born Americans—the road that led TED WEISS to America began in Hungary and ended just before the sweeping madness of the Holocaust during the Second World War.

Throughout his life here in the United States, TED WEISS stood up and was counted, first as an attorney and later as a member of the New York City Council, starting in 1961.

When he was elected to the House 16 years later, TED WEISS fought for arms control, compensation for agent orange victims among our Vietnam veterans, increased AIDS research, and against restrictions on the National Endowment for the Arts.

Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was one of our strongest voices for a more progressive America.

It is our great loss that his voice has been silenced, but we are richer for having had that voice among us for so long.

I ask that our colleagues join with me in extending our deepest condolences to his wife, Sonja Hoover Weiss, and to TED's sons, Stephen and Thomas.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Madam Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for holding this special order in honor of a great friend and a great Member of this body.

Tonight, Madam Speaker, we mourn the loss and pay tribute to one of the most able members of the House of Representatives. TED WEISS was perhaps the most progressive and most liberal voice in the Congress. The American people, those who believe in fairness, in civil and human and consumer rights, have lost a truly dear, good friend. He was a good and decent man, a strong man, a man of conviction, a man of courage.

Madam Speaker, he will be deeply missed not only by the people of New York that he served so well but by people throughout America. He was a champion for the weak, for those who did not have much of a voice, for those who had very little power.

Madam Speaker, I have known and admired the good work of TED WEISS long before I came to Congress. I heard about him, I read about him.

During the past 6 years we have had an opportunity to chat on many occasions about issues and problems confronting our Nation and our world. From time to time some of us, including the dear gentlewoman from Califor-

nia, NANCY PELOSI, the gentleman from the State of Washington, JIM MCDERMOTT, and I would get together and break bread. I can recall just a few days ago when we all gathered at a little restaurant here in Washington to eat together after the service for TED in New York. We all ordered our meal, and at the table we had a plate with food for TED and an empty seat.

TED will be missed. He will be missed by some of us who feel so dearly about the future of our land and our country, about issues small and large, for we all knew where TED stood on the great issues, the great issues of our time.

□ 2240

Madam Speaker, all of us in America have lost a friend. For the family and friends of TED WEISS, they have my prayers and the prayers of my family.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], one of the speakers at the funeral.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker and our dear dean, we thank the gentleman for his consideration, as always, not only for taking out this special order, but for sticking with us and prodding us and reminding us. We appreciate it. And also to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], who so fiercely believes in what he has to say tonight that he is prepared to stay until the lateness of the hour, but his courtesy that was extended not just to the Members, but more importantly to the family of our friend, TED WEISS, is deeply appreciated.

I suppose at a time like this that we have to say how lucky we are, how lucky we are to have known a man as strong as TED, to have had a husband and a partner not only in terms of love, but in terms of his political ideals and to share them and outperform them; how lucky we are to have a brother like that and know that so many people never had a brother or sister, but to have one that is so respected.

Indeed, when people talk about family values, I guess that is what TED WEISS was all about, values and how much we appreciate it.

I was struck by the remarks of the gentlewoman from California in talking about TED and the flag, because I think all of us in some way believe that as we come to the Congress that we know what that flag means and we know what the Constitution means; but we always know what it means the way we look at it. That is the difference in TED WEISS.

How could a person like the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] say that he agreed with TED WEISS? No one doubts his patriotism, his belief in what the Constitution is about, and what the Congress should be doing. Everyone comes down here with that belief, but the continuity, the consistency, as CHUCK SCHUMER talked about, the treasure that has been left to us, the legacy that has been left to us is that we do not have to look at that board anymore, because we know what the right thing to do is.

The question is, Does our self-interest, do our political interests allow us the courage to do what TED WEISS has done?

Some would suspect that it was his constituency that gave him the luxury to do it. Others might say that he had the intellect, the wit, and the charm to persuade his constituents to let him do it.

God knows I will not be able to do it, because I was his neighbor. We shared the same community, and more often than that we voted alike; but you are right. Right on this House floor he held up a Veterans' Administration bill. "That ain't no ordinary bill to hold up."

But somehow or other, the chairman and the committee members forgot to put in the funds for agent orange victims. The easiest thing in the world that he would have been able to say is, "Next time we'll correct it"; but it was late at night and he stood up and he stopped it.

It is easy to love a person when you can find things that you agree with that he has done and that you want to do; but every time our Nation does not do the right thing, yes, he earned that flag.

Was it the invasion in Panama? Was it the day we hurriedly went into the Persian Gulf? Was it the invasion in Granada? Was it the way we treated the people in Haiti? You did not have to worry what the issues were, because TED WEISS saw this country the way it should have been seen, from afar, not someone who was born here and sees the country from his block, from his community and from his family.

But I guess it is different when you see this country with the Statue of Liberty guiding us to this country, with all the dreams you have as to what it should be, and to dedicate your life to justice in the district attorney's office, to the mechanics of government from 15 years on the city council, and to reach the Congress and saying that you want to make this country as great as it was to you to give you the opportunity. That is what we all dream, that our country can really reach that full potential, that everyone does not have to look and find out what your religion was. I think that was proven at the synagogue.

Certainly, you do not have to check someone's color to find out what he should believe. If the 435 of us truly represented the United States of America and what that shining Constitution should be, not only to ourselves but a symbol for the entire world that seeks democracy, then TED WEISS would not be the exceptional person that he was.

We all should have so much of that TED WEISS in us that we all will be just one of the gang and we all will just be doing the right thing.

But I guess CHUCK SCHUMER said it. Yes, we looked up at that board, because we knew that was the symbol for the right thing, whether we were prepared to vote that way or not.

I guess we can say the right thing without even looking up at that board.

We know the strength of our country. We know when she is right. We know when she is wrong, and we can give each other the courage to do the right thing, as TED gave us the cover and the courage to do the right thing.

We are indeed the luckiest legislators in the world. We have taken away from us the excuse of not knowing, but given to us what that great torch can be when someone can stand in this well and say that what he is saying has no political significance, except that is what the Constitution is about, to come into this well and talk about AIDS at a time that even doctors were not talking about it, and we have ministers today who will not discuss it, to talk about stopping a war and creating peace, to talk about agent orange when all the heroes of the House and the Senate say it just does not exist, that is the kind of courage that heroes are made out of, and that is what makes this body so great, because from time to time it gives us the opportunity to say that we are a part of that body.

So after the tributes are over and the pain will be with us, we have to remember some way to thank God for picking us out as very, very special people, that he shared TED WEISS with, because it is going to be a long time when we find conservatives, liberals, Jews and gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, blacks and whites, saying that Ted says and does what he truly believes.

So if we are that lucky, I might suggest that when the pain, the longing and the missing and the empty chair is being stared at, we might pause and thank God for how lucky we were that he picked us to share the beloved TED WEISS with.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] for his comments. They have been very eloquent.

Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Madam Speaker, I want to join FRANK HORTON, the chairman of the New York State delegation, in thanking our colleagues from across this great land of ours, many of them from California, from Georgia, and the State of Washington. It speaks volumes for TED WEISS that they would appear here and it speaks volumes about these Members, our respected and admired colleagues.

I would also like to express our profound appreciation to Congressman

BOB DORNAN of California for having yielded his time, for having shown the grace, the gentleness, the kindness to have made it possible for all of us and Ted Weiss' friends to have heard these words before his special order.

BOB, it was a very generous act and we are all very grateful to you.

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, one other thing I would like to add, today coincidentally we had the meeting of the New York congressional delegation, which was a regularly scheduled one. At the last meeting, as I mentioned to the delegation today, at the last meeting TED WEISS was there, sat to my immediate left as he did at every one of those meetings. I commented on the fact that we missed him and then the delegation had a moment of silence in his memory.

I speak for the entire delegation in saying that we have lost a real friend and we certainly will continue to think of TEDDY WEISS as one of our colleagues and a leader who has not gone away from us.

Madam Speaker, I have statements from Members who could not be here, and I will include the statements of Congressmen BEN GILMAN, JOHN LAFALCE, HENRY NOWAK, and SID YATES in this proceeding.

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for requesting this special order so that we might pay a special tribute to our friend and longtime colleague TED WEISS.

TED WEISS will be missed by all of us here, because he touched all of our lives in some special way. As for myself, I had the privilege of working with TED in at least three important areas: as a member of the New York congressional delegation, as a member of the arts caucus, and as member of the House Banking Committee.

As a member of the New York congressional delegation, I could not help but be impressed by TED'S commitment to his district and the people of New York City. He was an ardent and passionate defender of those he served, especially those in special need. Whether it was the homeless who needed shelter or those afflicted with AIDS, TED was a tireless and effective advocate.

TED brought that same compassion and zeal to the arts caucus, which he helped found in 1981. Elected chairman of the caucus in 1991, TED was a strong and vocal defender of the arts. When the National Endowment for the Arts came under severe attack a few years ago, TED WEISS was quick to return the fire. When America's art community needed help, TED WEISS was there and I'm glad he was.

I also know TED from his recent work on the Banking Committee. It should come as a surprise to no one that in being appointed to the committee he chose to serve on the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee. For TED, after all, was always a champion of the American consumer. For TED, the little guy always came first.

And that certainly extended to his work on the other committees on which he served. As chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Human Resources, he led the fight to protect consumers from dangerous drugs and helped stop fraud and abuse in health care programs. As a member of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, he worked aggressively on behalf of programs like Head Start, WIC, and child immunization programs.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that TED WEISS will be sorely missed by those whom he served in New York City and by those of us who were fortunate enough to serve with him as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. NOWAK. Madam Speaker, it is with a sense of great sadness that I join my colleagues in honoring our late friend and colleague, Congressman TED WEISS. He will be sorely missed by the New York delegation and this entire institution.

TED WEISS was the personification of the American dream. He was only 11 years old when he came to this country in 1938 with his family, fleeing Hungary and the menace of Nazi Germany. He served in the U.S. Army from 1946 to 1947 and earned undergraduate and law degrees from Syracuse University.

His adult life was dedicated to public service, first as a member of the New York City Council for 15 years and then as a member of the House of Representatives for the last 16 years. During all that time he was an unwavering man of principle and integrity.

He was dogged in pursuing issues of importance to him, whether that was advocacy of Israel, humanitarian assistance for Ethiopia, expanding access to health care and education for those without, and for gun control. He was an outspoken leader in Congress urging countries around the world to extend basic human rights to their people. He was also an early advocate for eliminating billions of dollars worth of needless weapons systems in light of the end of the cold war and for providing assistance to defense contractors as they convert to commercial production. Congress will miss his leadership on these and other important issues.

TED WEISS, however, was not a man focused solely on national and international affairs. He was deeply committed to the welfare of both the city and State of New York and worked tirelessly to obtain a greater Federal commitment to the area's pressing needs.

It is a testament to his drive and determination that he accomplished so much. He was a role model that any young American could look to for inspiration and pride. My sympathies and very best wishes go to his wife Sonya and sons, Tom and Stephen.

Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was a man of unusual humanity, courage and vision. I was deeply saddened by the news of his death earlier this month. I have lost a dear friend and colleague.

TED loved these United States and he worked very hard to make this a more just and caring Nation. I remember when he was first elected and how pleased I was when he came to the House in 1976. From the very first day, TED took a strong stand in support of the Bill of Rights and economic and social justice, and he never changed. TED believed that Government has a fundamental responsibility to help the poor and disadvantaged in society. He stood for a humane foreign policy that respected basic human rights and he spoke eloquently and voted consistently in support of these principles. TED demanded comprehensive Federal action to meet the Nation's health needs and he worked most effectively to protect the Federal role in encouraging the arts. Many of the positions that he advocated were not popular across the Nation during most of the time he was here but he was right. The country is beginning to see that his vision of a humane and active Government is necessary and needed.

I thank him for his strength and vision and I salute his memory. I extend my most personal sympathy to Sonya and all the Weiss family.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, the House of Representatives lost a little bit of its soul when our colleague TED WEISS passed away on September 14. I don't think there is another member of this House more ardent, more passionate or more committed in working on behalf of his constituents and pursuing his legislative goals than the gentleman from New York. Always he was guided by his deeply held belief that we can create an America on equal opportunity and social justice for all of its people and an America at peace with the global community.

TED WEISS served the people of New York as an elected official for 30 years. After serving on the New York City Council for 15 years, he was elected to the House of Representatives in 1976. Since then, he has faithfully represented the liberal ideals of Manhattan's West Side.

He has been one of this body's most stalwart champions of individual rights. As the author of the Civil Rights Amendments Act, he fought for enactment of this legislation to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. He was a champion of the first amendment—courageously standing up for freedom of speech even when it might not have been politically popular to do so. When the Congress considered a constitutional amendment to protect the American flag, TED WEISS was not afraid to speak up and point out the amendment for what it was—an unprecedented narrowing of the protections of our Bill of Rights. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, I knew that I could count on TED to be eloquent and determined in standing up for our constitutional freedoms whenever they were threatened.

TED worked tirelessly for peace. As a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, TED was one of the Congress' strongest opponents to Contra aid and helped to end our Nation's support for attempts to overthrow the Nicaraguan Government. He was quick to point out the folly of the U.S. invasion of Grenada and the abuse of the Constitution implicit in the Reagan administration's military action there.

He recognized the urgent need to reign in the Pentagon budget and to cease development and production of dangerously destabilizing weapons systems. But he also recognized that we must reach out to local communities whose economies were heavily dependent on Pentagon spending. To that end, he fought for

the Defense Economic Adjustment Act to help local economies adjust to the closure of military bases and lessen their reliance on military expenditures.

TED was also a champion of the right of every American to adequate health care. Through his work on the Government Operations Committee and his chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, TED fought for accountability in Federal health care expenditures. He worked for increased resources for AIDS research to enable drugs to combat AIDS to be brought to the marketplace as expeditiously as possible. He also was a vigilant watchdog of the Food and Drug Administration, working to ensure the safety of food additives and the efficacy and safety of medicines.

I've mentioned some of TED's more notable achievements and crusades here. But let me finish by coming back to the point I made at the beginning of my remarks. TED worked tirelessly for the causes in which he believed. He did not bow to the political winds or fear taking on an unpopular cause. In all matters, he did what he thought was right and in the best interests of our country.

While we will miss TED deeply, his life and his career continue to provide inspiration to each of us. And for that, and for being such a good friend and ally, I thank him.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my most sincere condolences to the family and loved ones of our good friend TED WEISS. His death on September 14 was a profound shock to all of us in this House, in great part due to TED's exceptional vitality. Throughout the nearly 16 years that TED WEISS was our colleague, we were always impressed with his tremendous energy, his overwhelming dedication to the tasks before us, and his absolute fearlessness in standing up for the principles he believed in. Congressman TED WEISS was a tremendous font of dynamism who inspired us all and who was a role model for all of our Members. He taught us to aspire to greatness.

The loss of Representative TED WEISS was a great loss to all of us here in Congress, as well as to the 17th Congressional District of New York and our Nation as a whole. Though TED and I may not have agreed on every issue, I always respected TED's point of view and will miss his insightful input in the days to come.

As a youngster, TED WEISS and his family were victims of rising anti-Semitism in Hungary, their native land. His experiences as a victim of the Holocaust and as a refugee from war-ravaged Europe served as a living memorial for all of us who had the pleasure of working with him on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. TED WEISS constantly reminded us of what could happen if the United States stuck its head in the sand and refrained from intervening for humanitarian causes throughout the world. The hardships TED WEISS and his family were forced to endure could be repeated if we as a free people do not constantly remain diligent. TED WEISS, although never the type to call attention to himself, always served as a living reminder of the need to constantly work for freedom and justice in our world.

Whether he was arguing in support of increased funding for AIDS research, improved social programs, or defense budget cuts, TED WEISS always conducted himself in an admirable fashion. He was always personable, but was never afraid to stand firmly for what he believed in; and he always worked diligently and persistently to further worthy causes. In addition, TED never failed to support his arguments with the latest facts and figures, making it difficult for anyone to dispute his viewpoint.

He perservered through three defeats in the primaries before he was finally elected to the House in 1976. Since then, TED has been a leader among his colleagues, holding positions on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Human Rights and International Organizations, the Education and Labor Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and Human Resources. As my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Speaker, I will attest that TED's ardent support for humanitarian aid to Africa and the Middle East was an invaluable asset to our relief efforts. We were especially appreciative of how TED always recognized that support for Israel, the only democracy and our only true ally in that crucial part of the world, was in America's best interest.

In his congressional district, TED worked hard to represent the diverse, progressive viewpoints held by his constituency. His district, the Upper West Side of Manhattan, has always been known as one of the more diverse melting pots in our Nation. In the 1950's, TED helped found the reform-oriented Committee for Democratic voters and the New Democratic Coalition. In 1961, he was elected to the city council where he wrote the city's gun control law. More recently, he led the congressional arts caucus and supported continued federal arts funding, even for controversial artists.

Mr. Speaker, the death of TED WEISS was a great loss to all of us. He was a man of admirable character and personal warmth. He was also undaunted in his efforts to promote worthy causes and represent the interests of his constituency. He set an example that we all should strive to emulate. I extend my deepest sympathies to his wife Sonya, his sons Thomas and Stephen, and all of his other friends and loved ones as they endure this great loss.

Mr. GUARINI. Madam Speaker, when my good friend TED WEISS announced he was going to run for a ninth term, he summed up his political aspirations beautifully. He said, "For me, politics is about fighting for change and trying to do the right thing." TED spent his entire 16 years in Congress proving those words to be true.

TED was a champion of many noble causes. His flight from Nazi persecution in Hungary just before the Second World War gave him great empathy and understanding for those who suffered at the hands of others. As the senior member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, TED worked tirelessly to end human rights abuses around the world, from South Africa to China to El Salvador.

TED's concern and compassion extended into many different areas. As chairman of the House Committee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, TED was the first Member of Congress to hold a congressional hearing on the devastating effects of the AIDS virus. That was back in 1983, before most of us had even heard of the disease. From that moment on, TED was relentless in pursuing increased funding for those afflicted with the deadly disease.

TED led the charge in other health-related matters as well. After discovering poor quality of care and even illegal activity in so-called Medicaid mills, TED introduced a bill that requires a strict screening process for physicians involved in Medicaid. His concern about the safety of silicone breast implants led to the first controlled study of implants by the Food and Drug Administration. TED's investigation into the effects of agent orange on U.S. servicemen in Vietnam led to legislation that provides assistance to soldiers who were exposed to the harmful defoliant.

TED also recognized that with the end of the cold war, we must turn our attention to enemies here at home, namely crime and drugs. He led efforts to transfer defense spending to domestic programs, focusing on drug treatment and prevention and early education. He also looked out for American workers who would lose their jobs due to defense cutbacks, by writing a bill that would provide work force retraining and factory retooling for civilian production.

Above all, TED will be remembered as one who cared and provided protection for those who needed help. Whether he was standing up for the rights of gays and lesbians, or the oppressed citizens of developing countries, people know they could turn to TED for protection of their inalienable rights. At a time when there seems to be a shortage of compassion for our fellow human beings in the world, TED's death leaves an especially large void. His legacy will never be forgotten. He left behind a legion of friends, and a record that will stand as a tribute to his outstanding public service.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Madam Speaker, we are all deeply saddened by the passing of TED WEISS.

Our Nation has lost one of its most dedicated, principled, and hard-working leaders.

And those of us who had the pleasure of knowing TED personally have lost a treasured friend whose deep personal commitment and gentle nature were a source of comfort and inspiration.

TED came to this Nation, as millions before and since, fleeing persecution abroad and seeking a haven of freedom and tolerance in America.

And from the moment that he sailed into New York Harbor as a child and glimpsed the Statue of Liberty, his love of America was unsurpassed.

As an immigrant, TED uniquely understood the great privilege and enormous opportunity that is afforded to each American citizen. That is why he devoted his entire life to protecting the principles for which this Nation stands, fighting zealously to make certain that the ideas that built this Nation would never be forgotten, and to ensure that all Americans would have the same opportunity that he did to build a better life in a country that respects individual rights. He understood that once we start taking these rights for granted or diluting them we become accomplices in their destruction.

TED's life embodied the concept of service to the public. As a soldier, as a prosecutor, as

a city councilman, and as a Member of Congress, his first allegiance was to the people that he represented. He was known by everyone as a man who stood firmly on principle and as one who would not, under any circumstances, alter his stand for political advantage.

In Congress, he was one of the most unshakable and vocal advocates of fundamental change in Federal budget priorities. His calls for increased investment in human needs—and his strong opposition to wasteful military spending—were a constant in Congress, even when these concerns were not popular within the institution or with the public.

TED served ably on the Education and Labor Committee for some time, fighting to improve education for American students. His work on the Foreign Affairs Committee was aimed at ensuring that American foreign policy respected human rights and international law. And the investigations of his Subcommittee on Government Operations frequently exposed inadequate or flawed Government policymaking in the areas of food and drugs, veterans affairs, and civil rights.

TED's life and his contributions to his Nation are a model and an inspiration for us all. He valued every moment that he spent as an American citizen, and he felt a deep commitment to give something back to the Nation he loved so much. And that is what he did.

TED gave to this Nation a lifetime of commitment to making it a better place to enhancing opportunity for all Americans to education, economic opportunity, and social justice.

And today, there is no more fitting tribute to the life of TED WEISS, no greater compliment that we could pay to his memory than to acknowledge that his presence here in this body has truly made this Nation greater.

TED WEISS gave his all for America, and we are all better off for it. Our rights are more secure. Our families are stronger. And our prospects for the future are brighter.

On the very somber occasion of saying goodbye to a friend we loved, trusted, and admired, we can also draw solace and inspiration in knowing that his dream has lifted us all to a higher plane and helped us do what is right for the future of our Nation.

Mr. FASCELL. Madam Speaker, TED WEISS' career of public service to his country and to the people of New York will be long remembered in these halls—and I feel honored to have this chance to pay tribute to his memory today.

As our colleagues know, TED was one of the foremost champions of civil rights, civil liberties and social justice. While we cannot help but mourn his sudden passing, the accomplishments of TED's lifetime will continue to serve as an inspiration to all who work for the cause of social justice.

TED WEISS and I served together for many years as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It would have been difficult for any Member to match the high level of preparation and dedication that he brought to our legislative deliberations. When TED WEISS took the floor to speak, you could rely on the fact that he came well prepared and his arguments for his point of view were always succinct and perceptive.

Born in Hungary, TED WEISS came to this country as a young boy, attended public schools in New Jersey, and eventually, was graduated from Syracuse University's College of Law.

As a young assistant district attorney in New York, TED started to form his approach and his dedication to solving the problems of life's common folk. As a member of the council of the City of New York for more than 15 years, he became a defender and protector of the people's rights and liberties.

Elected in 1976 to represent the famous West Side of Manhattan here in the U.S. House of Representatives, TED WEISS ably followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, Bella Abzug. Many would argue that he carried the cause of civil liberties far beyond any of those who went before him in his district.

We will miss TED WEISS on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We will miss him in the House of Representatives. And, with proper cause, the people of the 17th District of New York and the West Side of Manhattan will surely miss him because they have lost an able representative and a noble champion. God bless his memory and the cause to which he dedicated his service.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, it is with great fondness that I rise today to remember TED WEISS. TED was a good friend who we miss a great deal.

I knew TED for many years from our work in the Democratic reform movement in New York. It was a pleasure to get to know TED better while serving with him as a Member of Congress.

TED was a man who always stayed true to his principles, even if it meant being the only person who took a particular view. TED was passionate about many important issues, including AIDS research, abortion rights, gay and women's rights, and human rights around the world. I know that there were many people in the House who did not agree with TED's politics, but everyone respected him because his positions were always so well thought out. TED also had a knack for pointing out the side of an issue that had been overlooked.

During the past year, TED and I became particularly close because neither of us knew whether or not we were going to have districts to run from. We spoke daily about the outcome of redistricting and what we would do if we did not have congressional districts. I will remember those talks forever.

People like TED WEISS are rare. He is already missed by his colleagues in the House and also by the many important causes he championed. My heart goes out to TED's widow, Sonny, and the rest of his family. It was a pleasure to know TED and serve with him.]

Mr. RINALDO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, and my dear friend, TED WEISS.

First elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1977, Congressman WEISS served the people of New York for 15 consecutive years. During that time, he rose to leadership positions on the House Committees on Banking, Finance & Urban Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Government Operations. In addition, he has been a compassionate voice on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, as well as the chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus.

TED was born in Hungary in 1927, and arrived in the United States with his mother and sister in 1938. He served in the U.S. Army from 1946 to 1947. He later attended Syracuse University where he received Bachelor of Arts and Law degrees. He served as Assistant District Attorney of New York County for 4 years, and later was elected to the New York City Council where he served for 15 years before being elected to Congress.

TED has left behind a legacy of accomplishments and a distinguished record of service. His dedication and compassion have been displayed in many ways, from efforts to address the homelessness problem, AIDS, hunger, and the need for safe prescription drugs, to protecting basic human rights throughout the world.

He has earned numerous awards through his work in Congress, including the Consumer Federation of America's Public Service Award, the NAACP's National Legislative Award, and the Industry Award from the Foundation for a Creative America. He has also received the Vietnam Veterans of America's highest award for his work championing the rights of our Nation's veterans.

TED commitment to serving the basic needs of the people has earned him a lasting place of honor in this institution. While we are saddened by this passing, he has left behind a great legacy of service that will long be remembered.

Mr. VENTO. Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was a friend and colleague that contributed greatly to the qualify of the Congress and this nation.

TED joined the Congress in 1977, a classmate of mine, after 15 years of service in the New York City Council. From the beginning TED approached his role as a member of Congress with enthusiasm and passion. Because of the stiff competition he faced serving in local government and the fact that he had made several attempts to gain a congressional seat, TED relished his work in the House, where he was very obviously at home.

TED WEISS' first years, with the support of a Democrat administration, permitted him to work on numerous projects that were of some satisfaction. I recall vividly his efforts concerning educational testing and the serious questions he raised that have today resulted in major reforms. TED played an active role in the national Government's renewed commitment to education in his first terms. As the 1980's ushered in a changed policy, Representative WEISS was not discouraged, he shifted gears and found real action in health related issues and the serious problem of AIDS, which wasn't being seriously addressed by the National Government.

TED WEISS' work in Congress sought to provide a voice for those who had no power or voice, surely a job that had a limited political reward, but it was evident that this role was part of the very fabric of TED WEISS. A quality that I greatly admired in my friend, TED WEISS.

During the most difficult days of liberal political life, it was TED WEISS who took on the chairmanship of the Americans for Democratic Action, the Hubert Humphrey-established national organization which advocated a strong and proud liberal tradition. TED WEISS helped keep that flame of liberalism alive during the

1980's when few wanted to be thought of as a liberal much less the point man of that mission. This action defines TED WEISS more than many others. TED WEISS, it seems to me, loved such a challenge and had assumed similar roles throughout his long distinguished public career.

TED WEISS surely didn't go along to get along, he respected all and in return earned and deserved the common respect and admiration of his colleagues and friends. We shall miss TED WEISS but we shall not forget his spirit and lessons. My regrets to his constituents and family and especially Soni Hoover, his spouse.

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness and a deep sense of respect that I rise with my colleagues today to pay tribute to the Hon. TED WEISS of New York.

When I returned to Congress in 1990 I took heart in the fact that TED was still quick to his feet when he sensed a threat to the rights and privileges of his fellow citizens. Whether the issue was civil rights or AIDS, poverty or human rights, TED's voice was always one of the first heard, and it was always one of the strongest.

TED also had the tenacity to stick to his beliefs regardless of the opinions that others might have of them. If he did not agree with the President, he fought him tooth and nail even when he had to do it alone. If he was troubled by the potential implications of a piece of legislation, he opposed it despite the fact that he ran the risk of appearing to be on the wrong side of an important issue. Such actions take courage and integrity—TED had an abundance of both.

Mr. Speaker, it is not enough to say that TED WEISS will be missed from this body—he was irreplaceable, and we are less without him.

In the early eighties, TED took his convictions and the strength of his beliefs to the American people as president of Americans for Democratic Action. As a former president of ADA myself, I had the pleasure of working with him during those years. I remember how clearly he articulated our organization's goals and vision. TED's passion for justice kept us firmly committed to working for the equal treatment of all individuals, and ensuring that all have an equal opportunity for a fruitful and satisfying life.

I'm going to miss TED WEISS, and I will think of him whenever this Congress confronts issues that may prove dangerous for the lives and futures of other Americans, and that force each of us to take positions that may be unpopular, such as when we undertook the difficult question of whether we should go to war. At times like that we realize that we carry an enormous burden of responsibility as members of this institution. That burden will seem heavier without TED here to help us carry it.

Mr. Speaker, TED WEISS was our conscience, and the people of New York performed a great service for this Nation and this institution when they sent him to Congress for the last 15 years. We owe them our thanks, and we share with them our deepest respect for the good and honorable man we had the privilege of calling our colleague.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Speaker, I am honored today to take part in this special tribute to our late friend and colleague, the Honorable TED WEISS. His loss falls heavy on all of us; on his family, his friends, the constituents he served, and this institution as a whole.

Since his election to Congress in 1976, TED worked tirelessly on the issues he and his constituents held dear. TED fought to bring to light the dangers of silicone breast implants and battled to bring compensation to Vietnam veterans exposed to Agent Orange. Most notable among his healthcare efforts, TED was largely responsible for bringing the great tragedy of the AIDS crisis into the congressional spotlight when he was the first to hold hearings on the topic in 1983. Almost 10 years later, we now see just how crucial his early efforts were in fighting the AIDS epidemic.

TED was also an unfailing advocate of enacting legal barriers to discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. For over 12 years TED sponsored the Civil Rights Amendments Act, legislation to extend the protections of the Civil Rights and Fair Housing Acts to gays and lesbians.

Among his many accomplishments, TED may very well be remembered most for his work with the Congressional Arts Caucus. He was a true champion of the arts of every discipline, and he helped to protect and preserve an environment that allowed the arts to flourish and thrive in this country. Acting on his heart-felt convictions that the Government should take an active role in nurturing the arts, TED led many a fight in Congress to defend the National Endowment for the Arts. I am confident that future generations will look back on his work on behalf of the arts, and recognize how his contribution made this world a richer place for each one of us.

We will sadly miss TED's caring leadership on so many issues dear to so many of us. It was a great honor to have served with him and to have called him my friend.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today in honoring a Member and a friend who will be greatly missed by all of us. Representative TED WEISS died on September 14 but he will not be forgotten by those of us who worked beside him here in Congress.

I worked closely with TED for many years on the Government Operations Committee. During this time, I earned a tremendous amount of respect for him as a person and as a legislator. What struck me the most about TED was his unwavering dedication to his beliefs and his constituents. In order to be true to what he believed, he was willing to work as long and as hard as was necessary and he was willing to push for what he believed was right even if he was the only one fighting for a particular cause. Combined with his intelligence, this dedication and hardwork made him an effective and outstanding public servant.

At a time when the press is filled with stories of legislators without compassion or concern for their constituents and their needs, who vote according to the amount of campaign contributions they have received, Representative TED WEISS is a shining example of what is best in public service and he will continue to serve as a role model for the rest of us in years ahead.

Mr. MANTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional and courageous man, TED WEISS, who represented New York in Congress for 16 years until his untimely death earlier this month. I want to thank my colleagues, the dean of the New York delegation, FRANK HORTON, for taking this special order to honor our late dear friend.

Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was a man of conviction and a man of his word. He loved politics but he shunned political expediency. TED measured the righteousness of an issue, not on its popularity, but on his own strong-held beliefs and values. If he believed an issue was right, there was not a political poll to be found that could change his mind.

When it became unfashionable to be considered a liberal, TED wore the liberal badge with pride and honor. Indeed, he remained an unabashed and unapologetic liberal throughout his career.

He was a tireless and unyielding defender of civil liberties in America and human rights abroad. He also was a strong and consistent leader in the struggle to improve the health and welfare of our Nation's less fortunate.

TED was always a step ahead on important national issues. Before the AIDS crisis became national headlines, TED was fighting for additional funding for AIDS research and treatment. As chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Human Resources, he pushed the Food and Drug Administration to fast-track approval of AZT and forced the National Institutes of Health to conduct further experiments in drug treatment.

Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was a dedicated and committed public servant. New York and the Nation have lost a true hero, but his steadfast devotion to his beliefs and ideals will serve as his legacy for generations to come.

Madam Speaker, TED will be sorely missed. My most heartfelt sympathies go out to TED's widow, Sonya, and his children.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise in tribute to our late and distinguished colleague from New York, my good friend TED WEISS. Throughout his career, TED fought for the underdog, the disenfranchised, and the voiceless. TED championed the rights of the underrepresented: human rights, civil rights and socio-economic rights not just in the United States but across the globe.

He did so with passion and limitless commitment, but he was not without humor and the long perspective of one who had devoted his life to battles against larger forces. One remembers many illustrative moments of a dear friend's career. I will relate only one moment that seemed to capture TED's position in this House, his life's work, and his responsive wit. As a group of us discussed how best to organize the opposition to the President's commitment of troops to the Persian Gulf without congressional authorization in the fall of 1990, TED set forth his characteristically thoughtful analysis of the best strategy and tactics to employ. In so doing, he took a defiant yet pragmatic stance against the supporters of the Bush administration. He pointed out that the opposition to the use of force without the Congress's authorization ought to reserve its attacks for the central purpose. One of TED's junior colleagues responded by urging the group to fight the good fight and damn tactics for the sake of what was right. TED's withering reply: "Look, I don't need any pointers on

fighting lost causes." If any Member of Congress were entitled to that phrase, after 14 years in the House and 15 years on the New York City Council, TED WEISS was.

I will not attempt to list all of his feats, but I would like to note several highlights of his illustrious and productive career. TED promoted organizations and programs reflecting his emphasis on rights, including gay and lesbian rights, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Freedom of Choice Act. He was a perennial force for justice and reform in Central America as well as limitations on the nuclear madness that gripped this Nation until the fall of the Soviet Union. He was relentless in his support for gun control, and he brought public attention to the AIDS issue and the dangers of silicone breast implants. As the chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, TED's efforts protected consumers from dangerous drugs and ended fraud, waste, and abuse in our health care system. Emphasizing the importance of education while on the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, he pushed for Head Start and child immunization programs.

TED WEISS' legacy will live on in New York, in our own hearts here in the Congress and in the many programs he initiated, upheld and protected. I have appreciated this chance to offer my public tribute to a good friend, a great public servant, and a decent man of unblemished integrity. TED's remarkable record as an immigrant, activist, and elected official stands as a mark by which we and those who follow should continue to measure ourselves. I honor his memory and I celebrate his life.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, what was most extraordinary about TED was his work-ethic. In Congress, he was a Titan; indefatigable and single-minded in pursuit of a better world at home and abroad, and a government that was more responsive to the people.

These qualities are illustrated by TED's work with the Committee on Government Operations.

Beginning with the 98th Congress in 1983, he was chairman of our Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations. For almost a decade, the Subcommittee, under his leadership, drew the Nation's attention to critical health care problems. His hearings required senior officials and the heads of agencies to publicly explain their actions or, in many cases, lack of action.

TED was one of the leading voices in America on public safety, protecting us from poisonous foods, making sure our medical devices actually worked, and insuring that our drugs would not harm us but nurse us back to health. There was no more ardent and forceful crusader in the war against AIDS than he.

The six subcommittee oversight reports that will be offered tomorrow for final approval by the committee illustrate the breadth of his vision: "Continuing Deficiencies in Veterans Medical Care," "Is Science for Sale? Transferring Technology from Universities to Foreign Corporations," "The Politics of AIDS Prevention at the Centers for Disease Control," "The Quayle Council's Plans for Changing FDA's Drug Approval Process," "Fraud and Abuse in Head Injury Rehabilitation Industry," and "Is the FDA Protecting Consumers from Dangerous Off Label Uses of Medical Drugs and Devices."

TED said what he believed, regardless of whether it favored Democrats or Republicans. His tenacity in pursuing the truth is demonstrated by the issuance of a subpoena last fall to the Food and Drug Administration, following a unanimous vote by the subcommittee, when the FDA was told by the White House not to turn over to the subcommittee FDA documents dealing with the Vice President's Council on Competitiveness.

TED also used the legislative jurisdiction of the subcommittee. In this Congress he held two hearings on the Local Partnership Act, and his suggestions greatly strengthened the bill as it moved this year from the subcommittee through the committee. He emphasized that Congress must help poor rural areas as well as large cities like New York City if we are to ameliorate our social problems.

We are all saddened that ill health has taken him from us prematurely, but his work and contributions will continue to nurture the health and safety of many, many people throughout this country.

Mr. MAVROULES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects for one of the most esteemed Members ever to have graced the Halls of Congress. The sudden death of TED WEISS shocked us all and is a tragic loss for the people of the 17th Congressional District of New York and for the Nation.

TED always had the interests of not only his constituents, but the Nation as a whole, in mind whenever he prepared legislation. I saw his commitment in action. He was one of the first Members with the vision to see the need for economic conversion to aid our workers and industries hardest hit by cutbacks in defense spending. He was one of the first to expose the magnitude of the AIDS crisis and the harmful side effects of silicone breast implants. As the chairman of the Congressional Arts Caucus, TED was always taking the lead in fighting efforts to eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Madam Speaker, my friend TED WEISS was one of the Nation's most respected lawmakers and he will be sorely missed.

Mr. GREEN. Madam Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise this evening to pay tribute to the memory of my colleague TED WEISS.

TED and I have worked together for many years on issues of concern to Manhattan and to New York. He was my neighbor to the west in the city and truly represented his constituents in the finest manner. His care and concern were evident in the causes he espoused: health care, AIDS research and education, peace and arms control, to name a few.

I join my colleagues in sending condolences to his family and his fine staff. We shall miss TED WEISS.

Mr. RUSSO. Madam Speaker, sometimes we're lucky because the fates do conspire to send a man to this institution at the time he is most needed here and at the time the country most needs him. Sometimes we must face a terrible loss and grief when his time with us is all too short.

In paying tribute today to the late and honorable TED WEISS, I search for the words that will do him justice, and truly, justice itself was the cause to which TED WEISS devoted his considerable talents and energy. Here was a man of principle, a great liberal who fought long and hard for his beliefs with a determination that belied his gentle nature.

When someone with TED WEISS' compassion enters the public arena, it is then that the less fortunate have a champion. This distinguished public servant, who well deserved this accolade, was a voice for the many who have no voice, and he was uncompromising in his commitment.

We have lost a decent and loving human being, a true American jewel whose passing leaves us sad but the richer and wiser for having known him.

Mr. LENT. Madam Speaker, it is with a great sense of sadness that I rise today, because in so doing I mark the passing of a good and decent man, one who was a friend to each and every Member of this House.

TED WEISS was a gentleman and a person of great kindness and respect. Over the years TED and I may have disagreed over politics and policy, but through all that time I cannot remember a harsh word stated or unkind thought expressed by him. He conducted himself with dignity and honor, and will be long remembered for his dedication and commitment to his ideals.

This House and all of its Members have been enriched by the presence of TED WEISS, and while we mourn his passing, we celebrate with joy the memories we share of this caring and thoughtful man.

Mr. STOKES. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for reserving this time to pay tribute to our late colleague, TED WEISS. With his passing, the 17th Congressional District of New York has lost its greatest advocate and indeed our Nation has lost a great leader. I join others in mourning the loss of our colleague and friend. We gather today to reflect upon the accomplishments of this distinguished individual.

TED WEISS began his career in public service in 1961 as a member of the New York City Council. During his 15 year council tenure, he authored tough gun control legislation, chaired the Council's Committee on Environmental Protection and introduced the first civilian review board bill. TED earned a reputation as a hard worker on behalf of his constituency.

Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was elected to the House in 1976. His legislative accomplishments during his tenure are vast. TED served on the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families where he worked to expand Head Start, WIC, and child immunization programs for at-risk children.

In the House, TED was a member of the Government Operations Committee and chaired the Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations. In his role as subcommittee chairman, he conducted field hearings on the Federal response to the AIDS crisis, the plight of the homeless, and the Food and Drug Administration's regulation of illegal and safe drugs.

As a ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, TED served on the Subcommittees on Western Hemisphere Affairs; Arms Control; International Security and Science; and Human Rights and International Organizations. In the Congress, WEISS has been a strong

supporter of the State of Israel; he has championed efforts to bring humanitarian relief to drought-stricken countries; and he has been one of the leading advocates for human rights around the globe.

During the 102d Congress, TED was elected to chair the Congressional Arts Caucus where he led efforts to provide funding for the arts and promote artistic freedom. It was under TED WEISS' leadership that the Arts Caucus recently completed its 11th annual "Artistic Discovery" competition, saluting the artistic talents of our Nation's high school students.

As we gather today, many of us have fond memories of TED WEISS. He worked tirelessly on behalf of his constituency, yet he always found time for a friendly chat; he was always available for counsel; and he was at all times a gentleman. I read with interest the statement issued by TED in which he announced his candidacy for reelection in New York's new Eighth Congressional District. In his remarks he said, "There are some who want to be in Congress only because they want to hold office—because they like the title. For me, politics is about fighting for change and trying to do the right thing."

Madam Speaker, the legislative accomplishments of TED WEISS here in the Congress will stand as strong testimony of his belief. We are saddened over the death of our friend and we extend our sympathy to his wife, Sonya, and his family.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, on Monday, September 14, we lost a dear friend and valued colleague, TED WEISS.

TED was a man deserving of this Nation's respect. No matter what the issue, he always followed his principles. He consistently fought Presidents Reagan and Bush's cuts to domestic programs knowing he harm that they would inevitably cause.

TED cared deeply about people, whether they were his constituents or not. And he believed that our Government should be held accountable for its actions. Taken together, these two beliefs made TED a strong ally of America's veterans.

In fact, if it wasn't for TED veterans exposed to agent orange would most likely still be denied care and benefits. Not only did TED direct his subcommittee to review the Government studies of agent orange exposure and publish the report, "The Agent Orange Coverup: A Case of Flawed Science and Political Manipulation," he also prevented the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs from continuing to ignore the suffering of Vietnam veterans exposed to agent orange.

When the chairman attempted to pass a COLA bill by unanimous consent that lacked the agent orange provisions which the House had passed earlier, TED stood up and objected. An action that Paul Egan of the Vietnam Veterans of America called heroic.

TED was a true friend and ally to veterans. His enthusiasm, insight, principles, and friendship will be missed by us all.

I also would like to express my deepest sympathy to TED's wife, Sonya, and his sons, Tom and Steven. I can only hope that they find comfort in the fact that TED was special individual who managed to improve and ease the lives of millions of people.

Mr. CARR. Madam Speaker, TED WEISS was my friend. And, I was his. He was a remarkable man. Kind, unassuming in personal contact, but a giant of intellect and commitment to principles he held dear in his professional life, he had the best of all traits. Though we rarely, if ever, worked together as legislators, we did work together in support of the arts. He was gracious in victory and defeat and that always pointed to the future task ahead and the promise of a productive tomorrow. I will miss him.

Ms. OAKAR. Madam Speaker, I was saddened to hear of the death of Representative TED WEISS of New York.

TED WEISS entered public life as a councilman in New York City in 1961, where he compiled a distinguished legislative record. In 1976, he was elected to Congress to represent the lower west side of Manhattan. That was the same year that I was elected, and TED was my first friend in Congress when we took our seats in 1977.

During this current Congress, I had the additional pleasure of serving with Representative WEISS on the House Banking Committee.

Over many years, I was associated with TED WEISS in efforts to have Congress enact defense economic conversion legislation, about which I would like to comment further.

Beginning in his first year (1977), TED WEISS introduced bills to encourage transition from an economy with a heavy defense emphasis to a more peace-oriented economy. This was long before such a policy became popular in Congress or in the Nation.

TED WEISS' quiet dignity in this cause radiated intellectual and moral conviction.

In 1988, according to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, global expenditures for weapons and armies reached $1 trillion, displacing development world-wide and imposing crushing burdens on many nations and peoples.

TED WEISS spoke out on this subject. On June 13, 1989, he appeared as a witness before the Subcommittee on Economic stabilization, which I chaired at the time, to assist us in drafting a bill that would launch a defense conversion program and would be acceptable to the House of Representatives.

His testimony was helpful. It reflected the writings of prominent academicians. He also expressed his long-held belief that labor and management should work together toward these goals.

When the end of cold war came suddenly, at the end of 1989, the cause of economic conversion gained momentum. In 1990, as directed by the majority leader Representative GEPHARDT, I drafted a composite bill, drawing on the work of all advocates of defense conversion (H.R. 3999). This proposal became the basis for the $200 million program of defense economic adjustment assistance to workers, communities, and businesses that was enacted as division D of the Defense Authorization Act for 1991 (P.L. 101–510, a process in which the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative MAVROULES, was instrumental.

Two years later, we are discussing a $1 billion defense conversion program in the Defense Department authorization conference. That is progress.

In the debates that marked the coming of age of this legislation, TED WEISS often waited his turn to speak, although his foresight and dedication to this issue qualified him to be among the first to speak.

So, in a sense, the acceptance of defense economic adjustment and conversion legislation by the Congress can be regarded, in part, as a living tribute to TED WEISS.

I think of that man of peace when I read in the daily newspapers that the President, several times in the past 2 weeks, has announced massive arms sales:

Six billion dollars in sales of 150 F–16 fighters to Taiwan on September 2.

Nine billion dollars in sales of 72 F–15 fighters to Saudi Arabia on September 12.

If Representative WEISS were on the floor of the House today, I wonder what he would be saying about the wisdom, timing, and morality of these "military moves with political overtones"—Washington Post, September 3, 1992. For this and many other reasons, I am sorry that TED WEISS is no longer with us.

For more than three decades, Representative WEISS was the embodiment of conviction and courage in public life. He merits in death what he fought for in life—peace.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to my friend and colleague, TED WEISS, who died this week. His death took from us a man who fought long and hard for the important issues. Not the splashy or sexy issues, but always the ones that really count for the people of the country—supporting efforts to improve the well-being of children and families, making sure that programs worked for the people for whom they were intended, fighting for attention and resources needed to combat the AIDS epidemic, and on and on. He was among the original members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families and it was a special privilege working with him on the committee over the last 10 years. As the committee's chairwoman for the last 2 years, I knew that I could always count on TED to speak out. His health was not the best in recent years, but his commitment and persistence never flagged. I was in the middle of a committee hearing when I learned of his death, and while in shock at the loss, I knew he would be pleased that his committee was tackling the high costs of college education to make it more accessible and affordable for families. I will miss him and so will this body.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to our former colleague, TED WEISS, who served in this House with distinction for 15 years.

In those 15 years, TED never faltered in his beliefs, regardless of the degree of their popular appeal. He was caring and compassionate. TED championed the causes in which he believed with tenacity, and did not yield. He was opposed to injustice and took action to correct it where he perceived it. He cared deeply about the people of this country and those around the world.

TED was certainly a friend to the arts community, and was dedicated to promoting and protecting the arts. He served as chairman of the Congressional Arts caucus with characteristic effectiveness. When the National Endowment for the Arts was subjected to criticism, TED defended its many positive contributions because he felt people need to be ex-

posed to art, and the Government should have a role to play in achieving this.

TED was a good man of integrity who added much to the House of Representatives. He well represented his constituents, whose respect for him was illustrated last week by their overwhelming demonstration of support in the primary held after his death. In addition to serving the House, and his New York District, TED well served his country. His death is a loss to all of us, and we will miss him.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, TED WEISS, whose untimely death earlier this month robbed the Congress—and the country—of one of its most ardent champions of human rights.

An active and able member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the Subcommittee on Human Rights, TED worked tirelessly to promote universal respect for human rights. While TED is well-known for his liberal convictions, his outrage about human rights abuses transcended political ideology. Dictators of the right and left earned his rebuke. He defended equally and with conviction the rights of Soviet Jews to emigrate, of Guatemalan workers to organize, of Chinese students to demonstrate, of Chileans to vote, and of Zairians to be free from the yoke of corruption and tyranny. TED founded both the Congressional Working Group on Chile, to encourage his colleagues to pressure the Pinochet Government to allow democratic reforms, and the Chinese Political Prisoners Adoption Program, whereby Members work for the release of individuals imprisoned in China for their pro-democracy activities. It was TED'S principled and consistent commitment to promoting respect for the human rights of all that earned him the respect of his colleagues and ensured the effectiveness of his efforts.

I am pleased to insert into the RECORD several letters I have received from members of the international human rights community attesting to the invaluable contribution TED WEISS made to the cause of human rights and democracy. Included are letters from human rights activists in China, Columbia, Mauritania, and Guatemala, individuals whose lives were touched by TED and whose plight he sought to alleviate. I want to thank Holly Burkhalter, Washington, director of Human Rights Watch, for compiling these moving and well-deserved tributes to TED WEISS.

The letters follow:

HUMAN RIGHTS WATCH,
September 22, 1992.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to express my profound condolences to you and your colleagues on the death of Representative Ted Weiss. My colleagues and I at Human Rights Watch have worked closely with Ted over the years: we had no better friend in Congress. I wanted to take this opportunity to mention a few of the causes we worked on together, and to pass on to you some letters from human rights advocates from around the world who knew of Ted's commitment and wished to express their appreciation for it.

We at Human Rights Watch have worked with Ted Weiss since our organization was founded. Throughout the decade, he was a particular champion of human rights in Central America. He and his wonderful staff visited the region many times and there was never a time that they were too busy to send a cable or a letter or make a phone call protesting an arrest, a disappearance, or a killing. Ted led efforts to limit U.S. military aid to regimes which engaged in gross abuses in human rights, and worked hard to implement U.S. laws which link human rights to foreign aid.

Ted Weiss wasn't selective about human rights: he helped us on Cuban cases and Guatemalan, Nicaraguan and Chinese, Soviet and Somali. One effort that we particularly appreciated was his Chinese political prisoner adoption program, in which he distributed Chinese cases for other Members of Congress to help with.

Some of Ted's projects never made the news and were probably not known to many in the U.S., but what a difference they made to human rights activists abroad! I remember the resolution on human rights in Mauritania which Ted wrote, adopted by your Committee and by the full House in 1991. Representative Weiss was outraged by the Mauritanian Government's campaign of terror against its black citizens—which led to the torture and death of some 500 black political prisoners—and the continued practice of slavery in Mauritania. His resolution condemned these and other abuses, and called on the authorities to prosecute and punish the military and police officials responsible for them. We translated the resolution into French and gave it to Mauritanian human rights activists who had been expelled from their country and were living in dusty refugee camps in Senegal. Their joy at knowing that the United States Congress cared about them and the plight of their people was very moving.

Ted Weiss's contributions to the human rights cause are too numerous to enumerate, but I want to add a final note. In my many years working with Members of Congress, I have never known one with more integrity and generosity than Ted Weiss. We will miss him very much. As his staff people now move on to new jobs, I close by offering our warmest thanks for their efforts on behalf of human rights and our best wishes for the future.

Sincerely,

HOLLY BURKHALTER,
Washington Director,
Human Rights Watch.

Rego Park, NY, September 23, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE FOLEY: I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the late Congressman Ted Weiss for his efforts in promoting human rights throughout the world, most specifically, in China.

In 1990, Congressman Weiss initiated the Chinese Political Prisoners "Adoption" Program. Through this program, members of Congress would "adopt" a prisoner from a list provided by Asia Watch, for whom the Congressman could write letters to the Chinese officials on a prisoner's behalf, raise his/her case when meeting with Chinese officials, maintain contact with family members, or take any appropriate actions to ensure humane treatment during imprisonment. Most importantly, this program has helped keep alive the spirit of the pro-democracy movement in China.

As a former political prisoner, I am aware of the debilitating and demoralizing effects of physical and mental torture by prison officials. Despite the guards, the barbed wire and walls that surround the prisons, words from the outside world are able to penetrate. Any words of comfort and encouragement are taken to heart by the prisoners and give them the strength to live through their ordeals.

Congressman Weiss' actions on behalf of political prisoners in China have proved indispensable in helping to bring to attention human rights abuses. It is my hope that his desire to ensure human rights for all lives on, not only in memory, but also in action.

Sincerely,

LIU QING.

Barrancabermeja, Colombia,
September 21, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS FOLEY,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER FOLEY: It is with great sadness that we have learned of the death of Representative Ted Weiss. Representative Weiss has long supported respect for basic human rights around the world, and took a special interest in the Andean region's human rights conditions. Members of his staff made fact-finding trips to Colombia, and often travelled to remote, dangerous regions to meet with human rights monitors and relatives of victims. We also understand that during congressional hearings and meetings with Colombian officials he often raised human rights concerns.

Representative Weiss's compassion for the victims of human rights abuses and his tireless efforts to defend those victims will be missed. We sincerely thank him for his efforts.

Sincerely,

JORGE GOMEZ LIZARAZO,
President,
Regional Committee for Human Rights,

MAURITANIA ACTION NETWORK,
Washington, DC

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

DEAR SPEAKER FOLEY: I am writing to express my condolences for the loss of Congressman Ted Weiss and to honor his particular contribution to alerting the world about the plight of black Mauritanians. I know, I speak for Mauritanians living in exile and especially those who live in asylum and fear in Mauritania itself.

On the behalf of all victims of human right abuses in Mauritania, I express my deep appreciation for the work done by Congressman Weiss. He will be in our memory for many years to come.

Sincerely yours,

MOCTAR TOUMBOU.

The Council of Ethnic Communities "Runujel Junam" ("We Are All Equal") [Consejo de Comunidades Etnicas "Runujel Junam" (CERJ)], before national and international public opinion,

Expresses:

That with sadness and consternation, it has received the news of the death of the respected and distinguished Representative Ted Weiss, who from Congress of the United States of America carried out an unyielding fight in defense of human rights in our country.

Ted was a true friend of human rights monitors in Guatemala, especially during difficult times.

We will always remember him for his valiant contribution to our work in Guatemala

promoting and defending Human Rights. His example will help guide us in the difficult and rough path that we yet must travel in our country.

CERJ offers its most sincere condolences to the distinguished and respected family of Representative Ted, to his wife and children, and to his friends.

Guatemala, September 23, 1992.

WASHINGTON OFFICE ON LATIN AMERICA,
Washington, DC, September 28, 1992.

Chairman DANTE B. FASCELL,
House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FASCELL: At the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA) we have all long felt a special affinity with Ted Weiss. He cared deeply and fought hard for human rights in Latin America. Over the years he was often on the losing side, but he was willing to fight again and again, because it was the right thing to do. In this era when "compromise" and "pragmatism" seem to have displaced moral outrage in the hearts of so many foreign policy makers, when so few care about international issues unless their district or their state is affected in some way, Ted Weiss never resigned himself to accepting policy that failed to embody fundamental principles of decency and generosity.

Our causes were frequently not popular politically or significantly geopolitically. But they were his causes as well. He kept human rights in Peru and Guatemala on the map in Congress and worked for the establishment of democracy in Chile. He was always counted in the never-ending battles to end aid to a brutal military in El Salvador and to end the Contra war that took so many Nicaraguan lives. He seemed able to draw from deep wellsprings in his own experience to identify with people far away displaced by war or brutalized by tyranny, and it showed in every policy stand he took.

Ted Weiss chose the most capable of staff people, who—following his lead—were never too busy to take a call or talk to a visiting Latin American, even when they worked overtime. When meeting with his staff, we would sometimes see him coming in or out of his office, looking a little rumpled or tired, not the kind of man one imagines riding in a limousine or schmoozing at a State dinner, though he doubtless did his share of both. He was not an "insider" but a far more rare (and increasingly endangered) type of Congressman, one who was genuinely unafraid to speak truth to power.

We drew real sustenance from Ted Weiss, a public man who stood for what is truest and best in what we do as a people. All of us at WOLA deeply mourn his loss, and we will miss him on the frontlines.

Sincerely,

ALEX WILDE, *Director.*

LAWYERS COMMITTEE
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, September 29, 1992.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FASCELL: I am honored to have the opportunity to pay tribute to Ted Weiss. I am saddened that this letter is occasioned by his untimely death. As a representative of a non-governmental human rights organization, I am also writing in behalf of folks around the world whose human rights struggles he so powerfully represented over the years. Many of the people whose cause he so effectively championed never even knew his name, but were beneficiaries of his steadfast advocacy and persistent pleading. Through law, legislation, and petitions, Congressman Weiss left an inspired legacy of compassion. He recognized early on that the United States, a great and powerful nation, needs laws which seek the protection of the defenseless both here and abroad. Indeed his many initiatives in behalf of human rights and fundamental fairness were rooted in an unshakable solidarity with those whose dignity has been transgressed by governments.

Mr. Weiss was a man who recognized the urgent need for law tempered by mercy. His life was a testimony to the simple idea that all people, regardless of race, class, or place of birth, ought to be able to claim human rights as a fundamental birthright. He also made it unmistakably clear that defense of that birthright is a charge we all must keep. Indeed that conviction helped illuminate the path for the rest of us. We will greatly miss his companionship and leadership.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH ELDRIDGE.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to my late colleague and friend, TED WEISS. His death took from us all a man who cared and fought for the important issues. Not the splashy or sexy issues, but always the ones that really count for the people of the country—supporting efforts to improve the well-being of children and families, making sure that programs worked for the people for whom they were intended, fighting for attention and resources needed to combat the AIDS epidemic, and on and on. He was among the original members of the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families and it was a special privilege working with him on the committee over the last 10 years. As the committee's chairwoman for the last 2 years, I knew that I could always count on TED to speak out and then to act on what he said. Although he was not well in recent years, his commitment and persistence never flagged. I was in the middle of a committee hearing when I learned of his death, and while in shock at the loss, I knew he would be pleased that his committee was tackling ways to make higher education more accessible and affordable for families. We owe him much for his legacy of leadership and service. I will miss him.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, with the untimely passing of Congressman TED WEISS, we lost one of our most distinguished and beloved colleagues.

TED WEISS was called the conscience of the House, and he merited this honor. A victim of European anti-Semitism, he fought it as strenuously as he sought to eliminate all forms of hatred from human society.

His mission in life was to serve—to extinguish the ills that plague our society. When he saw suffering, he sought to relieve it. When he saw injustice, he sought to correct it.

TED was an outspoken champion of the democratic process and devoted his life to protecting and advancing it.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him and always remember what he stood for. He has left this House—and America as a whole—a rich legacy. And we are grateful for it.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the memory of Representative TED WEISS. I think I speak for many of my colleagues when I say his presence, which exemplified leadership, brotherhood, and friendship, will be deeply missed.

TED WEISS was born in Hungary and immigrated to the United States in 1938. He received his B.A. at Syracuse University and his law degree at Syracuse University College of Law in 1952.

As an immigrant, he understood very well the position of America's underprivileged. He served as our conscience in the Halls of Congress and as the voice of the underclass, when their calls for help went unanswered.

Since my election to Congress, I had the distinct honor and pleasure of serving on the Government Operations Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations with him.

As chair of this subcommittee, he took his oversight responsibilities very personally and very seriously.

He was respected by everyone who knew him, even those who disagreed with him, and both his colleagues and his critics could always count on him to stand on the strength of his convictions. Chairman TED WEISS demonstrated leadership and commitment to ensuring the safety of the American public. He was a man of unmeasured compassion for this country's most disadvantaged citizens. He championed causes that many felt were not worth pursuing.

The recent passing of Chairman WEISS is a loss to us all and the undeserved American has lost a strong voice in Congress.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, Sonya, and his sons, Thomas and Stephen, and to his devoted staff, who worked very closely with a man who improved the quality of the lives of those he encountered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional Congressman and true friend who served in the House of Representatives for 16 years: Representative TED WEISS. I am sure that I speak for all of us who were shocked and saddened to learn of his untimely death.

TED was a leader in the House on many issues, including human rights, women's rights, gay and lesbian rights, and against censorship of the arts. TED was one of the first to demand that the Federal Government treat the AIDS epidemic as a serious health crisis and he was instrumental each year in securing the necessary funding for AIDS research and prevention programs.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations which he chaired, led the investigations into the possible health risks of silicone breast implants. He stood out on the Foreign Affairs Committee as a voice for respect of basic human rights in every country. He has been an articulate and sometimes lonely champion of freedom of expression.

I was proud to serve with TED on the Government Operations Committee and the Congressional Arts Caucus. His wisdom, humor, and leadership on so many issues which we both believed to be critical, will be sorely missed in Congress. I join my colleagues in honoring TED for all his years of outstanding service to Congress and the Nation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Congressman TED WEISS of New York's 17th District. He was a man of

principle who unabashedly championed the issues in which he believed. His constituents and the Nation have lost a great legislator and an outstanding leader.

Congressman WEISS was a strong proponent of improved Federal health-care legislation. He worked diligently to expedite the process for testing experimental drugs for AIDS, and he sought greater Federal funding and increased assistance for AIDS research and education. I testified before two hearings he held on these issues. As chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Human Resources and Intergovernmental Relations, he worked ceaselessly to monitor the Food and Drug Administration, and he also fought to extend veterans benefits to those who had been exposed to agent orange.

Congressman WEISS was also on the Foreign Affairs Committee, where his opposition to military conflict was well known. He was a champion of international accountability on human rights, often suggesting sanctions or condemnations against oppressive governments. He was a great believer in the arts; expertly and graciously he led the Congresssional Arts Caucus, to which I belong.

New York has lost a powerful legislator. The Nation has lost a great leader. The Congress will mourn TED WEISS for his enormous intellectual ability and his huge heart. I will miss an irreplaceable colleague and friend.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on the subject of my special order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

BILL CLINTON'S RUN FROM HONOR

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues who enjoy serving in the majority and will never know the agony of being here over a 16-year span in the minority, I will never know the joy that my friends in the Speaker's chair know to sit up there in that great historical American Speaker's chair and preside over this House.

Let me say that my subject matter tonight in the fourth special order that I am doing on the Presidency to come, either a second term for President George Bush or a 4-year uncertain run for the Governor of Arkansas, Mr. Clinton, is that one of my staffers pointed out to me this week by telephone, when I was home in California, the striking difference between some of the writings of Mr. Clinton and the unbelievably moving and poignant letter by Union officer and major of the 2d Rhode Island Regiment to his wife Sarah. It was probably the high point for me of the whole incredible 11–12 hour series on the Civil War that PBS has already aired twice. Public Broadcasting thinks so highly of this letter of Maj. Sullivan Ballou that, when they have their subscription drives, they offer this letter on simulated parchment from the Civil War period, and I could never come within light years of reading it in the same beautiful manner as the excellent narrator's voice in that Civil War series, but I am going to do it to set the tone of what I think is the essence of pure honor and pure sacrifice when it comes to the ugliest of all mankind's shortcomings: Warfare.

This was the letter written at Camp Clark, very close here to Washington, DC. I will find out exactly where this Camp Clark was on today's map. It was written on July 14, 1861, and it begins:

My Dear Sarah, the indications are very strong that we will move in a few days, perhaps tomorrow. Lest I should not be able to write again, I feel impelled to write a few lines that may fall into your eye when I shall be no more.

I have no misgivings about, or lack of, confidence in the cause in which I am engaged, and my courage does not halt or falter. I know how strongly American civilization now leans on the triumph of the government and how great a debt we owe to those who went before us through the blood and sufferings of the Revolution, and I am willing, perfectly willing, to lay down all my joys in this life to help maintain this government and to pay that debt.

Sarah, my love for you is deathless. It seems to bind me with mighty cables that nothing but omnipotence can break, and yet my love of country comes over me like a strong wind and airs me irresistibly on with all these chains to the battlefield. The memory of the blissful moments I have spent with you come creeping over me, and I feel most gratified to God and to you that I have enjoyed them so long, and hard it is for me to give them up and burn to ashes the hopes of future years when, God willing, we might have lived and loved together and seen our sons grow up to honorable manhood around us.

I have, I know, but few and small claims upon divine providence, but something whispers to me. Perhaps it is the wafted prayer of my little Edgar that I shall return to my loved ones unharmed. If I do not, Dear Sarah, never forget how much I love you, and when my last breath escapes me on the battlefield, it will whisper your name.

Forgive me my many faults and the many pains I've caused you, how thoughtless and foolish I have ofttimes been, how gladly I would wash out with my tears every little spot upon your happiness.

But oh, Sarah, if the dead can come back to this earth and flit unseen around those they loved, I shall always be near you in the gladdest days and in the darkest nights always, always, and if there be a soft breeze upon your cheek, this shall be my breath as the cool air fans your throbbing temple. It shall be my spirit passing by.

Sarah, do not mourn me dead. Think I am gone, and wait for me for we shall meet again.

Maj. Sullivan Ballou was killed just a few days later at the First Battle of Bull Run very close to where my family lives here when the House is in session, that sacred ground out there at what the South calls Manassas and the North calls Bull Run. It was the beginning of the greatest agony in the history of our country, Madam Speaker: 618,000 dead Americans, most of them dead to disease.

Madam Speaker, there were a lot of people that did not share Major Ballou's cause. Forty percent or more of this country fought on a different side. Very few of them were slave-owners, but they were tragically—even the revered Gen. Robert E. Lee—fighting a perpetual cause that would have perpetuated the second greatest evil in this country—I believe the greatest evil to be abortion, and I am entitled to that opinion—but slavery, the stealing of men's lives, and women's lives, and children's lives, but at least letting them live. That is an equal horror, and in some cases, maybe for those in the most suppressed situations, painful.

Continuing this series of special orders about a man who has overcome incredible odds, Bill Clinton, to carry the nomination of the party that has the highest registration in our country, when he finds himself coming out of his convention with double digits; it may be 20–30 points ahead, when people are writing it is his race to lose, I am questioning his honor, and people have a right to know something about me.

Just a brief sketch:

□ 2300

I joined at 19, because like Bill Clinton, I had a fantasy of someday becoming President of the United States. I thought it might be possible. I dreamed about it often during the course of my life, setting a goal in politics, this Chamber or the other side. And I set a high standard for myself, a standard that in the main I have tried to cling to. I could be a better or more charitable person, but nobody is shredding my reputation about, breaking my marital vows, or using drugs, or letting someone else wear the uniform of my country in my place.

I was watching JOHN LEWIS speak tonight, beautifully, eloquently, and I thought about sitting in the second row in front of the Lincoln Memorial, watching JOHN at 29 years of age address a quarter of a million people that had marched with Martin Luther King.

I was in that audience. I had marched with Dr. King, and I was proud of it. I had nothing to bring to that at 30 years of age except to wear my Air Force captain's uniform.

I remember a little lad, a little child of African-American descent, came up to me and said, "Sir, sir." He was about 6 or 7 years of age. He said, "Are you guarding, or marching?"

I said, "I am marching, son." And he slipped his hand in mine. From some-

where around 8th and 9th Street, I marched all that distance, holding this little beautiful body's hand, and then lost him somewhere around the Memorial.

I sat with a delegation of people who were mostly liberals and proud of it from Hollywood. Hollywood was a different community then. The liberal cause was generally civil rights. A few old timers that had praised Stalin and Lenin and were sorry for it, but they knew how to apologize in those days. But it was not a city of violent films, cocaine, sexual promiscuity, and the death of storytelling. It was a pretty good group, and I was proud to be with those liberals.

I have an impulse as an investigative reporter, which is causing me to get on Governor Clinton's trail and try to find the truth.

I swam the Chappaquiddick Channel on Mary Jo Kopechne's birthday, 1 week after somebody else did not swim it. Nobody in this Chamber or the other has negotiated that channel by swimming except this Member.

I have been to the Soviet Union 10 times. I have been to Vietnam 10 times, only once in uniform for a couple of days, ferrying an airplane. I never could get my Government to bring me back on active duty. The shame of it is I had no right with five children under 9 years of age to even dare to ask to go back on active duty, when I had served my time honorably in the most dangerous profession, one of certainly the most top two or three most dangerous professions in the military, flying supersonic aircraft.

Bill Clinton describes himself as a boy at 23. On this floor the other day I said that I felt I was a man, that I was training to be an element leader.

I met one of my pilots that I checked out today over in the Cannon Caucus Room. He works for the National Security Council, David Palmer. I have not seen him in years.

I just recalled the other day that I bailed out of an F-86 Sabrejet August 22, 1960. I had only turned 23 a few months before, on April 3. I bailed out a second time when I was 26. When I bailed out the second time I had four children. I was flying in the California Guard, not on active duty.

I used to laugh. You get back on the horse that throws you. If you love flying and want to serve the country and wear the uniform, you do not take those brushes with death as some cowardly excuse to say not for me anymore. Now, 23 is a man.

I find out now historically the most peculiar thing in the world. I know now that the people in Clinton's headquarters watched this. Young George Stephanopolous insulted me with some name like lunatic. What does that young punk know?

I am going to show you a picture in a minute, George—Stephen, I mean, Stephen Stephanopolus—I am going to show you the antithesis of the man you are dedicating your life to. I will tell you something about heroes.

He became an ace, Richard Bong, who dropped out of college to join the Air Force months before Pearl Harbor, Richard Bong became an ace at 23 years of age, Betsey, and Didi, and Steve, and all the people down there at the Clinton headquarters.

Did you ever hear of the Sullivan brothers? Reading Sullivan Ballou's letter made me think of the Sullivan brothers. I remember crying in that movie when I was a young boy about the Sullivan brothers.

I have been reading about Guadalcanal because we are going through the 50th anniversary of the longest battle in the history of the United States. It started August 7, 1942, and it wasn't over until February 9, 1943. That is a long, long time for young marines and then finally backed up by young Army soldiers to battle in those jungles.

Japanese soldiers used to capture an occasional marine and torture him and put a megaphone or a public address system in front of his mouth, and the other marines would hear him screaming as he was tortured to death. "Marine, tomorrow you die." I grew up in a time of heroes.

These five Sullivan brothers were all killed when the light cruiser USS *Juneau* was torpedoed during one of the many sea battles off Guadalcanal. They died, that anniversary is coming up here, the 50th anniversary, we will be adjourned, 10 days after the election, November 13.

Listen to these deaths, Madam Speaker. I want Bill Clinton to be aware of these deaths. These were all men. George, 29; Francis, 26; Joseph, 23, a man, not a boy, Governor; Madison, 22; and Albert, 20.

Albert was the age that George Bush was when he was shot down in the same Pacific Ocean twice 10 months later.

They all had worked, these five Sullivan brothers, for the Rath Packing Co., and vowed to enlist and fight together after the death of a boyhood friend, and all went down on that light cruiser together.

I was thinking about Eddie Rickenbacher who looked almost 10 or 15 years older than he was, our ace of aces in World War I who shot down 22 airplanes and 4 enemy balloons. He was 26 when he had his first few victories, so I guess that is not close enough to suit Governor Clinton to 23 years of age.

Here is what drives me on to do these special orders on Clinton's lack of honor. It is simply the way he speaks, the way he twists things, the way he deceives.

Here is a press release from the Association of the Medal of Honor Society.

"J. Elliott Williams, President of the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, today," and this was 2 days ago, "criticized Bill Clinton for misleading the public into believing that the Medal of Honor group supported the Democratic nominee. During an interview this morning on NBC's Today Show," that would be Monday, "Bill Clinton indicated that he was backed by," now, get this clever wordage, "all the Medal of Honor winners who have endorsed me. They know the facts."

"But according to Williams, only three of the 205 surviving recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor have actually endorsed the Governor. His statements indicating support of 'all' recipients of the Medal of Honor is blatantly false and misleading," Mr. Williams said.

"I personally feel that Clinton continues to lie about the draft issue and he lies about our endorsement. We cannot endorse, nor do we endorse, Bill Clinton for President."

Now, one of the articulate women that serve in this House got up following me the other day and said Bill Clinton will be the greatest President of this century. I immediately flashed on the Roosevelts, particularly Teddy Roosevelt. I though about five-star General Eisenhower, who walked through the concentration camps and looked at the emaciated bodies of the people he had liberated in what he called the Great Crusade.

I said here the other night he had the "Our Father," composed by Jesus Christ our Savior, pumped out over the public address system of 5,000 invasion ships, and how politically incorrect that would be today.

This office of the Presidency is special to me. I can rattle off all 41 in a few seconds. I said the other day, that came from a punishment by a good nun in the seventh grade, Sister Miriam Rita.

When I was in beginning pilot training in 1953, I strived to be the highest ranking cadet out of about 1,500, and I miraculously made it. I was the Aviation Cadet Corps Commander, Colonel, Cadet Col. Robert K. Dornan.

I had gotten that position partly by memorizing what was called cadet memory. The best of all the cadet memory was a general order, a GO, sent out by Gen. George Washington to his troops at Valley Forge.

This is why honor is important to me, the quality of our first President, the Father of our Country.

□ 2310

He sent this order out in the winter of 1777 to men who were combatants without boots, a third of them, about foul speech. I put the Gennifer Flowers tapes in the RECORD the other day. I did it partially thinking about what George Washington would have thought of someone running for the Presidency with these tapes out there and the news media suppressing them, not knowing about them at all, really.

Here is the way he felt about men combatants in the presence of only men, not in the drawing rooms of Philadelphia society or in front of women and children but just men around men.

Here is what George Washington said.

The General is sorry to be informed that the foolish and wicked practice of profane cursing and swearing, a vice heretofore little known to an American Army, is growing into fashion. He hopes the officers will endeavor to check it and that both they and the men will reflect that we can have little hope of the blessing of heaven upon our arms if we insult it by our impiety and follow. Added to this, it is a vice so mean and so low, without any temptation that every man of sense and character detests and despises it.—George Washington, 1777, Valley Forge.

That is a quality human being, and that is a strain that more often than not comes down through Jefferson and Madison and Jackson and Lincoln, right down into these times. And George Bush, I believe, is that type of quality man, as a father and a grandfather and a man who tried to compromise with leaders in this Chamber and the other Chamber and was taken to the cleaners on a tax increase that I am beginning to think was a cleverly devised plan looking forward to the 1992 election season to destroy a compact that the President had with his supporters and with thousands upon thousands of Reagan Democrats not to raise taxes.

I went out this weekend, again on the road for the President, a week ago I was in New Haven and White Plains, NY. A week before that, Colusa County and up in California. This weekend, I went to Phoenix, Tucson for the President. When I was in Tucson, because of the special orders of last week, one of the veterans of the 355 TAC Fighter Wing that flew out of Takli, we had two amazing bases in the center of Thailand, Korat, in Takli, these were our two F-105 Thunderstreak bases, Thunder Chief bases.

The men gave a nickname to their planes, Thud, the sound of it hitting the ground. It was a beautiful airplane, and it carried the heaviest burden on the Air Force side of attacking Route pack 5 and 6 over North Vietnam.

These men, if they had been given the proper orders by Robert Disgraceful Strange McNamara, they would have succeeded in stopping the aggression of the Communists in North Vietnam over the South.

One of the people who had been a veteran of this wing came to this gathering of 220 people, the Tucson Trunk, as in elephant, Trunk and Tusk Republican Club. And there were a couple of Congressmen there, a couple of my colleagues that I was appearing for.

There were many candidates who were State Senate Assembly, one of the congressional challengers in my party was there, all sorts of chairmen and party leaders.

I asked how many of them had ever read a single word of the Gennifer Flowers tapes. Not a single hand went up. I asked how many of them had ever known till they saw my special order that Bill Clinton never graduated from Oxford, is not an Oxford man, barely got through half the program and spent all of this time creating demonstrations in Europe and Oslo and now we find out in Moscow. Hardly anybody knew.

I asked them what they knew about the chronology or his record of draft dodging. Hardly anybody knew. These are smart, politically active people.

At the end of it, this retired colonel came up and presented me with something, and it moved me because he compared me to the symbolic type of composite hero that I thought I could join and help in the Vietnam war, but it was my fate to be a journalist and try and track the noble men and noble women in a noble cause.

Here is what the colonel gave to me. It is a picture that says at the bottom, the "Fighter Pilot." It is by Maxine McCaffrey, the late Maxine McCaffrey, who became the most beautiful artist capturing the spirit of our fighting men and women in Vietnam.

It says, "Dedicated to the fighter pilot who flew in Southeast, 1964," when that year ended and we only had 23,000 people there, "to 1973. Their mission was to fly and fight and they didn't forget it."

It says, "To United States Congressman Robert K. Dornan, an American Patriot, from Tucson River Rats, September 28, this year."

River Rats are those men who flew missions over Northeast Vietnam in both the Navy, Air Force, and many marines also.

And I think that this picture is the antithesis, the very antithesis of Bill Clinton.

This is the type of hero that Bill Clinton is not. This is the type of man that did his duty knowing that this Chamber and the U.S. Senate and the White House was manipulating him and his life in a political way so that he was not allowed to achieve victory in Vietnam.

You notice the colors are the colors of the flag of South Vietnam, free Vietnam, red and yellow. You notice the frame is bamboo. I will treasure this.

Now, there are two articles that I could submit to the RECORD, Madam Speaker. I choose to read them. I think they are so important.

The first one, today's Los Angeles Times, by Harry G. Summers, Jr. He is a retired colonel. I think he was the best of all the former military experts who the networks utilized to try and bring us some understanding of Desert Shield and then the 42-day air war over land and the last 4 days by the brilliant 4-day land war called Desert Storm.

Harry Summers is a retired Army colonel, a lecturer in strategy and a distinguished fellow at the Army War College.

Here is what he says today:

"Which side are you on, Bill? Not Clinton but those who served and fought communism are vindicated by history."

The column begins,

Amazing! Almost a quarter of a century later, after all that has transpired, Governor Bill Clinton still sticks by the slogans of the anti-American rallies that he organized in England and maybe in some Scandinavian countries during his student days there. Most of his contemporaries have long since thought better of their actions, given the horror of the reeducation concentration camps, where 400,000 Vietnamese were imprisoned for decades after the war.

And good Colonel, you leave out 68,000 executed by death squads of people who trusted us, looked up to us, believed in us and in many cases loved us. We were not the French. They did not want us to leave.

□ 2320

He goes on,

The unspeakable suffering of the almost 1 million boat people and the grinding poverty engendered by the rigid Marxist economic policies of the Communist victories, most people who wave National Liberation Front banners and shouted, Ho, Ho, Ho Chi Minh, the NLF is going to win, now realize that their loyalties were terribly misplaced. But not Clinton. One may question his morals or his patriotism, but one cannot fault his tenacity. In an interview published about a year ago in the October 5 Army Times, Clinton tells of how he worked for 2 of his college years on the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee under Fulbright.

"I became convinced that our policy (in Vietnam) was a tragic mistake, that we weren't going to win, we weren't trying to win, we couldn't win."

If he had stopped there, most Americans, including most who fought in Vietnam, would have nodded in agreement, but Clinton had to show his moral superiority to those who did serve by defending the slogans of his youth.

"We weren't supporting the sides that were capable of prevailing." And who might that have been? At the time, according to Senator Fulbright and his ilk, that meant the National Liberation Front, the supposedly autonomous collection of South Vietnamese freedom fighters opposing the tyranny of the Saigon government. Sure enough, the National Liberation Front did prevail, only to then contemptuously reveal to those they had duped that they were in no sense an independent entity. Organized in Hanoi in December, 1960, the NLF was totally controlled and directed by the Communists in North Vietnam. Even at the time Clinton was shouting his slogans, soldiers of the North Vietnamese army (NVA), constituted more than 70 percent of the Viet Cong "guerilla" forces in the south, and in Great Spring Victory", the account of his multidivision cross-border blitzkreig that overwhelmed South Vietnam in 1975, North Vietnamese Army General Van Tien Dung hardly mentions the role of the Viet Cong or the Liberation Front.

"It turned out," this is General Van Tien Dung, now, "the sides that were capable of winning—

Excuse me, that is Clinton's quote—

"were not the VC or the NFL, they were North Vietnam's regular armed forces. It was not black pajama-clad Viet Cong guerillas that broke down the front gate of the presidential palace in Saigon in April, 1975. It was a T-54 tank of the North Vietnamese Army."

Clinton could be forgiven for not foreseeing that in 1968-69—

His first year at Oxford, when I have to assume he did go to class.

Many people were misled by North Vietnamese propaganda, including not only Fulbright but many Viet Cong cadres as well. But to persist in that ignorance in 1992 is unconscionable.

Almost 10 years ago in his landmark 1983 work, "Vietnam: A History," former Washington Post correspondent Stanley Karnow—

And he is the central figure played by Sam Waterson in the amazing film "Killing Fields—

Karnow described the NLF as a "true communist front organization which took their orders from the Politburo in Hanoi," and he is a liberal writer.

He described the betrayal of their South Vietnam supporters as well, a quote from Dr. Duoung Quynh Hoa. He says, "I have been a communist all my life." He is one of the 16 founders of the NLF. "But now for the first time I have seen the realities of communism. It is a failure—mismanagement, corruption, privilege, repression. My ideals are gone," gone with the wind.

In his 1990 book, "Flashbacks: On Returning To Vietnam," CBS News correspondent Morley Safer corroborated Karnow's findings. Remember, Morley Safer was the one that showed the Marine lighting the hooch on fire and a corps Marine officer, and said, "We have to burn this village to save it." A good piece of film, Morley. We must have seen it a thousand times during the rest of the effort to save the Vietnamese from communism.

Morley Safer corroborates Karnow's findings. "They called it a people's revolution," said former VC Colonel Pham Xuan An. But of course, the people were the first to suffer. The people were immediately forgotten. They still haven't remembered the people.

A quarter of a century ago when Bill Clinton was leading his anti-war rallies through the streets of London, I do not think Colonel Summers knows he was traveling to Moscow, I will straighten Harry out tomorrow, "he undoubtedly believed that he occupied the moral high ground, but Clinton failed to notice that the ground has been shifted dramatically beneath his feet. Time has shown conclusively that it was not the National Liberation Front and their supporters among the American anti-war movement who were on the side of history, it was those who Clinton 'loathed,' the young American men and women who served in his stead to oppose the spread of communism that have been vindicated. "That Clinton still just doesn't get it, that he still cannot admit that he was wrong, is a sad commentary indeed on the depths of his intellectual ignorance."

Since my special order on Friday I have learned out of the mouth of his press secretary exactly when he arrived in Moscow. Get your pencils, help me, Madam Chairman; work with me, people. He arrived on New Year's Eve, the 31st of December, a Wednesday, the last day of the year, 1969. That means when he woke up somewhere in Moscow with housing undoubtedly supplied by the KGB, I have to give young boy Clinton the benefit of the doubt that he didn't know that, but every peace group was manipulated by Soviet secret police, KGB-controlled. They used their word "peacemir" like a hammer to pursue their goals in Afghanistan, Angola, Cuba, Nicaragua, and yes, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos and Mongolia and in all the captive nations before that in East Europe. It was always "peace" they were fighting for.

If they could find a young American that would violate the sense of decency and honor to travel to Great Britain and arrange demonstrations against better men than he, who probably hated the war worse than he did, because they were the warriors who had to put up with the unbelievable political manipulations, MiG sanctuaries, I mentioned the other day, so these Soviet MiG fighters just on the outskirts of Moscow shipped to Vietnam could take off from a Robert McNamara dishonorably created sanctuary, and our young pilots would see the sun glint off their wings, knowing the next time they would see them is when they were coming at them from 40, 45, 50,000 feet to make one run to kill some Lieutenant on his first mission, who graduated from college with better grades than Bill Clinton, who understood that when there is a window of opportunity and your country needs you, as I quoted Churchill the other night, particularly if you ever want to lead men into battle or serve in a political position on an Armed Services Committee or Secretary of Defense or President of the United States, Commander in Chief, if you ever aspire to that, you do not let one, two, three, and four young men take your place and wear the uniform of your country.

Here is another article today. By the way, I said I swam the Chappaquiddick channel, marched with Martin Luther King. What quirk of fate put me in Moscow that very week? I kind of felt something Friday night when I was on the floor here, that he was going to turn out to have been in the Soviet Union in the very early part of 1970.

Remember, all I had to go on was one of those vague lines of his that he was there sometime in the early seventies. You can't get any earlier than January 1, 1970, and a few days later, as I said the other night, I arrived with Carol Hanson, Connie Hessel, Pat Hardy, Pat Mearns. We arrived there on a nonstop flight from Cairo, Egypt, and we were arrested at the airport because we didn't have the greased visa that Bill Clinton had gotten at the Russian Embassy in Moscow, where some agent came up to him pretending he was a fellow student and said, "You are a wonderful American demonstrating against this evil imperialistic interventionist war of American capitalism, stopping the poor Viet Cong from controlling their own fate."

This is great, that you have the guts to demonstrate against your own country with these skulls and crossbones and caskets and singing and chanting right here in Grosvenor Square in front of the statue to the American Eagle Squadron and under the nose of Franklin Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief that helped pull Russia's chestnuts out of the fire against the German blitzkreig, the Nazi conquest, Operation Barbarossa, right in that square Bill Clinton was recruited to come on by the Russian Embassy, I will give you that address tomorrow, and to come to the Soviet Union in the dead of winter.

You know what the wives and I remembered that temperature to be? Twenty-six degrees below zero. I had the U.S. Weather Service do a search over the last 2 days. You know what the average temperature was that whole week he claims he was in Moscow? We don't know that he was there, but 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, who says it was a week? Everything else he twists and distorts.

That week the average temperature was 22.3 degrees below zero. What student from Oxford, as DeDe Meyers, his spokesman, said in response to my three special orders last week, "Oh, it is a ridiculous insinuation. He was there like any other student traveling on a winter break." No, no, no tourists were going there. It was not very friendly, as he describes it. It was not a period of detente. This was the height of the Vietnam war. I repeat again what I said Friday, Soviet fighter pilots were flying MiG-23's against the Israelis because the Israelis shot down five of them. Soviet pilots may have been flying in Vietnam killing our men, and we know for certain they were training the North Vietnamese.

□ 2330

No, this was the height of the war. Here are the exact statistics. The day he left for Moscow, and we do not know whether he flew in on a plane or came in a car, because none of the people, Madam Speaker, none of the media people in this country pinned him up against the wall yet and said, "How did you get to Moscow? Train or plane? When did you go? When did you show up in Oslo? Was it December 18? Was it a month after? How did you get there?"

Here is how many men died when he was there: December 31, 2; January 1, 19; January 2, another 19; January 3, 15; January 4, 18; January 5, 21; January 6, 26; 120 men, and any one of them might have been one of the soldiers that took his place. It is incredible.

What were the casualties for the Vietnamese in that same week? There were 304 of our allies killed, 786 wounded. And when I kept track of this every day off of the front page of the L.A. Times, and I have a scroll that goes from here to the other end of the

Speaker's area, Madam Speaker, I always recorded the so-called enemy boys because they were peasant kids. They did not know what they were fighting for under Ho Chi Minh. There were 1,999 young men from North Vietnam who suffered the ultimate death fighting to turn their country into the economic basket case that it is now.

There is the date. I am trying to find out when Clinton was in Oslo. Sometime after December 12, not November as I said Friday. Where did he go from Oslo on December 12 before he claims through the "mir" that he shows up on New Year's Eve, 26 degrees below zero in Moscow? What hotel did he stay at, what youth hostel? Wherever he stayed, I will bet you that the Soviet Government picked up the bill, the KGB, and we just know that is the case. And it will come out, and the horror of it is that all of this will come out after he is President, because then he picks up that radioactivity of the leader of the free world.

When I was a young fighter pilot we used to have an expression. I just saw it in an aviation magazine, 35 years later. We used to say that there are only three jobs worth having in the United States, a super rock star, and notice the word "super," a super rock star, President of the United States, or fighter pilot. That is how we loved our profession.

Well, this man avoided the third, and his saxophone certainly is not going to get him in the first category, and he is going to end up the President of the United States. Then he takes on the special aura of the office. Then what his alter-ego that he has been working with since that group worked for McGovern in east Texas as youth organizers in 1972 he and Betsy Wright then will have to worry about the bimbo expression. That is her expression, not Mary Matalin's. Then the bimbo eruption will be able to get hard coinage of the realm of Hard Copy, or Current Affair, or Maury Povich, or Philly Donahue, and they will all be looking for these people. A lot of them will be frauds like the flying saucer type people. But a lot of them will be the real ones that are going to start to pop up, and they are going to be telling the stories of I traveled to Moscow with the future President of the United States. We worked with people that on reflection I have to admit were probably KGB. We worked for peace. We did not realize we were part of the Evil Empire and were being used, because as Colonel Summers says, where are the admissions of youth in full naivete with the reflection of history. He is still clinging to the chants of those disloyal marchers in foreign countries.

Here is the September 9 Wall Street Journal, "Clinton ignores history's lessons in Vietnam," Peter R. Kann, who happens to be the publisher of the Journal.

Bill Clinton was back onstage last week explaining his actions of 23 years ago in avoiding the draft and Vietnam. His complex maneuvers then, and convoluted explanations now, make it unlikely his "one final statement on the subject will be his last." I think that is the one he made at the American Legion.

Yet, the real issue isn't where Bill Clinton's heart and feet were in 1969, but rather where his head is in 1992.

What he did 23 years ago and why is less relevant to being President than how he explains those actions today. But even that so-called character issue is less germane to his potential Presidency than what he now thinks about the rightness or wrongness, the causes and effects, of the American experience in Vietnam.

When Bill Clinton says that 23 years ago, and interestingly, that is precisely half his life ago since he is now 46, when Bill Clinton says that 23 years ago he "believed strongly our policy in Vietnam was wrong," he was reflecting a then common view of a controversial, politicized, "conflict." I added "politicized."

When, 23 years later, he says "I still believe that," it reflects obliviousness to the lessons of two decades of history in Vietnam, Asia and beyond.

For those of us of Bill Clinton's generation, the late sixties and the early seventies were a testing time. At the poles of our generation were those whose convictions led them to volunteer for Vietnam, and those whose convictions led them to resist the draft. In between, of course, were the many who went because some combination of draft and duty called, the many more who straddled, fiddled, and found sanctuary—from graduate schools to National Guard Units—and later the many who lucked out with high lottery numbers.

Conviction, convenience, class, courage, cowardice and simple luck all shaped the actions of our generation. Two decades later, most might agree that it's only those who went and served—or the families of those who did not return—who truly inhabit a high ground from which to cast stones at Bill Clinton and the rest. This high ground isn't populated by many politicians, pundits, press people or others positioned to play moral arbiter.

Morality aside, the political and military issues of the Vietnam era confused many Americans. Containing communism in a period of developing "detente"; defending an often imperfect ally;—

Pardon me, like France, you know, and like a lot of people that we have defended, or like South Korea. There are a lot of countries that we have defended and shed blood over that turned out to be imperfect.

Supporting distant Asian dominoes; sowing democratic seeds in soil that frequently seemed infertile; waging the war with too much firepower, or too little—all this was eminently arguable two decades or more ago. So too were the questions of what price was worth paying for victory and what cost might be paid for defeat.

All fair issues in 1969. But now it's 1992. And it is hard to think of any issues or any place in the world where hindsight offers a cleaner spotlight in which to distinguish right from wrong and success from failure.

"The postwar history of Vietnam—the revenge of the reeducation camps, the exodus of more than 1 million boat people," 500,000 or 600,000 drowned at sea, were ravaged to death by sharks, or from days of dehydration on otherwise paradise-looking islands. So there is a misery that still goes on there. The crowded little cubby-hole hovels that people live in in Hong Kong at this minute as I read this. "* * * the economic misery and political repression that was the lot of those left behind—surely has made it obvious even to former flower children of the sixties," flower children of the sixties, the blooming idiots of today, that is my aside, "that the Vietnamese Communists were not, as one of the friends of my youth put it, 'those groovy little people in the jungle,' but rather the hardest and harshest of Communist cadres. These events in Vietnam—and in the killing fields of Cambodia and poisoned villages of Laos—" remember yellow rain, red rain, the poison that came from Moscow, the same kind of thing that Saddam Hussein is doing today, botulism, nerve gas, mustard gas, all of these poison gases first tested in Ethiopia and then in Laos?

"As to the rest of Asia, it did not go Communist, of course, but rather emerged—free, prosperous and stable—as the model for the developing world and the pride of the developed one. Surely it isn't because we left or lost Vietnam that this has all come about, but rather because we stayed so long and fought so hard.

"Our long and painful Vietnam experience bought the time for the rest of Asia to build foundations of free enterprise economics and freer societies, to create the prosperity and personal dignity that precludes communism taking root."

The President of Singapore told me that to my face, Lee Kuan Yew. BEN BLAZ, our colleague from the island of Guam was there and stayed back. He actually stayed back and I stayed back to talk to him.

□ 2340

BEN BLAZ told him "I have never heard such eloquence as you are expressing how our sacrifice in Vietnam bought you freedom, Malaysia freedom, Thailand freedom." The President of Singapore understands these words.

These one-time political dominoes that we now call economic tigers, they, not Vietnam, were the war's winners, and it is we who were and are their role model like this composite symbolic heroic fighter pilot.

What about the wider world, the expansionist, totalitarian ideology we sought to resist in Vietnam? Two decades later it collapsed in Stalin's satellites, and then in Vladimir Lenin's own land. In China, in Vietnam, and a few other outposts, the ideology lingers on trying to compromise with capitalism while repressing people, a combination unlikely to last. Do not forget Cuba and North Korea.

Communism, however, did not simply collapse of its own accord. That is

probably Clinton's opinion. That is McGovern's opinion, his hero of his youth. It collapsed because the U.S. and other free societies waged a long twilight struggle from the 1940's through the 1980's, late 1980's, from Harry Truman's Berlin Airlift to Ronald Reagan's Pershing missile development, from Europe to Vietnam to Afghanistan. We won some battles, and we lost some battles, but even the lost battles, for those who view Vietnam as a loss, were part of winning the wider war.

For Bill Clinton or any of us to have foreseen and fathomed all of this in 1969 would have required a gift of wisdom if not of prophecy to understand it, and in 1992, it requires merely common sense.

In the same week that Mr. Clinton was reaffirming that America was wrong in Vietnam, the Far Eastern Economic Review of Dow Jones magazine published out of Hong Kong was reporting an extraordinary story titled "The Rebels That Time Forgot." I will get this story, because I missed it. It is about a lost army of mountain tribesmen, totally isolated in the remotest jungles of Indochina, like the Hmong people in the Pleiku area in the little village of Kontum that put this bracelet on my wrist in September 1968. Oh, yes, that was the month Bill Clinton was starting his sojourn with no tests, no quizzes, no book reports, no papers, no thesis to write or turn in. That was a quarter of a century ago that I put this bracelet on. The village chieftain put it on, and said, "Please, do not take it off until they stop killing my people."

These tribesmen, the rebels time forgot, totally isolated in the remotest jungles of Indochina, continued to wage a lonely struggle to defend their culture, their religion, and their freedom against Vietnamese Communists. These tribesmen, however, trapped in a time warp, still understand the difference between what is right and what is wrong.

It is also important for Presidents.

Madam Speaker, in the remaining 8 minutes I have I would like to tell a story about that September 1968. I did not realize I was going to think of this tonight.

I was going as a journalist with a USO tour, a handshaker, it was called. The American performers went over there by ones and twos, and they could go way out right to the front lines, and I went over with a boyhood friend and schoolmate, Gary Crosby, Bing Crosby's son, and Gary and I went to all four corps areas, went to wooden platforms built on the top of mountains along the edge of the DMZ in I Corps, all the way down to some of the jungle camps in the Huminh Forest in the IV Corps area south of the delta, and it was in a hospital somewhere, I believe, in the III Corps area, in the area where the 11th Cavalry Regiment, a beautiful emblem, red and white diagonal with a black reared-up stallion on it, and it was commanded by General Patton's son.

We went into one of the hospitals, and they always wanted the handshake tours to go in the hospitals. This was September 1968, the third week of September, that the mini-Tet offensive, the major Tet offensive being all of February, the month that McNamara resigned on New Year's Eve day, February 29, with blood on his hands, walked off the battlefield, gave the last year of Johnson's Secretary of Defense leadership role to Clark Clifford, who has got his own problems right now. McNamara, 7 years of disgraceful service, and he dumped out in the last year to Clark Clifford.

February was the major Tet offensive. This is September, the mini-Tet, and Gary and I go into a hospital. We always met with the Army nurses. We were so impressed with the courage of these courageous women.

One of the nurses said, "Gary, I want you to come here and meet somebody, a fan of your father's, knows you, grew up with you," cover of Life magazine when you were 16 singing Sam's Song. "He wants to talk to you." If Gary is listening now, he will choke up listening to this. He kneels down next to this trooper lying in a bed on his face. His face was over the end of the bed. His head was shaved. He had metal stitches in his skull. I had never seen that. Both his arms were gone. He had part of one arm. Part of one leg, but both his legs really were gone, and a big piece of his face and his chin was gone, but he was able to speak. His face was in a net looking down at a bowl where he was bleeding, not bleeding as much as just saliva leaving his body, but he could talk clearly, and he started talking to Gary.

Gary choked and could not speak. He stood up, and came over to me and said, "Please, go over and talk to this trooper." And I said, "OK." I thought because Gary could not, that maybe I could. I could not speak either when I knelt down, and he said, "Gary, is that you?" And finally I got a response out and said, "Yeah, yeah, it is." And he said, "Gary, I am from Chicago. They tell me people in my home town are flying Vietcong and North Vietnamese flags. Is that true?"

Go back, go to your local library, and look at the September and late August issues of Time and Newsweek and look at the pictures in Grant and Lincoln Parks with these flower children flying these enemy flags that have so torn up Indochina, these Communist flags. I said, "Well, yeah. It is just a few creeps. Do not worry about it. It is not the country. The people still support what you are trying to do here. We have just got to figure out how to resolve this thing, depoliticize it." He said, "Well, Gary, will you make me a promise? Promise me you will never, never let any of these people fly an enemy flag in front of you."

You have got to picture this probably very handsome young guy with his arms and legs all gone, but one arm, and his face in this mesh, staring straight at the floor, trying to turn his head. I said to him, "I swear to you I will never let an enemy flag fly in front of my face." And I have seven of them in a box in my cellar at home. Four or five of them I picked up right out at the Mall here April 23, 1971.

That was the day I saw a Massachusetts Navy lieutenant with the Navy Cross throw his medals at the Capitol. They are on his wall now over in the U.S. Senate. He said he had borrowed somebody else's medals that he was throwing that asked him to, but I remember the press conferences on a day in 1971, and they said they were his medals.

I kept my promise to that trooper. He did not want to be in Vietnam. He let himself be drafted, and in a sense was volunteering. There were so many excuses to get out of there.

Tomorrow, when I pick up my next special order, I am going to try and make sense of a lot of this.

What is the first casualty of politics? The truth. I am going to compare some of Clinton's quotes back and forth, what he said last year and what he is saying now. Then I want to analyze the information in that letter to Colonel Holmes where Colonel Holmes said, what he said alone, in his December 3, 1969, letter, would have restricted Bill Clinton from ever qualifying to be an officer in the U.S. military. This is why Holmes placed that letter in the ROTC files, to make sure that Clinton would never again be able to become an officer in the United States.

I just found out today that Clinton took and failed his Air Force officer physical in 1969; he took and failed a Navy officer physical in 1969. He sought Federal employment that would bring a deferment in 1969.

Through influence, he had a Navy Reserve billet set aside for him in a unit that was full. That was in 1968. He had Senator Fulbright's chief of staff, his AA, exert pressure on that same ROTC commander, Colonel Holmes, so that he would go to the draft board, which he did, to take Clinton in under extraordinary arrangement, take him into the ROTC, and in a 2-hour conversation at the colonel's house about his deferment, he concealed from Colonel Holmes the fact that he had already received two draft induction notices, been involved and been a leader in organizing antiwar activities in a foreign country, and that information alone would have had the colonel say, "Get out of my house"; sought draft avoidance with an Oxford classmate through Winthrop Rockefeller, and it goes on and on.

Madam Speaker, I will pick up tomorrow with more inserts to discuss why I do not believe, or why I believe the Governor of Arkansas does not have the honor, the principle, and the character to be the President of the United States and the Commander in Chief.

□ 2350

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WATERS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS], is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS of Utah addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes each day, today and on October 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 15 minutes, on October 5.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WASHINGTON, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HUGHES, for 60 minutes, on October 1.

Mr. NATCHER, for 60 minutes, on October 2.

Mr. TAUZIN, for 60 minutes each day, on October 1 and 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO in three instances.

Mr. LEACH.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. HASTERT.

Ms. MOLINARI.

Mr. PETRI.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. HUNTER.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. HOPKINS.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Mr. GUNDERSON.

Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

Mr. SHAW.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

Mr. MAZZOLI, in three instances.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. LANTOS, in two instances.

Mr. DICKS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

Mr. DOWNEY, in two instances.

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

Mr. ENGEL.

Mr. HUBBARD.

Mr. MATSUI.

Mr. KOSTMAYER.

Mr. MANTON.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 1491. An act to establish a partnership among the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the States, and private organizations and individuals to conserve the entire diverse array of fish and wildlife species in the United States and to provide opportunities for the public to enjoy these fish and wildlife species through nonconsumptive activities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1697. An act to amend title IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 to increase the penalties for violating the fair housing provisions of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5058. An act to authorize appropriations for the American Folklife Center for fiscal year 1993.

H.R. 5399. An act to amend the United States Commission on Civil Rights Act of 1983 to provide an authorization of appropriations.

H.R. 5503. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5679. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6056. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1216. An act to provide for the adjustment of status under the Immigration and Nationality Act of certain nationals of the People's Republic of China unless conditions permit their return in safety to that foreign state.

S. 2344. An act to improve the provision of health care and other services to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m. the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 1, 1992, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4333. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a Soil Conservation Service plan for the Town Branch Watershed, Gentry County, MO, and an environmental impact statement, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4334. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a Soil Conservation Service plan for the East Yellow Creek Watershed, Sullivan, Linn, and Chariton Counties, MO, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4335. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the third report of the Commission on Alternative Utilization of Military Facilities, pursuant to Public Law 100-456, section 2819(b)(4) (102 Stat. 2120); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4336. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report pursuant to section 3140 of the Fiscal Year 1992 National Defense Authorization Act, pursuant to Public Law 102-190, section 3140 (105 Stat. 1581); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4337. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to France (Transmittal No. 21-92), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4338. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Victor Jackovich, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bosnia and Hercegovina, and of E. Allan Wendt, of California, to be Ambassador to Slovenia, and of Mara M. Letica, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to Croatia, and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4339. A letter from the Director, ACTION Agency, transmitting a copy of a final regulation issued by ACTION to exempt a system of records from certain provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5060(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

4340. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year (if any) and the budget year provided by H.R. 5620, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-578); to the Committee on Government Operations.

4341. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a copy of a report entitled "Customs Service: Trade Enforcement Activities Impaired by Management Problems," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Government Operations.

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. ROE: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. H.R. 5352. A bill to coordinate and promote Great Lakes activities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 102-742, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DE LA GARZA: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1696. An act to designate certain National Forest lands in the State of Montana as wilderness, to release other National Forest lands in the State of Montana for multiple use management, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-958, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 582. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5678) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and against the consideration of such conference report (Rept. 102-959). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 583. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany, and providing for corrections in the enrollment of, the bill (H.R. 5488) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and against consideration of such conference report (Rept. 102-960). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 584. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1637) to make improvements in the Black Lung Benefits Act (Rept. 102-961). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BEILENSON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 585. Resolution providing for the completion of the activities of the Task Force to Investigate Certain Allegations Concerning the Holding of Americans as Hostages in Iran in 1980 in the second session of the One Hundred Second Congress (Rept. 102-962). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1696. An act to designate certain National Forest lands in the State of Montana as wilderness, to release other National Forest lands in the State of Montana for multiple use management, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for a period ending not later than October 1, 1992, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries pursuant to clause 1(n) of rule X (Rept. 102-958, Pt. 2). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 6056. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations discharged; considered and passed.

By Mr. ACKERMAN:

H.R. 6057. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from waiving the collection of penalties for violations of the alternative operator services requirements of such act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself and Mr. BATEMAN):

H.R. 6058. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 600 Princess Anne Street in Fredericksburg, VA, as the "Samuel E. Perry Postal Building"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BACCHUS:

H.R. 6059. A bill to authorize the construction of Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities in Brevard County and Orange County, FL, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUSTAMANTE:

H.R. 6060. A bill to establish certain environmental protection procedures within the area comprising the border region between the United States and the Republic of Mexico; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 6061. A bill to require that if the Greensboro-Winston-Salem-High Point, NC, Metropolitan Statistical Area is combined with the Burlington, NC, Metropolitan Statistical Area, the official title of the resulting MSA shall include the name of each area within the new MSA; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 6062. A bill to promote the growth of environmental science and technology in the United States; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

H.R. 6063. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of expanded nursing facility and in-home services for dependent individuals under the Medicare Program, to provide for coverage of outpatient prescription drugs under part B of such program, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KLUG:

H.R. 6064. A bill to provide for assistance in the preservation of Taliesin in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANTON:

H.R. 6065. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to impose conditions relating to employment on certain transfers of air carrier certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 6066. A bill to establish procedures to prevent and resolve disputes concerning telephone toll fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. SABO, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. TORRES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 6067. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that the minimum wage rate under that act will be indexed to the cost of living in the same manner as Social Security benefits are indexed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H.R. 6068. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to increase authorization levels for loan guarantee programs of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. COX of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RIDGE, and Mr. ARMEY):

H.R. 6069. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to protect taxpayers against deposit insurance losses, to provide for a system of insuring the deposits of depository institutions through a self-regulating system of cross-guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 6070. A bill to establish a demonstration project under which payment shall be made under the Medicare Program for transportation services for dialysis patients residing in rural areas; jointly, to the Committee on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SKELTON:

H.R. 6071. A bill to permit States to waive application of the Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1986 with respect to certain farm vehicles operated more than 150 miles from a person's farm; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 6072. A bill to direct expedited negotiated settlement of the land rights of the Kenai Natives Association, Inc., under section 14 (h)(3) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, by directing land acquisition and exchange negotiations by the Secretary of the Interior and certain Alaska Native corporations involving lands and interests in lands held by the United States and such corporations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZIMMER:

H.R. 6073. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make nondischargeable claims of governmental units for costs that are incurred to abate hazardous substances and for which the debtor is liable under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, certain claims under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, and claims under State laws similar in subject matter to such acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 6074. A bill to provide that a Federal employee who is separated, due to a reduction in force, within 18 months before becoming eligible for an early retirement annuity may elect to continue in Government service, without pay, until the age and service requirements for such an annuity are met; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 6075. A bill to prohibit the use of foreign assistance or other U.S. Government funds to support certain activities that encourage U.S. businesses to locate or relocate their business operations outside the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution authorizing the Philippines Scouts and United States Veterans' Association of America to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor Filipino veterans who served in the United States Army during World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YATES (for himself and Mr. MILLER of California):

H. Con. Res. 365. Concurrent resolution making corrections in the enrollment of H.R. 5503; considered adopted pursuant to H. Res. 581.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to return the enrolled bill (H.R. 3379) with respect to the authorities of the Administrative Conference, and providing for its reenrollment with technical corrections; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution authorizing the presentation of a program on the Capitol grounds; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

H. Res. 586. Resolution commending the Ad Hoc commission of El Salvador upon the completion of its work in compliance with the January 1992 Peace Accords and expressing the confidence of the House of Representatives in President Alfredo Cristiani as he undertakes the actions necessary to implement fully, and in a timely manner the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

516. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to providing Federal funding for fishing industries and for studies of evacuation routes and protection levees in south Louisiana in light of the damage done and losses inflicted by Hurricane Andrew; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 551: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 856: Mr. HYDE and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1311: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1312: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado.

H.R. 1515: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1752: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 1943: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3058: Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 3164: Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 3561: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 3605: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3806: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 4206: Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 4399: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 4418: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 4507: Mr. MINETA and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 4725: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 4953: Mr. STARK, Mrs. MINK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TORRES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 4962: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 4963: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 5070: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 5106: Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 5208: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5250: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. COX of California, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. SCHULZE.

H.R. 5308: Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 5316: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 5317: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 5464: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 5550: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 5551: Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 5552: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 5556: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 5573: Mr. MORAN and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 5591: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 5610: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 5614: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 5681: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 5703: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 5713: Mr. EVANS and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5720: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 5737: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 5743: Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 5745: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 5776: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 5815: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. YATRON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 5846: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 5927: Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 5936: Mr. BARNARD.

H.R. 5973: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 6003: Mr. RITTER and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 6051: Mr. BORSKI.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.J. Res. 106: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.J. Res. 357: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.J. Res. 380: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GALLO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SYNAR, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.J. Res. 458: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WYLIE.

H.J. Res. 463: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LEACH, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. SWIFT.

H.J. Res. 479: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. CARR, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.J. Res. 495: Mr. PARKER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. REED.

H.J. Res. 538: Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EARLY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. RUSSO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. ORTON, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. TORRES, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SHARP, Mr. REED, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. PARKER, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WISE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. EWING, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PORTER, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MINETA, Mr. DREIER of

California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. EVANS.

H.J. Res. 540: Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. HEFNER.

H.J. Res. 547: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. FIELDS, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.J. Res. 550: Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SABO, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Ms. NORTON.

H.J. Res. 551: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CARR, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCEWEN, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RITTER, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTIN, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. COLORADO, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WELDON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. ROSE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. EARLY, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Ms. WATERS.

H.J. Res. 552: Mr. ROE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. OWENS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. ROGERS and Mr. SABO.

H. Con. Res. 337: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Con. Res. 362: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. RITTER, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 538: Mr. JONTZ and Mr. PAXON.

H. Res. 565: Mr. RHODES.

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. 5820: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.