

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, February 25, 1992

The House met at 12 noon.

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

Gracious God, give us the gift of hope for the opportunities for today and a faith for the concerns of tomorrow. May Your good grace, that is new every morning, be with each person as they face the decisions that affect their lives and the lives of those they love. We are grateful that we are surrounded by those who support us and give us strength, whose love and affection fills the heart with joy, but above all, we give You thanks for Your peace and hope that passes all human understanding. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER] to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BALLENGER 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.

PRESIDENT DECIDES TO EMULATE POLICIES OF PATRICK BUCHANAN

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

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to address the House as we start what I think will be a momentous week. It is clear that this is a week in which we are going to attempt to debate the economic future of this country as we consider the President's proposals for economic revitalization.

However, we should also do it with an eye toward reality. This is not really that debate. It is a political debate, generated by the President's own problems within his own party.

The reality is that we are not really here to discuss in a bipartisan manner the direction this country should take to regenerate itself. Rather, we are

here to serve as a whipping boy for the failure of the administration's policies over the last 3 years.

The President, when he lost that primary in New Hampshire, had two choices: He could reach to our side of the aisle for cooperation and conciliation, or he could attempt to become what his opponent is. He has chosen that, and as long as Pat Buchanan is in the primary process, Pat Buchanan's policies, unfortunately, will unfortunately govern this Nation, and this Nation will suffer as a consequence.

FINALLY LIBERALS ASK FOR TAX CUTS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, it would now appear that many Members across the aisle finally realize that tax cuts are a necessary function of our national economic recovery. It is generally agreed that tax cuts are indeed essential to promote economic growth and provide much needed tax relief for working families. Without a tax cut for the working families of this country, the economy is surely due to fall into an even more severe tailspin.

Any Member who wishes to hold fast to the 1990 budget summit agreement and to the flawed economic models put out by the democratically controlled Congress is only promoting future economic disaster. As was predicted by some of us, the tax increases had a damaging impact on economic growth. Estimated tax revenues have indeed proven to be lower, not higher, by up to \$130 billion over the next 5 years. Budget deficits have become bigger—not smaller—doubling from an estimated 5-year cumulative deficit of about \$527 billion to more than \$1 trillion.

The United States must abandon the 1990 budget deal; it's a bad idea, with little to offer in terms of economic recovery. Additionally, today is the 24th day until the March 20 Presidential deadline for enacting his budget proposal.

Yes, it is true that budget deficits are bad, but plummeting economic growth and family income along with increased unemployment are surely worse.

TRUTH IS STRANGER THAN FICTION

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, when I was sitting here in the House Chamber several weeks ago, listening to President Bush deliver his State of the Union Message, I looked up at the rostrum and a funny thing happened. I didn't see George Bush. All I could see was Dana Carvey, the fellow who portrays him on Saturday Night Live.

What we had standing here before us was a caricature of the President. Sure enough, President Bush said he supported a middle-class tax cut but the caricature was saying, "Don't believe me."

And you know what? I didn't believe him. And lo and behold, less than 2 weeks later, President Bush walked away from the middle-class tax cut that he advocated during the State of the Union.

This week we have a clear choice. We can vote for the middle-class tax cut, which is in the Democratic version of the tax bill, or we can vote against the middle class and with the President of the United States. It is that simple.

Once again, truth is stranger than fiction.

A \$93 BILLION TAX INCREASE

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, later this week, we will vote on different versions of economic growth packages.

Despite all the similarities in the initiatives, don't be misled. The Democrat alternative proposes \$93 billion in permanent tax increases over the next 6 years. In contrast, the President's plan does not raise taxes by \$1.

Furthermore, the President has already warned the Democrat leadership that he will veto their \$93 billion tax increase alternative if it reaches his desk. Why anyone in this Chamber would want to be on record as having supported a \$93 billion tax increase bill, only to have it fall down the road, is a mystery to me.

Perhaps the proponents of the Democrat alternative have lost sight of the goal. Or perhaps they are nearsighted with vision which only reaches to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

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

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

ACTION MUST BE STARTED ON A TAX FAIRNESS, ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PROGRAM

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the General Motors announcement of yesterday demonstrates very clearly that economic ills stalk this land. General Motors lost \$4.5 billion in 1991, will have to close 21 manufacturing facilities by the mid-1990's to hope to regain profitability, and will have halved by 1995 its salaried and hourly work force.

Just over the weekend back home the Courier Journal ran a poll which suggested that 81 percent of Kentuckians felt that the national economy was unhealthy, and that they would have a worse personal financial condition 1 year from today than they have today.

Mr. Speaker, people are demanding action. This week the House should pass the Democratic version of the tax plan, even though imperfect, to get the ball rolling so that we can go to conference with the other body and produce an even more effective tax fairness and economic growth package that will in fact put people back to work again.

The people will have very little patience with either the President of the United States or with the Congress unless we take action starting this week.

MOVING EXPENSE DEDUCTION

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat's tax bill has precious little in the way of job creation proposals, in fact it even has a proposal to increase taxes on a big group of people taking new jobs.

Right now if you move to begin work at a new place and the move satisfies a 35-mile test, the moving expenses are deductible. Ways and Means Committee Democrats offset tax breaks for narrow constituencies by voting several times to increase the mileage test. By the time they finished, the test had gone to 75 miles. The Democrats will be taking \$500 million from people finding new employment. I guess that is the Democrats' idea of a jobs bill.

□ 1210

THE RESULTS OF REPUBLICAN POLICIES

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me read to you from the Philadelphia Inquirer back in October 1991 in an article they did.

Caught between the lawmakers in Washington and the dealmakers on Wall Street have been millions of American workers forced to move from jobs that once paid \$15 an hour into jobs that now paid \$7 or less. If, that is, they aren't already the victims of mass layoffs, production halts, shuttered factories and owners who enrich themselves by doing that damage and then walking away.

As a result, the already rich are richer than ever; there has been an explosion in overnight new rich; life for the working class is deteriorating, and those at the bottom are trapped.

And for the first time in this century, members of a generation entering adulthood will find it impossible to achieve a better life style than their parents.

This happened in the 1980's. This happened because of the Republican policies and some of the failures of this body.

We have a chance in the next few days to reverse that, to forget about all the economists, to forget about all of the people that have given us advice and do what we know is right.

As Democrats, we know it and we hope the Republicans will join us. Give back this country to the middle class. Promote job growth. Promote a fairer Tax Code. Promote the things that made this economy great.

That is what is in this tax bill that the Democrats are promoting, and that is what will benefit the country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for doing what is right, what we think is right for a change.

DEMOCRAT ALTERNATIVES TRANSLATE INTO HIGHER TAXES

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. A vote for the Democrat alternative is an open invitation to higher tax rates in the near future.

The Democrat alternative provides a temporary, 2-year tax credit for many workers. But what happens after those 2 years. Will Congress let individual tax relief expire? Unlikely, most would say.

If the tax credits are made permanent, then additional tax increases will be needed. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that if the break points on the 35-percent bracket are adjusted to make the tax credits permanent, the new tax thresholds would begin at \$64,000 of taxable income for couples, and \$38,400 of taxable income for singles. Those thresholds for the 35-percent tax rate are below the break points for the current law 31-percent rate.

The Democrats' temporary feel-good plan only promises that tax increases on larger and larger portions of the middle class are just around the corner.

A CALL FOR SUPPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC SUBSTITUTE

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, we have stood here and promised working, middle-class Americans some relief from taxes—relief from the treatment they received during the 1980's and relief from the pain of a recession now in its second year.

Now is the time to make good on our pledge. If we don't pass a bill this week, it won't get done. The people I talk to in shopping malls, in grocery stores, and on the streets in my district want Congress to act now, but they don't believe we will. They are used to the rhetoric, and they expect inaction.

There is so much to be gained by passing this bill. It will provide real tax relief and incentives for economic growth. But more than that, it will restore the faith of the middle class in our ability to understand their concerns and respond to their problems. It will keep our promise to restore equity to the tax system; and it will show that our concern is deep enough that we can set politics aside.

Discussion and debate are important, but they only carry us so far. The measure of our success lies in the action we take to relieve the suffering of those who look to us for help. Now, more than ever, the sources of their support are limited. The middle class will surely get no relief from the White House. The President has turned his back on them. They can only look to Congress.

The country is waiting. We have everything to gain by passing this bill, and the trust of the American people to lose if we do not. Support the Democratic substitute.

THE 97-PERCENT BUDGET SEQUESTER

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

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, a vote for the Democratic leadership tax bill is also a vote to cut Medicare and effectively eliminate the programs held hostage in the paygo sequester system.

How? Because the fiscal 1992-93 revenue loss in the Democratic plan is so large it requires a 97-percent across-the-board cut for the Commodity Credit Corporation, AFDC work programs, veterans education benefits, the social services block grant, and others.

While the tax bill purportedly delivers fairness to the disadvantaged with one hand, it takes away low- and middle-income benefits with the other machete swinging fist. Medicare and stu-

dent loans have limited protection, but provider payments will be cut by \$3.8 billion and student loan interest rates increased.

You will not see this fairness issue on any charts from the other side.

We know the bill has a provision to nullify the budget agreement. If the financial markets thought Congress was abandoning all budget discipline, the increase in interest rates alone would choke any economic recovery. The budget waiver alone means the bill will be vetoed.

So, the Democratic leadership should face up to the truth—their bill can either be unfair or unfinanced.

ISRAELI LOAN GUARANTEES

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Secretary of State finally dropped the other shoe and announced that the administration would establish a direct linkage between the provision of loan guarantees for Israel and cessation of settlement activities on the West Bank and in Gaza.

This is a total reversal of the policy that the President himself enunciated last summer, when, asked whether the loan guarantees should be linked to settlement activity, he said, "I don't think it ought to be a quid pro quo."

It is pathetic how quickly this administration forgets the recent past.

One year ago, the Israelis were absorbing Scud missile attacks, sitting on their hands at the urging of the American Government, to preserve the allied coalition versus Saddam Hussein.

At the same time, the Jordanians had leaped into Saddam Hussein's arms, were breaking the U.N. embargo and supplying his country with desperately needed materials, and cheering his Scud attacks on Israeli civilians and American servicemen in Saudi Arabia.

How can we forget that?

But now, the Secretary of State says Israel won't get the full loan guarantees—which are vital to the absorption of Soviet Jewish refugees and which will cost us nothing—if she doesn't totally freeze settlement activity. And yet, he makes a "plea for Jordan assistance"—real taxpayer dollars in aid for Jordan.

Where are the conditions linking such aid to Jordan's ending the Arab boycott, its state of war with Israel, and its flouting of the U.N. trade sanctions on Iraq?

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired of our administration turning a blind eye to these obstacles to peace on the Arab side while obsessing on Israeli settlement activity.

Such an unfair, tilted policy promises to cripple the peace process. It is

sending a perfectly clear message to the Arab parties—that we're keeping two sets of books and they don't have to negotiate, compromise, or make any concessions to Israel, because America will deliver Israel hogtied and powerless to them.

SUPPORT THE REPUBLICAN PLAN, H.R. 4200

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the single most important task before this Congress is to get the economy moving. To that end, tomorrow we will be considering on the House floor two competing plans. The Republican plan, H.R. 4200, is a lean, mean 95-page jobs bill. It provides targeted incentives: targeted to encourage investment in machinery and equipment now so we will be a stronger, more competitive Nation in the future; targeted to encourage people to invest in housing now so we will build stronger communities for the future. These are the kind of targeted incentives that can get the economy moving because they incentivize the right kind of buying with ripple effects. Furthermore they are the two most important proposals that our hearings in December before the Committee on Ways and Means said could turn the economy around.

In contrast, the Democrats bill is 629 pages, a grandiose proposal that increases the deficit by many billions of dollars. It is exactly the kind of bill that we were warned over and over again in our December hearings would slow the economy and cost jobs. People in Connecticut are desperate. They cannot stand a slowing of the economy and losing yet more jobs.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LEHMAN

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

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the country-western star Kenny Rogers has a song about a poker player that says:

You have to know when to hold them; you have to know when to fold them; you have to know when to walk away and know when to run.

Mr. Speaker, one also has to know when not to run.

As Calvin Coolidge said in the 1920's when urged to run for another term, he simply said, "I do not choose to run."

Mr. Speaker, I do not choose to run in 1992 for reelection. I do this with my own free will and without pressure, without concern about reapportion-

ments, without concern about opposition.

Up to this very moment, I had not made up my mind on this matter. In fact, I was determined to run for reelection. But there comes a kind of a revelation, a self-realization that I cannot meet the standards that I set for myself in how I wanted to perform in this body. I am no longer sufficiently capable. I no longer have the aggressiveness and physical ability to do the job, to meet my own standards.

And that is why I decided not to seek reelection.

□ 1220

This is a very physical job to operate in this body. I do not have the physical capacity that I used to have.

I want to ask forgiveness of my family, my staff, and my supporters, because I have not told anyone about this decision until this very moment. I really feel badly about the way I am doing this, but it is the only way I could do it. This is a hard decision. It is the only one I can make at this time.

I guess one way to look at it is for 10 years in this body, as I managed the appropriations bills for the Department of Transportation and related agencies, I have heard in the committee and in the subcommittees and on the House floor "Good job, Mr. Chairman; good job, Mr. Chairman." I love that statement better than anything in the world, but 2 years from now I do not want that same statement made, not out of sincerity but out of sympathy. I could not handle that. That is why I am making this decision at this moment.

It has been a wonderful experience. I have the choice to run or not to run. Either way it was a bad decision, so I am trying to settle for the best I can.

I want to thank everyone here, the staffs and all the Members, especially members on the subcommittee, for all they have done for me during all these years. My own staff and the staff on the subcommittee and throughout this body have been wonderful.

I feel bad about my supporters in Florida and elsewhere, because I have not intentionally misled them. I truly was running flat-out for reelection.

I make this speech with reluctance and a great deal of sadness. I hope I find some peace and tranquility after the rest of this year. I am going to be here for awhile yet, and I will do the best I can. I'm sure that will be good enough for the rest of this year. Thank you very much.

A SOUND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY NEEDED FOR OUR OCEANS

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

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 2152, a bill

aimed at ending driftnet fishing in international waters.

The needless carnage inflicted by a 30-mile long drift net is an unnerving sight. Alongside thousands of food fish, there hang the ensnared, drowned bodies of air-breathing animals: sea birds, rare sea turtles, and dolphins.

These animals have no commercial value. Their slaughter is a cruel waste, and an abuse of the ocean, which belongs to everyone.

Driftnet fishing represents the indiscriminate and uncontrolled misuse of a commercial natural resource. Fish are an important food source, but they should not be harvested without regard for the survival of the rest of the creatures in the ocean.

The ocean and the animals in it belong to all of us, and we all have a responsibility to protect those resources while using them. All nations should do this. But they do not.

So we must take the lead, and bring sound environmental policy to our oceans, while penalizing countries foolish enough to ignore this critical need.

CONGRESS DEBATES AID FOR THE MIDDLE EAST WHILE AMERICA'S MIDWEST SUFFERS

(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, once again while Congress debates more money for the Middle East, the Midwest keeps getting kicked right in the teeth. General Motors announced they will lay off 15,000 American workers. Who is kidding who around here? It is not the quality of the cars, it is not the work ethics, the bottom line is the Constitution says Congress shall regulate commerce with foreign nations. The truth is that does not happen. Congress regulates American business but allows low wage unregulated foreign nations, even Communist nations, to have an advantage, taking our jobs and our dollars.

Wake up, before it hits everybody. It is evident the leading growth industry in America is narcotics. I plan to challenge constitutionally America's trade and tax policies because I firmly believe after seven years this body and the White House will do nothing about American jobs and American competitiveness. This is nothing more than a charade on the American people.

HOME BUYERS TAX CREDITS

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

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, well, it seems as though the Democrat leadership is catching on. After one committee caucus and two trips back to the

drawing board, the Democrat alternative is looking more like what the President proposed nearly a month ago. Simply put, the Democrat alternative contains six of the seven economic growth proposals contained in the President's plan.

Regretfully, however, the Democrat alternative drops one of the most popular features of the President's bill—the provision which would give first-time home buyers at \$5,000 tax credit. It's surprising that the Democrat leadership does not want to help individuals and couples realize their dreams of home ownership. But then again, had the Democrat alternative adopted the President's homebuyer's credit, their economic plan would look just like the President's.

Let us see if the proponents of the Democrat plan can explain to their constituents that it was a matter of pride, or better yet, is it not time that we all stopped playing games and started working together to put Americans back to work?

RECOGNITION OF THE EFFORTS OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS IN PENSACOLA, FL

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

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the American Red Cross at Pensacola Naval Air Station in my district in northwest Florida, the chapter in the city of Pensacola.

From 1917 to today, from World War I to Operation Desert Storm, Red Cross professionals and local volunteers have provided comfort and assistance in time of natural and personal disaster and a helping hand and heart during times of national need.

Pensacola NAS is also home to the second oldest organized Red Cross volunteer group in America. In the early 1930's, women of northwest Florida lent their time to the Pensacola Naval Hospital. And today men and women in the Red Cross volunteer program augment hospital staff in any way that is needed.

President Bush has said that "from now on in America, any definition of a successful life must include serving others."

Mr. Speaker, the tireless volunteers of the American Red Cross in Pensacola, FL have known that credo for three generations. The men and women, volunteers and staff have been illuminating points of light for 75 years. My congratulations to all of them.

WHAT IS BAD FOR U.S. AUTOMOBILE COMPANIES IS ALSO BAD FOR THE U.S.A.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General Motors announced record losses. In that respect it joined Chrysler and Ford. In this case what is bad for General Motors and Chrysler and Ford is indeed bad for the USA.

The Members will recall that some years ago when we strongly encouraged, to use the term loosely, Japan to impose various restraints on the export of their automobiles to the United States, the first response of the American auto industry was to raise prices.

□ 1230

Instead of using that opportunity to capture market, they raised prices, and they failed to respond adequately to what much of the American public wanted in a quality, fuel-efficient automobile.

Several Japanese automobile companies have announced their intention to raise their auto prices so as to preserve their profit margins. And what was the response of at least two of the Big Three in the American automobile industry? No, it wasn't to hold their prices steady and recapture a larger share of the American market; it was to likewise raise prices and miss another opportunity. This Member implores the Big Three to rethink this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the American auto industry is too important to this Nation to ignore despite the fact that they may be inviting that kind of treatment. Therefore, this Member is willing to set aside his antiprotectionist sentiments and give some protection to the American auto industry to help them to recover their profitability and strength if they meet certain conditions: First, executives making over \$½ million a year in salary and benefits must cut them by at least one-half; second, labor must agree to freeze their wages and benefits; third, management and labor must work cooperatively in the auto industry; fourth, the Big Three must not raise their unit prices, but instead understand that this is the time to hold their prices to increase their market share and overall profitability. In short, they must take advantage of this opportunity to sell more cars.

With agreement to those kinds of conditions, yes, we ought to help the American auto industry in its hour of need and preserve a crucial foundation sector in the American manufacturing industry.

ENACT FREEDOM OF CHOICE BILL

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, for anyone who wonders what America is going to be like when Roe versus Wade is rolled back by the Supreme Court, I ask them to look across the North Atlantic and look at Ireland. What a tragedy we see there when a very young girl has been impregnated by the father of one of her friends and yet the Government has ordered her to have the baby.

The Government gets its choice. The parents do not get their choice. The young girl does not get her choice. The Government wins. The Government says, "We control your life."

If that is what you like, that is where we are headed. I certainly hope this body does everything it can to enact the freedom of choice bill in the United States so we keep Roe versus Wade the law of the land rather than revert to the chaos we now see in Ireland where the Government steps into family homes and makes those decisions for individuals.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Before the gentleman proceeds, the Chair would advise our guests, who we are happy to have with us, that they are to refrain from taking part in any of the actions on the floor of the House, showing their approval or disapproval thereof.

CAMPUS SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS' BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

(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, last May I introduced H.R. 2363, the Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights Act. As of today, this measure has received the strong bipartisan support of 176 cosponsors.

This legislation is of vital importance to the thousands of women who are raped on our college and university campuses each year. Mr. Speaker, campus rape victims deserve to be informed of their legal rights. And whether the rape victim chooses to pursue the matter through campus proceedings or the court system, campus officials should provide them reasonable assistance in exercising their rights.

Mr. Speaker, knowing that one in four college women will be the victim of rape or attempted rape during her college career, Congress must take strong action to ensure victims their rights.

Last week, the Senate—without opposition—passed an amendment to the Higher Education Reauthorization Act

which is based on the Campus Sexual Assault Victims' Bill of Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, let us bring the higher education reauthorization bill to the floor as soon as possible so that we can join the Senate in taking this much needed action to protect campus sexual assault victims.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING VETERANS OF THE PACIFIC WAR FROM THE PHILIPPINES

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, last night a very good TV program dealt with Yorktown. I do not know how many people have thought about it, but more French soldiers died at Yorktown than American soldiers.

Yesterday I introduced a resolution to commemorate the veterans of the Pacific war from the Philippines who were on our side in that activity. I hope Members of Congress will join with me in commemorating the fine deeds of the Filipinos in helping us to bring about peace in the world at that time.

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why I am on the floor today.

TRIBUTE TO HONORABLE WILLIAM LEHMAN

We have just heard from the lips of a very fine American statesman the fact that he is not going to run next time because of his health.

BILL LEHMAN is one of the most outstanding Members of Congress. He has made a great record, and we are all very deeply obligated, the whole country is deeply obligated, to him for the things he made possible for our country. It is with great regret that I see him retiring.

He certainly has earned the accolades of all Americans.

THE DEMOCRATS' TAX BILL AND THE CREDIT MARKETS

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

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to consider tax proposals to stimulate the economy. It would be regrettable indeed if the Democrats' bill, H.R. 4287, were to pass. While the focus will be on the tax aspects of this bill, it is essential that we not overlook its fiscal impact, specifically the damage it could do to our struggling economy.

Section 2 of the Democrats' bill would blow up the Budget Enforcement Act by directing OMB to ignore any change in budget authority, outlays, or receipts resulting from this piece of legislation. By even considering H.R.

4287, we are sending precisely the wrong signal to the credit markets. The Democrats' bill will increase Federal borrowing by \$30 billion over the next 2 years. No wonder we have already seen in recent days a disconcerting rise in long- and short-term interest rates, which is just what we do not need for the recovery. I appeal to my colleagues not to lose sight of the objective which is to strengthen, not weaken, the economy. The only sound answer is a no vote on the Democrats' plan.

PROVIDE A REAL TAX BREAK FOR MIDDLE-INCOME AND WORKING PEOPLE

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the working people of America are crying out for tax justice, but their pleas, unfortunately, appear to be falling upon the deaf ears of the Democratic and Republican leadership.

Study after study has shown that during the last decade the rich have become much richer, while middle-income and working people have seen a decline in their standard of living. And yet, the tax policies of the last 15 years have given huge tax breaks to the rich, while working people and the middle class are now paying significantly more in Federal, State, and local taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the tax proposals being offered by both the Democratic and Republican leadership are grossly inadequate. It is beyond comprehension that both parties, the Republicans more than the Democrats, but both parties nonetheless, still continue to provide more and more tax breaks for the rich—including significant reductions in the capital gains tax—70 percent of whose benefits would go to the wealthiest 4 percent of our population, those who earn a \$100,000 a year or more.

Mr. Speaker, let us have the courage to take on the big money interests and finally ask those people to start paying their fair share of taxes—and with those proceeds, in a deficit-neutral manner, let us provide a real tax break for middle-income and working people—far more than is currently on the table.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVE

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Technology Assessment today released a report stating that the United States will likely lose as many as 2.5 million defense-related jobs over the

next 10 years. Assuming the large cuts now planned for defense spending, OTA estimates that defense employment will decline by about 250,000 jobs per year.

As the OTA report notes, it is difficult to replace the well-paid jobs that defense manufacturing provides or to replace the military as the Nation's premier equal opportunity employer in any case, but this challenge could be even more difficult in a recession.

The workers who support our defense are some of the most talented individuals in this Nation. Our challenge is to create new job opportunities for all Americans—and to ensure that the talents of these professionals do not go to waste.

The administration has requested an unprecedented \$3.7 billion for DOD environmental cleanup. Yet, studies show that there are not enough qualified people to do cleanup. I will soon be introducing a bill to make scholarships and loans available to train workers for DOD environmental cleanup, and am working on a more comprehensive effort to direct defense workers into this growing field. I look forward to the support of the House on this defense initiative with such great promise for the civilian and military world.

DEMOCRATS FIDDLE WHILE COUNTRY BURNS

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, Nero fiddled while Rome burned.

I might say that the leadership in this House on the Democrat side is continuing to fiddle while we do not solve the problems of unemployment in this country. We saw massive layoffs in the news today with General Motors closing down many of its plants. I see the gentleman from Michigan who is probably going to address this issue after I finish. Yet we have a Ways and Means Committee which met only 3 hours to consider a growth plan and the growth plan is coming back now in all kinds of bits and pieces.

We have a Democrat plan which is going to be offered supposedly tomorrow if they can pull it together with enough votes in order to try to advance it on the Democrat side that is claimed to be an economic growth package, but does nothing to stimulate the economy of this country.

It is time that we stopped talking about raising taxes during a recession and talk about creating jobs, talk about capital development, the things that create jobs in this country, and it is time that the Democrats and the Republicans work together in getting a package that will pass. There are good items in both packages that should come out in a unified package, and this

House and this Congress should speak with one voice with the President and say that we are for the creation of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, let us get to work.

THE FIASCO OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S ECONOMIC ISSUES

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days we have seen another fiasco with the administration of economic issues. The U.S. Attorney General announces his intention to use U.S. antitrust laws to fight cartel practices of foreign companies that exclude or limit sales of U.S. goods overseas or here in the United States, and immediately word comes that other forces within the administration, led by the Vice President, will fight such use of antitrust laws.

This disarray is symptomatic. Who is in charge, in the administration, of economic issues one asks? The answer is no one.

There is no single cause for the crisis in the U.S. auto industry, for GM's shattering announcement of plant closings yesterday, but one thing is clear. As the U.S. auto industry has worked to improve its product, the Reagan and Bush administrations have failed to improve their performance to help American companies have a fighting chance to survive and thrive.

There is no coherent American economic or trade policy and other countries have filled the vacuum with carefully designed policies and practices of their own.

When one hand in the U.S. Government does not know what the other is doing, American businesses are forced to function with one hand tied behind their backs and the innocent suffer, as was true yesterday for thousands and thousands of GM workers.

REPUTATION OF CONGRESS AT ALL-TIME LOW

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the reputation of the Congress is at an all-time low in the eyes of American people. I suspect after this week that reputation is going to be even lower, and frankly, it should be, because the President asked the Congress to work with him in a bipartisan manner to achieve an economic recovery program by March 20. This Congress began those hearings last December and ought to have no problem meeting that deadline in a bipartisan fashion.

Unfortunately, we are not only failing to work together in a bipartisan mode, but we also have made the deci-

sion that once again we are going to repeat the mistake of the budget summit agreement of 1990 which created most of the problems economically that we face today.

People should recall that we raised, going into the recession under that budget agreement, \$144 billion in new taxes over 5 years. Unfortunately, because we raised taxes in a recession, in fiscal year 1992 alone the projected deficit is now going to be \$130 billion higher than that agreement of only 14 months ago.

When, Mr. Speaker, will we learn?

THE PRESIDENT'S ATTACK ON CONGRESS

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States spoke to a group of business people, and I guess to no one's great surprise, attacked the Congress. This is no surprise to anyone I am sure in an election year while the President is under attack from within his own party, that he would turn against the Democrats in Congress.

It is unfortunate that this climate is in place as we begin the debate on the economic recovery plan for this Nation.

I sense in the district that I represent that no one is out there cheering for the Democrats to win or cheering for the Republicans to win. They are cheering for the American workers, the American families to win in this debate. They could not give two darns as to whether anyone is going to capitalize on this politically.

The plan that the Democrats will offer tomorrow is an attempt to make some concessions to the President's point of view. The President wanted to repeal the luxury taxes on certain items. We agreed to that repeal. The President wanted capital gains benefits. We agreed to it, at least partially, to help families, farmers, and small businesses.

The things that we insist on as Democrats, though, as part of this plan are to have the wealthiest people in this country pay their fair share. Why is it so repugnant to this administration to have millionaires pay a little extra in taxes so that working families could help to pay their own bills?

I hope we can come together now in a bipartisan fashion. This Democratic alternative is an effort to do just that.

THE QUADRENNIAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY ACT OF MADNESS

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this week we will witness the quadrennial Democratic Party act of madness. For 20 years every Presidential year the Democrats have moved to the left: George McGovern, Jimmy Carter; by 1980, Walter Mondale who promised to raise taxes and promptly crashed, losing all but one State, his own; and Michael Dukakis, who admitted by October that he really was a liberal.

Now what do we see? It is a Presidential year. The House Democrats are going to bring in a massive tax increase bill, a bill that has such a big tax increase that their front runner, Paul Tsongas, would veto it, and yet somehow they are going to muscle enough votes to pass a bill which will be a tax increase, which will cut Medicare and cut other entitlements, which will force a sequester.

And I said, every 4 years they seem to do it to themselves again. Once again the Party of the left is engaged in its quadrennial dance of self-destruction, but it is bad for America. The President asked for a tax cut. We ought to pass tax cuts.

The President asked for a bill that creates jobs. We ought to pass a bill that he can sign that would create jobs.

It hurts unemployed Americans to play the kind of partisan games the Democrats will be playing this week.

I think it is very unfortunate for America, and the American people, and I frankly would rather have a Democratic Party that was more rational about economics and willing to work on a bipartisan basis on a tax cut instead of a partisan tax increase bill.

CAN WE TRUST CHINA?

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

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, President Bush is going to accept China's word that they will not send any more missiles to the Middle East. Now, this is the same Communist country that kills their own people for doing what Americans do every day, and that is to go out and speak freely as I am doing now and to assemble freely without fear from soldiers.

I ask you, can you trust a country like that? With friends like that, you do not need enemies.

But what does China get for all this? Well, George Bush is going to send them American high technology. That is right, folks. There go more American jobs.

I hope he does not get any more agreements going for him, particularly with our enemies, because we cannot afford any more of his benevolence.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S GROWTH PACKAGE

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking Republican on the Rules Committee. We have been for the last 2 hours marking up the so-called Economic Growth Package up in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, I have become so disillusioned because I hear so much talk about whose side are we on. It is just too bad that we cannot be on everybody's side, be on America's side, because that is really what we need today.

In other words, America's side is everybody's jobs, not just somebody's jobs. So why do we have to be on somebody's side?

Right now the President has asked us for an economic growth package that would stimulate the economy.

□ 1250

And that is what we ought to be doing. Instead of that, we are going back to the Rules Committee in a couple of hours and finish up marking up this rule in committee. We will bring a bill on the floor that the President is guaranteed he will veto, and even a front-running Presidential Democrat nominee has said he would veto if he were the President. What kind of credibility could that bill have? Yet the American people are out there waiting for this Congress to act to do something. I think it is wrong. When are we going to get together to do what is right? It is no wonder the people want term limitation for Members of Congress—and so do I.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BOB MICHEL, REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB MICHEL, Republican leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 26, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 141(a)(C) of Public Law 101-649, I hereby appoint the following two individuals from private life to serve as members of the Commission on Legal Immigration Reform:

Mr. Harold W. Ezell, 5000 Birch Street, Suite 4800, Newport Beach, California 92660.

Mr. Robert Charles Hill, 14507 Briarwood Terrace, Rockville, Maryland 20853.

Sincerely,

BOB MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I,

the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

TELEPHONE DISCLOSURE AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3490) to protect the public interest and the future development of interstate pay-per-call technology by providing for the regulation and oversight of the applications and growth of the pay-per-call industry, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3490

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, FINDINGS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act".

(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The use of pay-per-call services, most commonly through the use of 900 numbers, has grown exponentially in the past few years. This payment mechanism is convenient to consumers, cost-effective to vendors, and profitable to communications common carriers.

(2) The interstate nature of the pay-per-call industry means that its activities are beyond the reach of individual States and therefore requires Federal regulatory treatment to protect the public interest.

(3) The lack of nationally uniform regulatory guidelines has led to confusion for consumers, industry, and regulatory agencies as to the rights of callers and the oversight responsibilities of regulatory authorities, and has allowed some pay-per-call businesses to engage in practices which abuse the rights of callers.

(4) Because the consumer most often incurs a financial obligation as soon as a pay-per-call transaction is initiated, the accuracy and descriptiveness of vendor advertisements become crucial in avoiding consumer abuse. The obligation for accuracy should include price-per-call and duration-of-call information, odds disclosure for lotteries, games, and sweepstakes, and obligations for obtaining parental consent from callers under 18.

(5) The continued growth of the legitimate pay-per-call industry is dependent upon consumer confidence that unfair and deceptive behavior will be effectively curtailed and that consumers will have adequate rights of redress.

(6) Vendors of telephone-billed goods and services must also feel confident in their rights and obligations for resolving billing disputes if they are to use this new marketplace for the sale of products of more than nominal value.

(7) Many applications employing audiotext technology such as lotteries, games, and sweepstakes, sometimes erroneously have informed consumers that they must utilize audiotext services to claim or win a prize, or have not adequately informed consumers of

the right to participate in the same applications through other forms of entry.

(8) Some interstate audiotext services have offered programs aimed at children, inducing them to call such services without their parents' permission.

(9) Consequently, Congress should enact legislation that will offer consumers and vendors necessary protections and help facilitate the growth of a robust and competitive pay-per-call marketplace.

**TITLE I—AUDIOTEXT INDUSTRY
OBLIGATIONS AND CONSUMER RIGHTS
SEC. 101. AMENDMENT TO COMMUNICATIONS
ACT OF 1934.**

Title II of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

“SEC. 228. REGULATION OF AUDIOTEXT SERVICES.

“(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section—

“(1) to put into effect a system of national regulation and review that will oversee the audiotext business;

“(2) to give the Commission authority to prescribe regulations and enforcement procedures and conduct oversight to afford reasonable protection to consumers and to assure that violations of this Act do not occur.

“(b) AUTHORITY FOR REGULATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall, within 270 days after the date of enactment of this section, complete a rulemaking proceeding to establish a system for oversight and regulation of audiotext services in order to provide for the protection of consumers and providers in accordance with this Act and other applicable Federal statutes and regulations. The Commission's final rules shall—

“(A) include measures that provide a consumer of audiotext services with adequate and clear descriptions of the rights of the caller;

“(B) define the obligations of common carriers with respect to the provision of the audiotext services;

“(C) include requirements on such carriers to protect against abusive practices by providers of audiotext services;

“(D) prohibit customers from being disconnected from local exchange services for refusal to pay for audiotext services; and

“(E) identify procedures by which common carriers and providers of audiotext services may take affirmative steps to protect against nonpayment of legitimate charges.

“(2) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR PROVIDERS OF AUDIOTEXT SERVICES.—The regulations required by paragraph (1) shall prohibit any common carrier from offering audiotext services of any provider of such services who fails—

“(A) to include in each audiotext message an introductory disclosure message that (i) describes the service being provided, (ii) specifies clearly and at a reasonably understandable volume the total cost or the cost per minute and any other fees for that service, and for any other audiotext service to which the caller may be transferred, (iii) informs the caller of the option to hang up at the end of the introductory message without incurring any charge, and (iv) informs the caller that parental consent is required for calls made by children;

“(B) to disable any bypass mechanism which allows frequent callers to avoid listening to the disclosure message described in subparagraph (A) after the institution of any price increase and for a period of time sufficient to give such frequent callers adequate and sufficient notice of the price change;

“(C) to stop the assessment of time-based charges immediately upon disconnection by the caller;

“(D) to include an appropriate and clear signal, at intervals determined by the Commission, where technically feasible, during live interactive group programs, to alert callers to the passage of time, and explain this signal in the disclosure required by subparagraph (A) for such programs, except that the requirements of this subparagraph do not apply to programs for which the caller is required to preregister or presubscribe; and

“(E) to comply with such additional standards as the Commission may prescribe to prevent abusive practices.

“(3) COMMON CARRIER OBLIGATIONS.—The regulations required by paragraph (1) shall require that any common carriers offering audiotext services shall—

“(A) require, pursuant to contract or tariff, that a provider of audiotext services comply with the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (2), and terminate, in accordance with procedures specified in such regulations, the offering of an audiotext service of a provider if such service is not provided in compliance with such regulations;

“(B) ensure that a caller is not billed—

“(i) with respect to audiotext services provided in violation of the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (2); or

“(ii) under such other circumstances as the Commission determines necessary in order to protect callers from abusive practices;

“(C) establish a local or a toll-free telephone number to answer questions and provide information on callers' rights and obligations with regard to their use of audiotext services and to provide to callers the name and mailing address of any provider of audiotext services offered by the common carrier;

“(D) within 60 days after the issuance of final regulations pursuant to paragraph (1), provide, either directly or through contract with any local exchange carrier that provides billing or collection services to the common carrier, to all of such common carrier's telephone subscribers, to all new subscribers, and to all subscribers requesting service at a new location, a disclosure statement that—

“(i) sets forth in clear, standard English, or other languages as specified by regulation, all rights and obligations held by the subscriber and the carrier with respect to the use and payment for audiotext services;

“(ii) describes any nonpayment option prescribed by the Commission under subparagraph (B) and the applicable blocking option; and

“(iii) provides an explanation of live interactive programming;

“(E) ensures that charges for audiotext services are stated separately on the bill from the sections relating to local and long distance telephone charges and that such statement includes the toll-free telephone number specified in subparagraph (C);

“(F) notify in writing the State regulatory commission of any State within which the carrier intends to offer audiotext services of such intention, which notification shall include a description of the service to be provided to telephone users within that State as well as a list of the carrier's policies and procedures;

“(G) subsequently make available to the State regulatory commission, upon request, a list of audiotext telephone numbers accessible by callers within that State through such carrier, which list shall include the name, business address, and business telephone number of the audiotext provider; and

“(H) obtain from any provider of audiotext services that solicits charitable contributions proof of the tax exempt status of any person or organization for which contributions are solicited.

“(4) BLOCKING REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations required by paragraph (1) shall require that any local exchange carrier carrying audiotext services shall offer callers the option of blocking access to all audiotext services from their telephone, whenever technologically feasible. Such regulation may permit the costs of such blocking to be recovered by contract or tariff, but such costs may not be recovered from local or long distance ratepayers. Such option shall be offered at no charge to the caller for a reasonable and appropriate period (established by the Commission in such regulations) after (A) the effective date of such regulation, (B) an initial connection, or (C) subscription for any new telephone line.

“(5) EXEMPTIONS FROM INTRODUCTORY MESSAGE REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations prescribed by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (2)(A) may exempt from the requirements of such paragraph—

“(A) calls from frequent callers or regular subscribers using a bypass mechanism to avoid listening to the disclosure message required by such regulations; or

“(B) audiotext services provided at nominal charges, as defined by the Commission in such regulations.

“(6) CONSUMER REFUND REQUIREMENTS.—The regulations required by paragraph (1) shall establish procedures, consistent with the provisions of titles II and III of the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act, to ensure that carriers offering audiotext services and other parties provide appropriate refunds to callers who have been billed for audiotext services pursuant to programs that have been found to have violated this subsection or such regulations or any other Federal, State, or local consumer protection law.

“(7) RECOMMENDATIONS ON DATA PAY-PER-CALL.—The Commission, within one year after the date of enactment of this section, shall submit to the Congress the Commission's recommendations with respect to the extension of regulations under this section to services that provide, for a per call charge, data services that are not audiotext services.

“(c) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—

“(1) NO PREEMPTION OF ELECTION LAW.—Nothing in this section shall relieve any information provider, common carrier, local exchange carrier, or any other person from the obligation to comply with Federal, State, and local election laws and regulations.

“(2) CONSUMER PROTECTION LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall relieve any provider of audiotext services, common carrier, local exchange carrier, or any other person from the obligation to comply with Federal, State, or local laws relating to consumer protection or unfair trade.

“(3) GAMBLING LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall preclude any State from enforcing its statutes and regulations with regard to lotteries, wagering, betting, and other gambling activities.

“(4) STATE AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section shall preclude any State from enacting and enforcing additional and complementary oversight and regulatory systems or procedures, or both, so long as such systems and procedures do not significantly impede the enforcement of this section or other Federal statutes.

"(5) LIABILITY.—No cause of action may be brought in any court or administrative agency against any common carrier or any of its affiliates on account of any act of the carrier or affiliate, and which the carrier or affiliate shows to be in good faith, to terminate any audiotext service in order to comply with the regulations prescribed under subsection (b).

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'audiotext services' means any service—

"(A) in which any person provides, through interstate telecommunications—

"(i) audio information or audio entertainment produced or packaged by such person; or

"(ii) access to simultaneous voice conversation services;

"(B) for which the caller pays a per-call or per-time-interval charge that is greater than, or in addition to, the charge for transmission of the call; and

"(C) the charge for which is billed and collected by a common carrier or local exchange carrier.

Such term does not include directory services provided by a common carrier or its affiliate or by a local exchange carrier or its affiliate or any service the charge for which is tariffed.

"(2) A common carrier 'offers audiotext services' by transmitting an audiotext service through interstate communications. A local exchange carrier shall not be considered to 'offer audiotext services' if the local exchange carrier only provides exchange access services or billing services, or both, to a common carrier in connection with the common carrier's offering of audiotext services."

SEC. 102. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 3(c) of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 is amended by striking "section 228" and inserting "section 227".

TITLE II—USE OF THE 900 TELEPHONE NUMBER

SEC. 201. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) The Federal Trade Commission shall prescribe rules, as described in this subsection, for any advertisement for services or products procured through the use of a telephone number with a 900 service access code or any other access code under which liability for the service or product provided attaches to the telephone bill of the individual calling such number. Such rules shall require that the person offering such services or products—

(A) clearly and conspicuously disclose in any advertising the cost of the use of such telephone number, including the rate per minute and, if applicable, for the duration of the call,

(B) in the case of an advertisement which offers a prize or award or a service or product at no cost or for a reduced cost, clearly and conspicuously disclose the odds of being able to receive such prize, award, service, or product at no cost or reduced cost, or, if such odds are not calculable in advance, disclose the factors determining such odds,

(C) in the case of individuals under the age of 18 using such telephone number, clearly and conspicuously state, where appropriate, in any advertising that such individual must have the consent of such individual's parent or legal guardian for the use of such telephone number, and

(D) be prohibited from using advertisements that emit electronic tones which can

automatically dial a pay-per-call telephone number.

(2) The Commission shall by rule require a common carrier that provides telephone services to a vendor who uses the telephone number described in paragraph (1) to make available to the Commission any records and financial information maintained by such carrier relating to the arrangements (other than for the provision of local exchange service) between such carrier and vendor.

(3) A rule issued under paragraph (1) or (2) shall be treated as a rule issued under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)).

(b) RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall prescribe the rules under subsection (a) within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Such rules shall be prescribed in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—Any violation of any rule prescribed under subsection (a) shall be treated as a violation of a rule under section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices. Notwithstanding section 5(a)(2) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)), communications common carriers shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 202. ACTIONS BY STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever an attorney general of any State has reason to believe that the interests of the residents of that State have been or are being threatened or adversely affected because any person has engaged or is engaging in a pattern or practice of telemarketing which violates any rule of the Commission under section 201(a)(1), the State may bring a civil action on behalf of its residents in an appropriate district court of the United States to enjoin such telemarketing, to enforce compliance with such rule of the Commission, to obtain damages on behalf of their residents, or to obtain such further and other relief as the court may deem appropriate.

(b) NOTICE.—The State shall serve prior written notice of any civil action under subsection (a) upon the Commission and provide the Commission with a copy of its complaint, except that if it is not feasible for the State to provide such prior notice, the State shall serve such notice immediately upon instituting such action. Upon receiving a notice respecting a civil action, the Commission shall have the right (1) to intervene in such action, (2) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein, and (3) to file petitions for appeal.

(c) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of bringing any civil action under subsection (a), nothing in this Act shall prevent an attorney general from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of such State to conduct investigations or to administer oaths or affirmations or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(d) ACTIONS BY THE COMMISSION.—Whenever the Commission has instituted a civil action for violation of any rule prescribed under section 201, no State may, during the pendency of such action instituted by the Commission, institute a civil action under subsection (a) against any defendant named in the Commission's complaint for acts or omissions alleged in the complaint for violation of any rule as alleged in the Commission's complaint.

(e) ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.—

(1) Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit an authorized State official from

proceeding in State court on the basis of an alleged violation of any general civil or criminal statute of such State.

(2) In addition to actions brought by an attorney general of a State under subsection (a), such an action may be brought by officers of such State who are authorized by the State to bring actions in such State for protection of consumers and who are designated by the Commission to bring an action under subsection (a) against persons that the Commission has determined have or are engaged in a pattern or practice of telemarketing which violates a rule of the Commission under section 201.

SEC. 203. ADMINISTRATION AND APPLICABILITY OF TITLE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in section 202, this title shall be enforced by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.). Consequently, no activity which is outside the jurisdiction of that Act shall be affected by this Act, except for purposes of this title.

(b) ACTIONS BY THE COMMISSION.—The Commission shall prevent any person from violating a rule of the Commission under section 201 in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this title. Any person who violates such rule shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, power, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this title.

SEC. 204. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) The term "attorney general" means the chief legal officer of a State.

(2) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

(3) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

TITLE III—TELEPHONE SERVICES BILLING AND COLLECTION

SEC. 301. CORRECTION OF BILLING ERRORS.

(a) INITIATION OF BILLING REVIEW.—A customer may initiate a billing review under this section with respect to a telephone-billed purchase by sending, within 30 days after receipt of a billing statement from a billing carrier that contains a charge for such telephone-billed purchase, a written notice to that billing carrier in which the customer—

(1) sets forth or otherwise enables the billing carrier to identify the name of the customer and the phone number to which the charge was billed;

(2) indicates the customer's belief that the statement contains a billing error that relates to a telephone-billed purchase and the amount of such billing error; and

(3) sets forth the reasons for the customer's belief (to the extent applicable) that the statement contains a billing error.

(b) RESPONSE TO CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(1) RESPONSE BY BILLING CARRIER.—A billing carrier that receives a notice from any customer under subsection (a) shall—

(A) if the billing error is described in section 308(6) (D), (E), or (F) or otherwise relates to the calculation of amounts due, be

deemed to be a providing carrier for purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) transmit such notice within 15 days to the providing carrier for the telephone-billed purchase to which the alleged billing error relates.

(2) **RESPONSE BY PROVIDING CARRIER.**—A providing carrier that receives from any customer a notice that meets the requirements of subsection (a) shall, unless the customer has, after giving such written notice and before the expiration of the time limits herein specified, agreed that the statement was correct—

(A) not later than 30 days after the receipt of the notice, unless the action required in subparagraph (B) is taken within such 30-day period, send a written acknowledgement thereof to the customer, which acknowledgement shall include the name, mailing address, and business telephone number of the vendor that is the subject of the notice, and

(B) not later than two complete billing cycles of the billing carrier (in no event later than 90 days) after the receipt of the notice and prior to taking any action to collect the amount, or any part thereof, indicated by the customer under subsection (a)(2) either—

(i) make appropriate corrections in the account of the customer, including the crediting of any related charges on amounts erroneously billed, and transmit to billing carrier and the customer a notification of such corrections and the providing carrier's explanation of any change in the amount indicated by the customer under subsection (a)(2) and, if any such change is made and the customer so requests, copies of documentary evidence of the customer's indebtedness; or

(ii) send a written explanation or clarification to the customer, after having conducted an investigation (including, where appropriate, contact with the vendor), setting forth to the extent applicable the reasons why the providing carrier believes the account of the customer was correctly shown in the statement and, upon request of the customer, provide copies of documentary evidence of the customer's indebtedness.

(3) **INVESTIGATIONS CONCERNING DELIVERY OF TELEPHONE-BILLED PURCHASES.**—In the case of a billing error where the customer alleges that the billing statement reflects goods or services not delivered to the customer in accordance with the stated terms of the transaction, a providing carrier may not construe such amount to be correctly shown unless the providing carrier investigates, with reasonable diligence, whether such goods or services were actually delivered or otherwise sent to the customer and provides the customer with a written statement of the results of such investigation.

(4) **TERMINATION OF PROVIDING CARRIER RESPONSIBILITY.**—After complying with the provisions of this subsection with respect to an alleged billing error, a providing carrier has no further responsibility under this section if the customer continues to make substantially the same allegation with respect to such error.

(5) **PERMITTED ACTIONS BY BILLING CARRIERS.**—Nothing in this title shall prohibit a billing carrier from removing a charge from a customer's billing statement upon receipt of a billing inquiry from the customer if the billing carrier—

(A) informs the appropriate providing carrier that the charge has been removed;

(B) informs the customer that removal of the charge does not limit customer liability for that charge if the vendor or providing carrier or its agent elects to pursue collection of the charge; and

(C) informs the customer that, to assure the protection of the customer's rights under this title, the customer must send a written notice in accordance with subsection (a).

(c) **COLLECTION ACTIONS.**—

(1) **DEFINITION.**—For the purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B) of this section, "action to collect the amount, or any part thereof, indicated by the customer under subsection (a)(2)" does not include the sending of statements of account, which may include late charges on amounts in dispute, to the customer following written notice from the customer as specified under subsection (a), if—

(A) the customer's account is not restricted or closed because of the failure of the customer to pay the amount indicated under subsection (a)(2), and

(B) the billing carrier indicates to the customer that the payment of such amount is not required pending the providing carrier's compliance with this section.

(2) **NO EFFECT ON AMOUNTS NOT SUBJECT TO REVIEW.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit any action by a vendor, providing carrier, or billing carrier to collect any amount which has not been indicated by the customer under subsection (a)(2) to contain a billing error.

(d) **FORFEITURE OF RIGHTS.**—Any billing carrier or providing carrier who fails to comply with the requirements of this section or section 302 forfeits any right to collect from the customer the amount indicated by the customer under subsection (a)(2) of this section, and any late charges thereon.

SEC. 302. REGULATION OF REPORTS.

(a) **ADVERSE REPORTS PROHIBITED.**—After receiving a notice from a customer as provided in section 301, a vendor, billing carrier, providing carrier, or its agent may not directly or indirectly threaten to report to any person adversely on the customer's credit rating or credit standing because of the customer's failure to pay the amount indicated by the customer under section 301(a)(2), and such amount may not be reported as delinquent to any third party until the billing carrier or providing carrier has met the requirements of section 301 and has allowed the customer 20 days thereafter to make payment.

(b) **REPORTS DURING CONTINUATION OF DISPUTE.**—If a billing carrier or providing carrier receives a further written notice from a customer that an amount is still in dispute within the time allowed for payment under subsection (a) of this section, a vendor, billing carrier, or providing carrier or its agent may not report to any third party that the account of the customer is in arrears because the customer has failed to pay an amount indicated under section 301(a)(2), unless the vendor, billing carrier, providing carrier, or its agent also reports that the amount is in dispute and, at the same time, notifies the customer of the name and address of each party to whom the vendor, billing carrier, providing carrier, or its agent is reporting information concerning the arrearage.

(c) **REPORTS OF RESOLUTIONS.**—A vendor, billing carrier, providing carrier, or its agent shall report any subsequent resolution of any matter reported pursuant to subsection (b) to the parties to whom such matter was initially reported.

SEC. 303. PROMPT NOTIFICATION OF CREDIT.

With respect to any telephone-billed purchase where the vendor is a person other than the billing carrier, and where the vendor accepts or allows a forgiveness of a debit for the telephone-billed purchase, the vendor shall promptly transmit to the billing carrier a credit statement with respect thereto

and the billing carrier shall credit the account of the customer for the amount of the purchase.

SEC. 304. RIGHTS OF CUSTOMERS.

A billing carrier or providing carrier who seeks to collect charges for a telephone-billed purchase from a customer for a vendor shall be subject to all claims (other than tort claims) and defenses arising out of any telephone-billed purchase in which the customer's telephone billing account is used as a method for collection, if the customer has made a good faith attempt to obtain satisfactory resolution of a disagreement or problem relative to the purchase from the vendor or providing carrier. In no event shall the billing carrier be liable for any amount greater than the amount billed to the customer for the purchase.

SEC. 305. RELATION TO STATE LAWS.

(a) **STATE LAW APPLICABLE UNLESS INCONSISTENT.**—This title does not annul, alter, or affect, or exempt any person subject to the provisions of this title from complying with, the laws of any State with respect to telephone billing practices, except to the extent that those laws are inconsistent with any provision of this title, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency. The Commission is authorized to determine whether such inconsistencies exist. The Commission may not determine that any State law is inconsistent with any provision of this chapter if the Commission determines that such law gives greater protection to the consumer.

(b) **REGULATORY EXEMPTIONS.**—The Commission shall by regulation exempt from the requirements of this title any class of telephone-billed purchase transactions within any State if it determines that under the law of that State that class of transactions is subject to requirements substantially similar to those imposed under this chapter or that such law gives greater protection to the consumer, and that there is adequate provision for enforcement.

SEC. 306. ENFORCEMENT.

The Commission shall enforce the requirements of this title. For the purpose of the exercise by the Commission of its functions and powers under the Federal Trade Commission Act, a violation of any requirement imposed under this title shall be deemed a violation of a requirement imposed under that Act. All the functions and powers of the Federal Trade Commission under that Act are available to the Commission to enforce compliance by any person with the requirements imposed under this title, irrespective of whether that person is engaged in commerce or meets any other jurisdictional tests in that Act. The Commission may prescribe such regulations as are necessary or appropriate to implement the provisions of this title.

SEC. 307. STUDY OF NEED FOR ADDITIONAL REMEDIES.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—The Commission shall conduct an ongoing study of the need to develop and implement additional provisions to prevent evasions of the requirements of this title, through the use of alternative billing or other procedures, that undermine the rights provided to customers under this title. In examining such additional provisions, the Commission shall consider the extent to which such additional provisions may be implemented under the Commission's rulemaking authority pursuant to section 306.

(b) **REPORTS REQUIRED.**—The Commission shall submit to the Congress, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the results (as of the end of

such period) of the study required by subsection (a), and shall submit such additional reports to the Congress as are merited by later findings of such study. Such reports shall include such recommendations for legislation as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 308. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title—

(1) The term "providing carrier" means a local exchange or interexchange common carrier providing telephone services (other than local exchange services) to a vendor for a telephone-billed purchase that is the subject of a billing error complaint.

(2) The term "billing carrier" means a local exchange or interexchange common carrier that transmits to a customer a statement of charges for a telephone-billed purchase.

(3) The term "vendor" means any person who, through the use of the telephone, offers goods or services for a telephone-billed purchase.

(4) The term "customer" means any person who acquires or attempts to acquire goods or services in a telephone-billed purchase.

(5) The term "telephone-billed purchase" means any goods or services (including information services) acquired through the use of the telephone, any part of the charges for which are compiled and transmitted through the use of billing services provided by a local exchange or interexchange common carrier, except that such term does not include—

(A) local exchange telephone services or interexchange telephone services or any service that the Federal Communications Commission determines, by rule—

(i) is closely related to the provision of local exchange telephone services or interexchange telephone services; and

(ii) is subject to billing dispute resolution procedures required by Federal or State statute or regulation; or

(B) the purchase of goods or services which is otherwise subject to billing dispute resolution procedures required by Federal statute or regulation.

(6) A "billing error" consists of any of the following:

(A) A reflection on a billing statement from a billing carrier of a telephone-billed purchase which was not made by the customer or, if made, was not in the amount reflected on such statement.

(B) A reflection on a billing statement of a telephone-billed purchase for which the customer requests additional clarification, including documentary evidence thereof.

(C) A reflection on a billing statement of a telephone-billed purchase that was not accepted by the customer or not provided to the customer in accordance with the stated terms of the transaction.

(D) The billing carrier's failure to reflect properly on a billing statement a payment made by the customer or a credit issued to the customer with respect to a telephone-billed purchase.

(E) A computation error or similar error of an accounting nature of the billing carrier on a statement.

(F) Failure to transmit the billing statement to the last address of the customer which has been disclosed to the billing carrier, unless that address was furnished less than twenty days before the end of the billing cycle for which the statement is required.

(G) Any other error described in regulations prescribed by the Commission pursuant to section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(7) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SWIFT. 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 presently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues, Mr. MARKEY, chairman of the Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee, Mr. RITTER, the ranking minority member of the Transportation and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, and Mr. RINALDO, the ranking minority member on the Telecommunications Subcommittee in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

We have all seen the ads on television, playing to viewer's emotions, to call a number immediately if they are lonely, bored, or want to get instant credit. What you don't see or hear very clearly is how much the call or service will cost. This legislation will force those that provide 900-number services to state cost information in both advertisements and during the call itself.

The pay-per-call industry offers consumers a convenient, instantaneous method for purchasing goods and services. It has also offered some fly-by-night opportunists a convenient method for deceiving and stealing from consumers through the use of a payment system tied to the consumer's local telephone bill.

The two subcommittees of the Energy and Commerce Committee have worked together in a very productive manner and have crafted legislation that brings in focus the authority of both the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Communications Commission to better protect consumers from deceptive pay-per-call operators. And in turn, the two subcommittees have benefited from the very good working relationship between the FTC and the FCC.

Specifically, title I of H.R. 3490 directs the Federal Communications Commission to complete a rulemaking to ensure that consumers will have adequate information about charges they entail when they make a 900-number call. This FCC rulemaking will also define the obligations of telephone common carriers to protect their consumers from abusive practices by information providers. And this FCC rule

will prohibit the disconnection of basic telephone service for failure to pay a disputed 900-number charge.

Title II directs the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules for any advertisement of 900-number services or products. Such rules will include requirements for the clear and conspicuous disclosure of the cost of such calls, odds disclosure for contests and promotions, parental consent warnings for advertisements targeted to children, and the prohibition of the use of electronic tones that would automatically dial a pay-per-call telephone number.

The legislation also addresses a key missing component in the existing payment mechanism for 900-numbers, and that is a formal dispute resolution procedure such as that used in adjudicating customer complaints in the credit card markets. After the breakup of AT&T, the current telephone payment mechanism was developed for channeling telephone charges from interexchange carriers to the consumer's telephone bill. This telephone billing system did not envision the successful application and widespread growth of the technology used in the 900-number pay-per-call industry. Title III provides for telephone service billing and collection procedures—patterned on those used for credit cards and to be administered by the FTC—to resolve disputes by customers for pay-per-call transactions.

Mr. Speaker, the continued growth of the legitimate pay-per-call industry is dependent upon consumer confidence. First, unfair and deceptive behavior must be effectively curtailed. And second, consumers must have adequate rights of redress when they have legitimate complaints about 900-number charges on their telephone bill. And vendors of telephone-billed goods and services must also feel confident in their rights and obligations for resolving billing disputes if they are to use this new telephonic marketplace for the sale of products of more than nominal value.

This is progressive legislation in the best sense of the word. While it will help clean up the current problems in the pay-per-call industry, it is not meant to be punitive. This legislation recognizes the real and potential public benefits of the 900-number marketplace. But until both consumers and sellers have a confidence that deceptive behavior will not be tolerated, it will never achieve the potential that it might have. This legislation should go a long way to ensuring consumer rights and restoring public confidence in the electronic marketplace.

I urge the House to adopt this important consumer legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I simply would like to add that I have heard frequently from my constituent that they think Congress spends too much time fighting along partisan battles with one an-

other. That, of course, is the kind of activity that is most likely to draw the attention of the media; it is more colorful, it is more interesting.

But it is fairly typical in this institution that, in fact, the public business is done on a bipartisan basis. This particular legislation, I think, shows the degree of cooperation possible and, frankly, typical in Government. Not only has there been cooperation between Republicans and Democrats, there has been cooperation between two committees with different pieces of jurisdiction, and, even more importantly, there has been cooperation between two independent agencies of Government who have crossed jurisdictions.

So, this legislation we bring before you today is an example of how Congress and governmental agencies can and do work together, and that in itself should not be overlooked.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3490, the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act. This bill addresses the problems associated with the rapid growth of the 900 services industry. The bill seeks solutions to those problems without restricting the growth and future viability of a service many consumers consider valuable and worthwhile.

Nonetheless, instances of abuse within the industry are on the rise, and the record compiled by the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance amply demonstrates the need for some statutory standards and guidelines as the industry continues to grow.

H.R. 3490 takes a reasoned balanced approach to addressing problems in the 900 services industry. It affords consumers the necessary protections without imposing regulatory roadblocks to this relatively new service.

Title I of the bill, which was reported by the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, would require the FCC to adopt regulations that would ensure that the 900 service provider includes a preamble to each call that identifies the name and other important information about the provider, the nature of the service, and the cost of the call; 900 service providers also would be required to notify the caller that prior to incurring any charge, he or she may disconnect the call; 900 service providers would also have to use the type of equipment that stops billing once the caller hangs up.

In addition, the bill requires telephone companies to provide free blocking to customers, list 900 service charges in a separate portion of a consumer's phone bill, and establish a toll-free number for customers to ascertain their rights and obligations concerning 900 services.

Additionally, the bill would exempt prescribed and preregistered calls from the beep tone requirement that reminds callers of the passage of time. The bill would also exempt from the preamble requirement calls that cost up to \$3. Finally, local exchange carriers that do not provide 900 services would be exempt from the consumer refund provisions and the FCC's reporting requirements.

Title II of the bill, which was reported by the Subcommittee on Transportation and Hazardous Materials, addresses the issue of advertisements of 900 services. In essence, title II would protect consumers from abusive advertising practices by 900 service providers. The FTC would be empowered to ensure that 900 services accurately disclose the cost of the service. In the case of lotteries or contents, 900 service providers must also accurately disclose, to the degree possible, the odds of winning.

In addition, State attorneys general would be permitted to pursue grievances in Federal district court. Title II would also establish a dispute resolution mechanism to allow the consumer to preserve his or her rights and obtain information on the provider for the purpose of pursuing a complaint. Finally, while the bill requires the provider to disclose prices for 900 services, the bill does not disturb longstanding practices, such as that of the yellow pages industry, of not accepting price advertising.

Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 3490, I would like to commend my colleagues Messrs. MARKEY, SWIFT, and RITTER—the other original sponsors of this measure—for working together on this important issue and devising a practical legislative solution to this problem. The Telecommunications and Transportation Subcommittees worked cooperatively, and in bipartisan fashion, in establishing a regulatory framework that not only seeks to put a stop to abuses but also provides consumers with a framework for seeking redress in the event of abuse. I would also like to thank the full committee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, and the ranking Republican member, Mr. LENT, for their work on and support of this bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this comprehensive legislation.

□ 1300

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] very much, and I congratulate the gentleman for his work and his subcommittee's work in constructing the portions of this legislation which fell under his subcommittee's jurisdic-

tion. The bill, as well, has components which fell under the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, and, as a result, coordination was necessary, and, working with the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], we were able to bring a product out here today. Of course, without the assistance, cooperation, and working relationship which we have with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] this would not be possible, and up at the full committee level with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] we were able to put together a piece of legislation which we present to the House today for its approval.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I think it is long overdue. This is a burgeoning marketplace which now has created a mind-boggling number of new services which are available to people in our country. It ranges all the way from sports statistics and stock quotes all the way down to offerings like gab lines, and horoscopes, and just about an infinite number of services, if anyone is interested in it. However, as is the case with many new industries, the growth of audiotext services has been accompanied by an increasingly large number of unscrupulous pay-per-call providers who reach into the homes of the United States to peddle fraudulent services to unsuspecting customers.

Unfortunately, peddlers of fraudulent 900 number services have cast a pall on the audiotext industry as a whole. Legitimate providers have suffered from practices that have undermined consumer confidence and stunted the growth of the once burgeoning industry. In addition to consumers, telephone companies have demonstrated considerable concern over this industry, so much so that one major carrier has announced that it will discontinue all 900 number offerings because there is inadequate regulation governing the industry. Because of these concerns, legitimate audiotext businesses are penalized by the actions of a few providers while the 900 number hucksters themselves continue to go unpunished.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is meant to remedy that problem so that we can punish the hucksters while allowing the legitimate business people to move forward with providing these services to Americans. H.R. 3490 requires the FCC and the FTC to work in tandem to craft clear, constructive guidelines to govern offerings of 900 number services. Reporting and disclosure requirements will ensure that consumers know exactly what they will get for their money, before they incur any charge for the call. In addition, the legislation will guarantee that consumers will not have their phones disconnected for nonpayment of 900 number bills. H.R. 3490 also will give consumers

the option of blocking their lines from all outgoing calls to 900 number services, and equally important, will require children under the age of 18 to obtain parental consent before calling an advertised number.

The bill also includes a technical amendment that would correct a drafting error in the reference to a section in the law signed by the President regulating autodialers. This change has been cleared by both sides.

We think that this is a very good piece of legislation. It is one we have been able to put together on a bipartisan basis.

I want to specifically thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] for his work on this legislation, bringing it to our attention, and I recommend this legislation to the full House.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] 2½ additional minutes in order for him to be able to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARKEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY], as well as the ranking minority members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO], for their work on this bill, and I would like to enter into a colloquy with Chairman MARKEY regarding a perfecting amendment that I hope can be incorporated into the final bill.

The 900 telephone line industry has brought numerous services into the homes of Americans via the telephone. Many of these services have been beneficial to Americans, however, these services have gone unregulated, allowing a few operations which are nothing more than frauds and ripoffs. It is well past time for remedial action.

H.R. 3490 is designed to address such problems by requiring the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission to regulate and oversee the activities of the 1-900 pay-per-call industry.

The amendment I suggested to the committee responds to a complaint from one of my constituents, who spent 5 minutes on the phone at \$1 per minute trying to get information about Medicare for her mother-in-law from a private company which did everything it could to create the impression that it was run by the Federal Government.

I would like to suggest that 900 lines be subject to the same sensible restrictions as mail. Thus, I drafted an amendment, modeled on our deceptive mailing practices law, that requires that 900 lines that imitate Government

programs or services contain a message in their audiotext specifying that their services are not approved or endorsed by the Federal Government and are not being made by an agency of the Federal Government. I also suggest that advertisements of 900 services includes similar language.

This is an important step, to protect Americans from being unknowing victims of such scams. While the 900 industry may be beneficial in many instances, we must prevent unscrupulous companies from profiting by deceiving consumers.

□ 1310

This problem was brought to my attention after the committee had marked up H.R. 3490, but I am anxious to work with the chairman to find a way to include my suggestion in the final bill. I would like to know if I have your support in this report.

Mr. MARKEY. We have discussed the very valid points made by the gentle lady from New York, and you can be certain that we will continue to work with you to see that your suggested language is included in the final bill.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. I thank the chairmen and ranking members for working with me on this. I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I look forward to its swift implementation with my perfecting amendment.

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Transportation Subcommittee and a senior member of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, I have worked closely with my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee to fashion this important legislation. I want to commend both of the subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Massachusetts, as well as the ranking member of the Telecommunications Subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey, for their diligent efforts on this bill.

Protecting the American consumer is a goal we all share on both sides of the aisle, and I want to note the excellent spirit of cooperation shown by all members on our committee in moving this legislation forward.

H.R. 3490 is legislation that will protect the American consumer and the integrity of legitimate American businesses. The 900 number industry has grown fantastically in the last several years—from less than 250 companies in 1988 to over 14,000 in 1990. The industry's revenues hit the \$1 billion mark in 1990, and are projected to reach \$1.7 billion by the end of 1992.

This is a growing, high-technology industry which should be regarded as a contributor to economic growth and to the competitiveness of our economy.

But both the industry itself and its customers are threatened by a few unscrupulous operators who engage in fraudulent or deceptive practices. H.R. 3490 is meant to stop these predators in their tracks.

The legislation takes a comprehensive approach to consumer protection in the 900 field by joining the forces of the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission. The FCC is to address such matters as cost disclosure at the beginning of a 900 call, the option of free blocking of 900 services, separate listing of 900 charges in telephone bills, and the availability of a toll-free consumer information number for telephone customers.

The FTC, on the other hand, is to employ its expertise in fighting deceptive advertising practices. The FTC will promulgate rules requiring disclosure of key information in all advertising of 900 services—such as cost disclosure. The FTC rules will also prohibit such outrageous practices as evasion of parental consent for children who use 900 numbers, and the reprehensible practice of broadcasting ads directed at children which actually dial the 900 number by emitting electronic dialing tones when the unknowing child places the phone receiver up against the TV screen.

Both the FTC and State attorneys general will be empowered to seek injunctions and otherwise enforce the Federal rules. In addition, the FTC will oversee the implementation of a system of billing dispute resolution for 900 charges that is analogous to the system already administered by the FTC for credit card billing matters. The implementation of such a system, however, will not in any way prevent responsible carriers and providers from continuing or initiating their highly successful on-the-spot system for resolving billing disputes immediately over the telephone.

By taking this comprehensive, multi-disciplinary approach and combing the legislative efforts of our Telecommunications Subcommittee, with FCC jurisdiction, and our Transportation and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, with FTC jurisdiction, we have fashioned a balanced, proconsumer bill.

But we also have been careful to consult the telecommunications industry for its own perspective and expertise. In this way, we have sought to protect the interests of legitimate businesses who are harmed as much as consumers by the unscrupulous conduct of a few in this new industry.

This is the kind of bipartisan proconsumer, procompetitiveness legislation that I am proud to be associated with. I urge its prompt approval.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my

strong support for this bill and to commend Chairman SWIFT, Chairman MARKEY, Chairman DINGELL, ranking members RINALDO, RITTER, and our colleague, BART GORDON, for their leadership on this important consumer issue.

A number of my constituents have complained about the shock that they experienced when they opened their phone bills. For instance, I received a call from a lady in Tuscaloosa, AL, whose 12-year-old son ran up a \$3,000 phone bill in 1 month after he had seen a 900 number ad on TV. I received a similar letter from a pastor of a small rural church in my district. The church had been billed for several hundred dollars' worth of 900 number calls made from the phone in the church's office. All of these situations were preventable with the per line call blocking contained in H.R. 3490.

While the FCC has begun to take steps in the right direction of regulating the calls themselves, I am especially pleased with the provisions in this bill which protect a consumer's credit record from being blotted when these 900 number charges are disputed. This bill also makes certain that the local phone company cannot cut off essential telephone service because of outstanding 900 number bills.

The Alabama Public Service Commission has been very active in advocating introductory messages which clearly state the costs of these calls up front. H.R. 3490 contains just such a mandate. Full disclosure of all are necessary to insure that a consumer is making an informed choice.

While there are many legitimate uses of this technology, there are also many operators abusing the opportunity that this innovative use of our telecommunications network presents. H.R. 3490 is a measured response to these abuses which will protect consumers without discouraging further developments of this new industry.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] for their leadership on this bill.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that, under section 201(a)(1)(A) of the bill, the Federal Trade Commission's rules on 900 numbers must include a requirement for clear and conspicuous cost disclosure in all advertising of 900-type services?

Mr. SWIFT. If the gentleman will yield, yes, that is my clear understanding.

Mr. SCHUMER. As to print advertising in particular, does this directive to the FTC to establish clear and conspicuous cost disclosure requirements empower the FTC to address the ques-

tion of type sizes; that is, whether the cost figures are sufficiently large in a print advertisement to constitute clear and conspicuous disclosure?

Mr. SWIFT. The gentleman is entirely correct in his understanding. Indeed, there have been numerous instances in the past in which the FTC, in its role of prosecuting deceptive advertising practices, has included mandatory type-size requirements as part of its orders and consent decrees. Under H.R. 3490, the FTC would have those same powers in its 900 number rulemaking, in the context of the record created in the rulemaking itself.

Mr. SCHUMER. Is it also true that in past FTC orders, such as in the matter of Outdoor World Corp., the Commission has barred companies from advertising products or services—including prizes, awards, gifts, bonuses, or premiums—"without disclosing fully, in type of equal size to that used to identify such good or service and immediately following each good or service thus represented, any cost that the consumer must pay to receive such good or service."

Mr. SWIFT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for confirming and clarifying this important aspect of the legislation.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and thank him for his help and understanding in this matter.

□ 1320

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York for his interest and his work on this issue in clarifying these very important matters, and I concur with the responses of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], my chairman.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Washington for their help in this matter.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] has provided an enormous amount of leadership on this issue. He originally brought this issue to the attention of the House and the legislation before us today contains many of the ideas and suggestions of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to give my strong support to the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act, which contains the consumer protections for 900 number users that I believe are essential, and many of which I proposed in the previous Congress and again last year.

Chairman SWIFT deserves praise for his work in crafting this excellent bill and for bringing it to the floor today. I

also want to praise Chairman ED MARKEY of the Telecommunications Subcommittee for his leadership in moving 900 number legislation forward in his subcommittee.

Finally, I wish to thank full committee Chairman JOHN DINGELL and his staff for moving this bill forward and bringing about the cleanup of the 900 business.

Mr. Speaker, this will be one of the most important pieces of consumer legislation Congress will pass this year. It will save consumers millions of dollars and bring the weight of the law down on the 1-900 fast-buck operators who prey on the young, the lonely, and those in economic trouble.

Almost 2 years ago, I began working to bring to light the way fraud and rip-offs were beginning to dominate the 1-900 industry.

Horror stories of people losing hundreds, even thousands of dollars to con artists abounded. Consumers had no confidence that 900 numbers were a good deal.

Irresponsible businesses set up across State lines to frustrate State law enforcement efforts. The Federal agencies were overwhelmed and not equipped to deal with this new technology.

Since then, we have made much progress. In October 1990, Representative MARKEY, after holding a hearing on my original legislation, asked the Federal Communications Commission to begin studying possible rules for the industry.

Early last year, I introduced a second 900 bill, H.R. 328. Representatives MARKEY and SWIFT, working with Chairman DINGELL, built on that legislation to craft the excellent bill before us today.

The 900 industry has responded to the congressional attention and started to clean up its act. The FCC, the FTC, and the Postal Service have gotten involved.

However, without this legislation, it would be too easy for the scam artists to slip back into the picture. Our intent and our message must be clear.

Unfortunately, there always are going to be some hucksters running scams. But this legislation gives consumers the basic tools they need to inform and protect themselves.

H.R. 3490 is a fair, commonsense approach that does not put an unreasonable burden on the information industry. Legitimate businesses do not mind telling their customers what they are buying and how much it is going to cost.

Many fine companies and entrepreneurs who considered entering the 1-900 industry turned away because they did not want to be associated with the unsavory characters who found a home in 1-900 numbers. Consumer confidence fell and the 1-900 industry's growth explosion began to fizzle.

This legislation gives industry and consumers alike a chance for a new

start. Today, we can make it clear that the crooks are not welcome in the 1-900 industry. We can give consumers and both Federal and State law enforcement authorities the tools they need to go after those who insist on trying to make a fast buck by fraud.

This legislation and its predecessors have drawn strong bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to cast their votes for consumers and support H.R. 3490.

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this noble Chamber to offer my support of H.R. 3490, the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act.

I unequivocally support this much needed legislation as in an attempt to regulate the telecommunications industry, a level of protection is being provided for consumers against unscrupulous companies who promote the use of the 900 service.

No question, I know of many parents who can readily relate horror stories about abuses that they have suffered as a result of the 900 service. Most youth fail to realize the seriousness of picking up the telephone and calling the 900 numbers of which they are bombarded on a daily basis. For the most part, they fail to notice the fine print that spells trouble to their parents' pocketbooks.

The advertisements intermittently flash across the television screen or are blurted out on a frequent basis over the radio. The truth of the matter is that there is no way to shield our children from this type of advertisement; therefore, we have no choice but to place some type of regulation that will serve to minimize its influence and deter its use.

The successful passage of H.R. 3490 is the very least that we can do to express our support for those parents who have become shocked, frustrated, and rendered defenseless after having learned that the amount of their telephone bill has tripled as a result of a youth or teenage family member's abuse of the 900 Service. We must pass H.R. 3490 because we as Members of Congress are aware that residing in every congressional district, there are those residents whose only means of communication rests with the use of the telephone.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this much needed legislation.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3490, the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

Hearings held by both the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance and the Subcommittee on Transportation and Hazardous Materials developed thorough records on the state of the 900 services industry. The subcommittees have found that while most of the providers offer a valuable and worthwhile product at a fair price, some bad actors are thriving in this market by misleading the American consumer. This bill is intended to address those abuses. It not only gives consumers increased protection but also provides them the means for redressing any abuses.

In crafting this bill, we recognized the importance of preserving the viability of the industry. Toward that end, I would like to clarify that in requesting the Federal Trade Commission to enact rules requiring the disclosure of prices for 900 services, our intent is to prevent the

abuse of consumers. It is not our intent to disrupt or otherwise burden the ongoing operations of media which are currently providing excellent service to consumers.

In the case of a medium such as yellow pages, which has a longstanding prohibition against accepting price advertising, our intent in passing this bill is not to require the Federal Trade Commission to invalidate that process. Instead, we expect the Federal Trade Commission to determine which rules fully protect consumers without disrupting such longstanding practices.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. MARKEY and Mr. SWIFT, chairmen of the Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee and the Transportation and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee respectively, as well as Mr. RINALDO and Mr. RITTER, ranking Republican members of the same subcommittees. Each of them worked hard in crafting this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3490, a bill designed to protect the consumer, the American family, from fraudulent telephone services.

Pay-per-call telephone services began as vehicles to provide families with a convenient and efficient means of obtaining goods and services. However, these 1-900 numbers have also become vehicles for consumer fraud. Our families today are already struggling through economic hard times, they don't need to be slapped in the face with unclear, unfair, and unwarranted charges.

Provisions especially targeted to help the family include an introductory message to be played describing the total cost of the call and all other related fees. Most importantly, H.R. 3490 would require the message to state that parental consent is required for calls made by children under 18. Families would be back in control and better able to decide what services they want to receive.

Mr. Speaker, the American family needs and deserves this bill. It is time to end the helplessness many families feel when they encounter fraudulent practices which result in costly and offensive calls. Let's put American families back in control of their lives. Let's pass this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3490, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

TRANSFER OF AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "LEXINGTON" TO THE CITY OF CORPUS CHRISTI, TX

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4113) to permit the transfer before the expiration of the otherwise applicable 60-day congressional review period of the obsolete training aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Lexington*, to the city of Corpus Christi, TX, for use as a naval museum and memorial, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4113

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

SECTION 1. WAIVER OF WAITING PERIOD FOR TRANSFER OF U.S.S. LEXINGTON

Clause (2) of section 7308(c) of title 10, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to the transfer by the Secretary of the Navy under section 7308(a) of such title of the obsolete training aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Lexington* (AVT-16) to the Corpus Christi Area Convention and Visitors Bureau, Corpus Christi, Texas, for use as a naval museum and memorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

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

Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1992, the Secretary of the Navy notified the Congress of his intent to transfer the obsolete aircraft carrier *Lexington* to the Corpus Christi Area Convention and Visitors Bureau. Under existing law the Secretary of the Navy has authority to transfer the *Lexington* to a not-for-profit corporation, such as the Corpus Christi Area Convention and Visitors Bureau, after notification to the Congress and expiration of a 60-day waiting period. However in this instance, Corpus Christi is ready and desirous of receiving the vessel now. Further, the vessel is ready for transfer, having already been moved by the Navy from Pensacola, FL—its last homeport—to a temporary storage location.

The bill would waive the otherwise applicable 60-day waiting period and allow an immediate transfer of the ship by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House pass H.R. 4113.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with my chairman and rise in support of H.R. 4113, legislation to waive the 60-day review period for the transfer of the U.S.S. *Lexington*.

When the Navy announced the decommissioning and retirement of the *Lexington*, the training carrier, in 1991,

several communities launched efforts to have the ship transferred to their respective areas for use as a naval museum and memorial.

The bid proposals from Mobile, AL, Quincy, MA, and Corpus Christi, TX, were fully evaluated by the Secretary of the Navy before he announced that Corpus Christi would become the new home of the *Lexington*.

The *Lexington*, known as the Blue Ghost, enjoyed a lengthy and auspicious career in the Navy, serving the United States since World War II. I can think of no better way to end her 48-year career than as a museum and memorial to the courageous sailors who have served aboard her, and the many pilots and crews who have trained aboard her.

□ 1330

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Congressman ORTIZ'S legislation (H.R. 4113) and to recognize the accomplishments of the U.S.S. *Lexington*. Since 1962, the *Lexington* has operated out of her homeport, Pensacola, FL, as well as Corpus Christi and New Orleans. Today, this body will vote to transfer the *Lexington* from my district in Pensacola, FL, to Corpus Christi, TX, where it will be used as a naval museum and memorial.

During World War II, the "Lady Lex" was hit extremely hard by Japan's Navy, not only once, but three times. Each time, Japan believed the *Lex* was destroyed. Each time, she quickly healed her wounds and went back into battle. Her ability to keep fighting, even after these blistering assaults, proved her worthy of Japan's new nickname for her, the "Blue Ghost."

After the *Lex*'s brilliant stint during World War II, she was involved with the 7th Fleet off of Taiwan in 1958, and was on standby for the Laotian crisis of 1959, and served as an attack carrier during the Cuban missile crisis in 1963.

After the Cuban missile crisis, she sailed back to Pensacola to serve as an aviation training carrier. This important new role allowed her to train new student aviators and maintain the high state of flight training for active duty and reserve naval forces. In fact, her decks have trained the Navy and Marine pilots who fought to preserve the peace in conflicts from the Vietnam war to the Persian Gulf war.

While it is sad to see this noble and venerable lady leave the port at Pensacola after 30 years, I am pleased that her new mission will be an important reminder of the conflicts this country has fought to keep the mantle of freedom. I want to commend and congratulate my good friend, Congressman SOLOMON ORTIZ, for his years of dedicated work on home porting and to him and Corpus Christi for landing the *Lady Lex*.

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to waive the congressional review period to permit the earlier transfer of the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Lexington* to the Corpus Christi area Convention and Visitors Bureau.

I should point out that Alabama's congressional delegation fought against the Texas delegation in an effort to obtain the *Lexington* for the U.S.S. *Alabama* Battleship Memorial Park in Alabama. Quincy, MA, also applied to the Secretary of the Navy for donation of the *Lex*, and I must say that its delegation also went to bat for Quincy. It was an intense competition and each applicant did an excellent job in promoting its case. Navy Secretary Lawrence Garrett told me this was one of the most difficult decisions he had made.

But, in the final analysis, Corpus Christi won the competition and the prize—the *Lexington*. I take my hat off to the people of Corpus Christi and, especially, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ]. I sincerely hope that the *Lexington* museum and memorial will be a tremendous success and that it will have a positive economic impact on the area.

Mr. Speaker, donations such as this ordinarily require a 60-day congressional review. I think it is appropriate to waive that review period so that Corpus Christi may begin necessary work on the *Lexington* and facilities to berth it and get the museum operational as quickly as possible. There is no protest of the award on the part of my constituents in Alabama and I know of no other reasonable objections to a timely transfer.

The *Lexington* would have been a tremendous boost and asset to the people of Alabama. It could have graced our park, such as the U.S.S. *Alabama* does now, and it would have been an added attraction to the beautiful azaleas and to the magnificent magnolias and to the wonderful people of south Alabama, to add to the other attractions to bring tourism as well as history, naval history especially, to south Alabama.

But we fought, we fought the best battle we possibly could. We were outfought and outmanned by the Texas delegation. My hat is off to them, and we wish the people of Corpus Christi and the State of Texas the best of everything, and our sincere cooperation and congratulations for a job well done.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. SOLOMON ORTIZ, the author of this legislation.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Vir-

ginia [Mr. BATEMAN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], for their support.

Mr. Speaker, my bill quite simply allows the immediate transfer of the U.S.S. *Lexington* to the Corpus Christi area Convention and Visitors Bureau for use as a naval museum and memorial.

It waives the 60-day congressional review period in order to allow the citizens of Corpus Christi to complete the actions necessary to get the museum up and running in time for the summer tourist season.

At this point, if all goes well, the U.S.S. *Lexington* should open as a museum in July.

As many of you know, the retirement of the aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Lexington*, brought requests from several cities across the Nation to obtain the use of the ship as a museum.

This inadvertently led last year to a competition among Mobile, AL, Corpus Christi, TX, and Quincy, MA, for the retiring historic carrier.

As a result, the Navy began a very lengthy review process of the applications from all three cities, requiring several rounds of detailed responses from all applicants.

The congressional delegations representing all three of the involved localities worked very hard to promote the proposals from their area.

In the end, on January 9, the Secretary of the Navy announced that he had selected Corpus Christi as the city to become the new home of the U.S.S. *Lexington*.

The Secretary of the Navy evaluated all three proposals on the technical and financial merits as well as a combined review.

The Corpus Christi proposal outscored the other two cities in all three categories.

In compliance with language passed in last year's Defense appropriations bill, the Secretary of the Navy prepared a very lengthy and detailed report outlining the basis for his decision.

It is clear from the report that the decision was fair and that the ship should be transferred to Corpus Christi.

The citizens of Corpus Christi have raised over \$1.5 million in pledges and the city council has agreed to offer \$3 million in city bonds to pay for the acquisition of the *Lexington*.

The people are ready to go and are eagerly awaiting the action of Congress to speed up the transfer process so that thousands of tourists can have the opportunity to visit the museum this summer.

In closing, I would like to thank Chairman BENNETT of the Seapower Subcommittee and Chairman ASPIN of the full Armed Services Committees, as well as the staff, for their hard work on the bill.

I am particularly grateful for their assistance and cooperation in bringing this legislation to the floor for a vote in such a speedy manner.

Passage of this bill is extremely important to the people from my congressional district and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the expedited transfer of the U.S.S. *Lexington*.

The Secretary of Navy chose the Corpus Christi site after a review of the technical and financial merits of each proposal as well as a cumulative evaluation.

The citizens of Corpus Christi raised over \$1.5 million in pledges and the city council has agreed to offer \$3 million in bonds to pay for the initial acquisition and conversion of the *Lexington* into a museum.

The waiver of the 60-day review period is necessary in order to allow the *Lexington* to be up and running as a museum in time for the summer tourist season. Otherwise, the museum would open after the summer is over.

The conversion of the ship is both costly and time consuming. The site must be dredged and prepared for mooring. Utilities must be constructed, the pier prepared, and environmental type activity has to be conducted. In addition, the ship must be fitted with exhibits and prepared to handle the expected influx of visitors.

The ship would transfer after 60 days anyway unless Congress passed a resolution forbidding it. This is very routine and just speeds up the process.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4113, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1340

U.N. INTERNATIONAL DRIFTNET FISHERY CONSERVATION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2152) to enhance the effectiveness of the U.N. international driftnet fishery conservation program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2152

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

TITLE I—HIGH SEAS LARGE-SCALE DRIFTNET FISHING

SEC. 101. DENIAL OF PORT PRIVILEGES AND SANCTIONS FOR HIGH SEAS LARGE-SCALE DRIFTNET FISHING.

(a) DENIAL OF PORT PRIVILEGES.—

(1) PUBLICATION OF LIST.—Not later than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall publish a list of countries that conduct, or do not prohibit their nationals from conducting, large-scale driftnet fishing beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country.

(2) DENIAL OF PORT PRIVILEGES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall, in accordance with recognized principles of international law—

(A) withhold or revoke the clearance required by section 4197 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 App. U.S.C. 91) for; and

(B) deny entry to any place in the United States and to the navigable waters of the United States to;

any large-scale driftnet fishing vessel that is registered under the law of a country included in a list published under paragraph (1).

(3) NOTIFICATION OF COUNTRY.—Before the publication of a list of countries under paragraph (1), the Secretary of State shall notify each country included in that list regarding—

(A) the effect of that publication on port privileges of vessels of the country under paragraph (2); and

(B) any sanctions that may be imposed on that country if nationals or vessels of that country continue to conduct large-scale driftnet fishing beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country after December 31, 1992.

(b) SANCTIONS.—

(1) IDENTIFICATIONS.—

(A) INITIAL IDENTIFICATIONS.—Not later than December 31, 1992, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(i) identify each country the nationals or vessels of which conduct large-scale driftnet fishing beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country; and

(ii) notify the President and that country of the identification under clause (i).

(B) ADDITIONAL IDENTIFICATIONS.—Whenever at any time after December 31, 1992, the Secretary of Commerce has reason to believe that the nationals or vessels of any country are conducting large-scale driftnet fishing beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(i) identify that country; and

(ii) notify the President and that country of the identification under clause (i).

(2) CONSULTATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after a country is identified under paragraph (1)(B), the President shall enter into consultations with the government of that country for the purpose of obtaining an agreement that will affect the immediate termination of large-scale driftnet fishing by the nationals or vessels of that country beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country.

(3) PROHIBITION ON IMPORTS OF FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS AND SPORT FISHING EQUIPMENT.—

(A) PROHIBITION.—The President—

(i) upon receipt of notification of the identification of a country under paragraph (1)(A); or

(ii) if the consultations with the government of a country under paragraph (2) are not satisfactorily concluded within 90 days;

shall direct the Secretary of the Treasury to prohibit the importation into the United States of shellfish, fish and fish products, and sport fishing equipment (as that term is defined in section 4162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 4162)) from that country.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall implement an import prohibition directed under subparagraph (A) by no later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Secretary has received the direction from the President.

(C) PUBLIC NOTICE OF PROHIBITION.—Before the effective date of any prohibition under subparagraph (A), the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide public notice of the impending prohibition.

(4) ADDITIONAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS.—

(A) DETERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF SANCTIONS.—Not later than 6 months after the date the Secretary of Commerce identifies a country under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall determine whether—

(i) any prohibition established under paragraph (3) is insufficient to cause that country to terminate large-scale driftnet fishing conducted by its nationals and vessels beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country; or

(ii) that country has retaliated against the United States as a result of that prohibition.

(B) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify to the President each affirmative determination under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country.

(C) EFFECT OF CERTIFICATION.—Certification by the Secretary of Commerce under subparagraph (B) is deemed to be a certification under section 8(a) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978(a)), as amended by this Act.

SEC. 102. DURATION OF DENIAL OF PORT PRIVILEGES AND SANCTIONS.

Any denial of port privileges or sanction established under section 101 with respect to a country shall remain in effect until such time as the Secretary of Commerce certifies to the President and the Congress that the country has terminated large-scale driftnet fishing by its nationals and vessels beyond the exclusive economic zone of any country.

SEC. 103. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) FISH AND FISH PRODUCTS.—The term "fish and fish products" means any aquatic species (including marine mammals and plants) and all products thereof exported from a country, whether or not taken by fishing vessels of that country or packed, processed, or otherwise prepared for export in that country or the jurisdiction thereof.

(2) LARGE-SCALE DRIFTNET FISHING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "large-scale driftnet fishing" means a method of fishing in which a gillnet composed of a panel or panels of webbing, or a series of such gillnets, with a total length of two and one-half kilometers or more is placed in the water and allowed to drift with the currents and winds for the purpose of entangling fish in the webbing.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Until January 1, 1994, the term "large-scale driftnet fishing" does not include the use in the northeast Atlantic Ocean of gillnets with a total length not to exceed 5 kilometers if the use is in accordance with regulations adopted by the European Community pursuant to the October 28, 1991, decision by the Council of Fisheries Ministers of the Community.

(3) LARGE-SCALE DRIFTNET FISHING VESSEL.—The term "large-scale driftnet fishing

vessel" means any vessel which is used for, equipped to be used for, or of the type which is normally used for—

- (A) large-scale driftnet fishing; or
- (B) aiding or assisting one or more vessels at sea in the performance of large-scale driftnet fishing, including preparation, supply, storage, refrigeration, transportation, or processing.

TITLE II—FISHERIES CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. IMPORT RESTRICTIONS UNDER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.

Section 8 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978) is amended—

- (1) in subsection (a)(4) by striking "fish products" and all that follows through "such duration", and inserting "any products from the offending country for any duration";
- (2) in subsection (c) by striking "fish products or wildlife products" and inserting "products";
- (3) in subsection (e)(2) by striking "fish products and wildlife products" and inserting "products";
- (4) in subsection (f)—
 - (A) in paragraph (1) by striking "fish products and wildlife products" and inserting "products"; and
 - (B) in paragraph (5)—
 - (i) in the first sentence by striking "fish products and wildlife products" and inserting "products"; and
 - (ii) in the second sentence by striking "Fish products and wildlife products" and inserting "Products"; and
- (5) in subsection (h)—
 - (A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'United States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.";

(B) in paragraph (3) by inserting ", including marine mammals" after "protect the living resources of the sea";

(C) by striking paragraph (4);

(D) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4);

(E) by striking paragraphs (6) and (7); and

(F) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(5) The term 'International fishery conservation program' means any ban, restriction, regulation, or other measure in effect pursuant to a bilateral or multilateral agreement which is in force with respect to the United States, the purpose of which is to conserve or protect the living resources of the sea, including marine mammals.

"(6) The term 'taking' as used with respect to animals to which an international program for endangered or threatened species applies, means to—

"(A) harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect; or

"(B) attempt to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect."

SEC. 202. ENFORCEMENT AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Defense shall enter into an agreement under section 311(a) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861) in order to increase the effectiveness of enforcement of domestic laws and international agreements that conserve and manage the living marine resources of the United States.

(b) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—The agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) procedures for identifying and providing potential locations of vessels that are in violation of domestic laws and international agreements designed to conserve and manage the living marine resources of the United States;

(2) requirements for the use of surveillance capabilities of the Department of Defense; and

(3) procedures for communicating vessel locations to the Secretary of Commerce and the Coast Guard.

SEC. 203. TRADE NEGOTIATIONS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.

It is the sense of the Congress that the President, in the carrying out of multilateral, bilateral, and regional trade negotiations, should seek to—

(1) address environmental issues related to the negotiations;

(2) reform articles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (referred to in this section as "GATT") to take into consideration the national environmental laws of the Contracting Parties and international environmental treaties;

(3) secure a working party on trade and the environment within GATT as soon as possible;

(4) take an active role in developing trade policies that make GATT more responsive to national and international environmental concerns;

(5) include other Federal agencies with environmental expertise during the negotiations to determine the impact of the proposed trade agreements on national environmental law; and

(6) periodically consult with interested parties concerning the progress of the negotiations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS].

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

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to bring before my colleagues legislation that will ensure that deadly large-scale driftnets will never again be used to ravage the oceans of this planet.

Large-scale driftnet fishing threatens the seas with overfishing and depletion of many species of fish, birds, marine mammals, and other wildlife. These destructive nets—ranging up to 40 miles long—hang in the water like walls of death, drifting with the tides and killing everything that comes in contact with them.

In the 1980's this Nation witnessed a tremendous proliferation in the use of large-scale driftnets by foreign fishermen in the North Pacific Ocean. In just 1 year in the North Pacific alone, over 2 million miles of driftnets were deployed—that is enough net to encircle the earth 80 times. Many of us could only imagine the incredible damage being done to our sea birds, whales, and our important salmon resources. But

we were told by foreign governments not to worry because this method of fishing was no more harmful than any other.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't believe them. Our fishermen—who were experiencing reduced salmon catches—knew better, and the environmental community was working hard to obtain more evidence of the devastating nature of these nets. We all agreed that driftnets were too destructive to allow in our oceans and that strong action was needed. In response to the massive buildup of foreign driftnet vessels, DON YOUNG and I authorized the Driftnet Impact Monitoring, Assessment, and Control Act of 1987. The goal of that law was simple, to obtain enough scientifically reliable data to shut down the fishery. The enactment of this law marked the official start of our 5-year legislative battle to end the use of large-scale driftnets.

As a result of the 1987 law, our Government placed observers on foreign driftnet fishing vessels. The reports we receive from those observers were nothing less than shocking. Tens of thousands of marine mammals, turtles, seabirds, and salmon of U.S. origin were being killed and discarded each year by foreign driftnet fishermen. By 1990, we finally had the scientific data necessary to prove that this method of fishing was devastating to the marine environment and must not be allowed to continue.

The war against large-scale driftnets spread from Congress, to the executive branch, to our environmental and fishing communities, and to the United Nations. In 1989, the U.N. General Assembly passed the first of several resolutions concerning the elimination of large-scale driftnet fishing. This past December, over 30 countries joined the United States in sponsoring Resolution 46-215, calling for a global moratorium on all large-scale driftnet fishing by December 31, 1992.

H.R. 2152 is intended to bolster the efforts of the United Nations to ensure that all nations comply with the required moratorium. Specifically, the bill:

Denies U.S. port privileges to any foreign driftnet fishing vessel. It is already illegal for U.S. fishermen to use large-scale driftnets;

Requires the President to embargo all shellfish, fish, and fish products and sport fishing equipment from countries that do not comply with the U.N. deadline;

Authorizes the President to use his discretionary embargo authority under the Pelly amendment against those countries that continue to ignore the U.N. deadline;

Strengthens the Pelly amendment by expanding the President's discretionary embargo authority to include any product imported from an offending nation;

Requires the Coast Guard and the Departments of Commerce and Defense to enter into an agreement to increase the effectiveness of enforcement of domestic and international fishery laws; and Urges the President—when undertaking multilateral trade negotiations—to address environmental concerns.

Mr. Speaker, our committee began this fight more than 5 years ago; today we have a chance to end it. Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI and his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee have been very supportive of our efforts to end the use of large-scale driftnets. For the first time ever, we are mandating in legislation trade sanctions against those countries that violate an international fisheries conservation agreement. And just as significantly, this bill strengthens the Pelly amendment by increasing the President's negotiating leverage in both international fisheries and wildlife negotiations.

H.R. 2152 is proof that when we all work together, great things can be accomplished. On behalf of our fishermen, the environmental community, and all the cosponsors of this bill, I urge my colleagues to support this very important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this important measure and urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the result of decades of work by our fishing industry to stop one of the most environmentally destructive activities ever invented. For years, hundreds of vessels from foreign nations have been setting driftnets on the high seas and destroying our marine resources. In some years, our fishermen in Alaska have seen their catches reduced to almost zero because the seas have been swept clean by the driftnet fleet.

Finally, after decades of inaction, President Bush's administration has led the charge at the United Nations to bring this fishery to a halt. At the urging of the United States, the United Nations has called for a global ban on large-scale high seas driftnets and, as of the end of this year, all major driftnetting nations have agreed to this ban. While the environmental movement may call this a victory, I want to point out that it is our fishermen in Alaska who led the way to stop driftnetting.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot in this Congress about jobs. This is an American jobs bill. When the driftnet fleet steals our salmon, jobs are lost—fishermen lose their vessels, processing workers are laid off, and support industries suffer, not just in Alaska, but nationwide. If you support American workers, you should support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to particular provisions of this bill.

Section 101(a) denies port privileges to driftnet fishing vessels that wish to enter U.S. ports. This denial is to be made in accordance with recognized principles of international law. A list of the driftnetting nations whose driftnet fishing vessels will be denied our port privileges is to be published no later than 10 days after the date of enactment of this act. It is the intent of our committee that the denial of port privileges shall take place as soon as the Secretary of State notifies each country that is included on the list. We expect the Secretary of State to notify countries immediately so that this sanction can be put into effect.

Section 101(b) imposes sanctions on the importation of fish, fish products, and sport fishing gear from countries that continue to engage in driftnetting on December 31, 1992. This sanction is effective immediately. If a country has vessels that are engaged in the driftnet fishery after that date, a provision is made to allow time for consultations with that country so that the driftnet fishery can be halted. We expect the administration to pay strict attention to the timeframe specified in the bill and not to delay in engaging in consultations or imposing sanctions if they are necessary.

Title II expands the Pelly amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 by giving the President the authority to embargo any product from a nation which is diminishing the effectiveness of an international fish or wildlife conservation program. We expect the President to use this authority broadly. In other words, if a nation is certified under the Pelly amendment and the President decides to impose sanctions, those sanctions are not to be limited to like products, such as imposing sanctions on imported fish products for violation of an international fisheries agreement.

Title II also requires the Coast Guard, the Department of Commerce, and the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement to use the capabilities of the three agencies to increase the effectiveness of enforcement of domestic laws and international agreements that conserve and manage the living marine resources of the United States. We have noted in the past that the three agencies have sometimes been reluctant to work with each other. The committee expects a full cooperative working arrangement among these three agencies. In other words, the committee expects all agencies in the executive branch to take a positive, active role in carrying out the provisions of this bill.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2152. The pur-

pose of H.R. 2152 is to enhance the effectiveness of U.N. Resolution No. 46-215 and to bring an end to the practice of large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas. H.R. 2152 would do so by broadening the import sanctions applicable under United States law to countries whose nationals or vessels engage in large-scale driftnet fishing on or after December 31, 1992.

It is our hope that these import sanctions will never have to be used because all countries have indicated that they intend to comply with U.N. Resolution 46-215. That resolution requires countries to cease driftnet fishing on the high seas no later than December 31, 1992.

In the event that import sanctions are ever warranted, the bill sets forth procedures for applying them that generally follow customary procedures under U.S. trade law.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the provisions of this bill have been worked out in close consultation between the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Committee on Ways and Means. As such, the bill comes to the floor today with broad bipartisan support from both committees. It reflects a clear recognition in the Congress of the importance of coordinating carefully our national policy with respect to the environment and our national policy with respect to international trade.

H.R. 2152 is an excellent example of how to produce legislation that meets the objectives of, and takes into account the concerns of, both the environmental community and the international trade community.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

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

I wanted to commend the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the gentleman from Alaska, the distinguished gentlemen who have brought this legislation to the floor, but I think it is also important to recognize that the real teeth in making this an effective piece of legislation are provided by legislative provisions in the resolution following within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Their ability to write legislation to bring down trade sanctions upon violating countries is crucial to make effective congressional concerns about driftnet fishing. So I commend the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], and other members of that committee.

The subject of this legislation, driftnet fishing, has been addressed by a subcommittee of the Committee on

Foreign Affairs. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. YATRON], and its chairman, and this Member who served as the ranking member, among others on the subcommittee have been concerned about this subject, have held hearings on this subject, and moved legislation on it.

Mr. Speaker, this matter first came to this Member's attention through my position as ranking member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee that has jurisdiction over international environmental policy. I was particularly disturbed by the practices of the Japanese fishing industry. And while the Japanese had at one time given lipservice to the international effort to eliminate driftnet fishing, their actions have suggested otherwise. Indeed, Japan is now claiming that the scientific data does not support the driftnet ban and, therefore, a driftnet moratorium should not be imposed.

But permit me to explore Japanese driftnet practices in more detail, Mr. Speaker.

Japan's use of driftnets causes as much, if not more, damage as its egregious and well-documented whaling practices. Driftnets are plastic filament fishing nets, up to 50 miles long and about 30 feet deep, that are dropped into the ocean, allowed to drift overnight, and pulled up in the morning to harvest the catch. Environmentalists call them walls of death because the nets kill not only the targeted marketable fish, but also everything else with which the nets come into contact—fish, whales, turtles, dolphins, birds, et cetera. This wanton, useless killing is quite literally strip mining of the oceans.

The Japanese have maintained a driftnet fleet in the North Pacific Ocean for over 30 years, mainly intended for harvesting squid. The statistics are gruesome. In the last 6 months of 1989, 32 Japanese fishing boats, or less than 4 percent of the North Pacific driftnet fleet, caught 3 million squid. In the process, they also accidentally killed 58,100 blue sharks, 914 dolphins, 141 porpoises, 52 fur seals, 25 puffins, 22 marine turtles, 539 albatrosses, 8,536 shearwaters, and 17 storm petrels. The driftnet fleets of Japan, Taiwan, and the Republic of Korea employ 40,000 miles of driftnets each night in the North Pacific alone, or 2 million miles of nets each season.

In 1981, Japan instituted a limited entry management system to regulate where in the North Pacific driftnets are allowed and when they may be used, but incredible damage occurs despite these regulations. In December 1987, Congress passed the Driftnet Impact Monitoring, Assessment, and Control Act requiring negotiations with the governments of the principle driftnet fishing nations—Japan, Taiwan, and the Republic of Korea—to develop cooperative scientific monitor-

ing, assessment, and enforcement agreements on driftnet fishing. As a result of these negotiations, transmitters have been placed on some Japanese boats to allow satellites to follow the location of the vessels, and United States monitors have been allowed on-board some vessels operating outside of authorized fishing areas. However, the number of transmitters, observers, and other monitoring programs remains insufficient to accurately measure and analyze the activities of Japan's large driftnet fleets, and the monitoring agreements affect only the Japanese fleets in the North Pacific Ocean. Driftnet fishing in the South Pacific is just as destructive—environmentalists say that the large-scale driftnet fishing in the South Pacific could put the populations of albacore tuna, dolphins, whales, sea birds, and sea turtles at risk.

A recent development in Japan's driftnet fishing operations involves the violation of a Soviet-Japanese fisheries treaty. This treaty controls where and when Japan can fish in the North Pacific Ocean, limits the annual catch that Japan can take from these waters, and requires Japan to pay the U.S.S.R. an annual fisheries cooperation fee. Recently, Soviet patrol boats stopped a fleet of 12 North Korean driftnet boats operating in these restricted waters, only to discover that they were in fact Japanese boats. Apparently, a Japanese fishing company arranged with the North Korean's to lease Japanese boats and market the catch, reflagging the ships as North Korean. This would allow Japan to get around the quotas set by the Soviets, which have been significantly decreased over the last few years. It is not known whether the Japanese Government was aware of this deal, so we do not know whether the Government or private industry is to blame.

International concern for the environment has increased dramatically in recent years, including concern for the marine environment. In July 1989, the South Pacific Forum, an association of South Pacific nations, issued the Tarawa Declaration condemning the use of driftnets. According to the forum, the use of driftnets is "not consistent with international legal requirements in relations to rights and obligations of high seas fisheries conservation and environmental principles," and Japan and Taiwan are guilty of "indiscriminate, irresponsible, and destructive driftnet fishing." Last December, the United Nations passed a resolution calling for a ban on driftnet fishing in the South Pacific by June 30, 1991, and in the rest of the world by June 30, 1992, and the International Whaling Commission has passed a resolution in support of this U.N. resolution.

We in the Congress could pass resolutions deploring driftnet fishing until

we are blue in the face without great effect. However, it is apparently only legislation like this, which begins to make it hurt when the nations practice this egregious kind of conduct which is so damaging to the fisheries industry and to the sea life of the world, that will cause offending nations and their fishing fleets to stop this driftnet fishing. So I commend the Merchant Marine and Ways and Means Committees for their effort and urge adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 1350

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

I want to join in commending the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the others who brought this legislation before us, but I also want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for his role in this important problem. The gentleman has described it exactly as it is. Driftnets are really hurting the sea life of the world; it needs to be stopped. This legislation will finally put some real teeth into our efforts.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his past expressed concern and for his kind comments.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for failing to commend individually every member of the Committee on Ways and Means. That was incorporated in my statement. They are duly commended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2152, a bill to enhance the effectiveness of the U.N. International Driftnet Fishery Conservation Program.

For several years, the United States has endeavored to protect marine mammals and threatened and endangered species from large-scale destruction such as that caused by driftnets. In 1990, the enactment of the Magnuson fishery management conservation reauthorization implemented a ban on the use of driftnets in the U.S. 200 mile exclusive economic zone and a prohibition of the use of such nets by U.S. fishing fleets anywhere in the world. It also prohibited the importation into the United States of certain fish or fish products caught with these nets.

In late 1989, the United Nations passed a resolution calling for the ban on large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas by June 30, 1992. In December 1991, the U.N. resolution was strengthened and the ban deadline pushed back to December 31, 1992.

The time has come to ensure compliance with the international morato-

rium by all nations. For too many years, driftnetters have been allowed to fish the seas, decimating populations of marine mammals, sea birds, sea turtles, and nontarget fish populations, in addition to seriously overfishing target species. Lost or discarded driftnets roam the seas unabated causing widespread destruction of marine life.

H.R. 2152 encourages full implementation of the U.N. resolution to end large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas by prohibiting fishing vessels of nations that engage in driftnet fishing from entering U.S. ports, and imposing certain import sanctions against countries whose vessels violate the moratorium. The bill also expands the authority of the President to impose import restrictions on any product of a nation which conducts fishery practices or engages in trade that diminish the effectiveness of international programs for fishery conservation or the protection of endangered or threatened species.

I strongly support H.R. 2152 and am pleased that the legislation includes language to notify nations of impending United States action when countries are in violation of the driftnet moratorium.

This legislation expresses the sense of Congress that we, as a nation, must do our part to end large-scale driftnet fishing and preserve our important marine life and I urge my colleagues support for its passage.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2152, which strengthens U.S. efforts to end the practice of driftnet fishing. I have long supported this measure as vital to protecting U.S. fisheries off the coast of the United States.

Ending driftnet fishing will have beneficial effects not only on the high seas, but in areas such as my landlocked rural northern California district as well. Overfishing of species such as salmon, which return inland to spawn, often has unintended side effects. It can trigger Endangered Species Act protections which have serious consequences on communities located hundreds of miles from the coast.

I regret that we did not take this step years ago. If we had, it may very well have prevented a serious problem affecting my district.

The winter run of chinook salmon, which spawns in the Sacramento River, has varied in number between 1,500 and 3,000 fish in recent years. Last year, however, it has dwindled to an estimated 200 fish. As a result, extraordinary measures are being taken to protect the remaining fish, including the drawdown of several major reservoirs, such as Whiskeytown Lake.

This action is wreaking havoc on the surrounding communities, threatening

their access to domestic water supplies, and devastating the local economy.

Driftnets such as we are trying to eliminate here today have had a major impact on the chinook salmon. We must take steps such as enacting H.R. 2152 if we are going to successfully prevent these types of environmental and economic disasters from occurring again. I urge the adoption of this vitally needed legislation.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman and the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor. It is certainly much-needed legislation. The need for it illustrates the fact that people through sheer greed can be unthoughtful of those around them in the world.

Also, it protects the environment in a way which needs to be protected.

This legislation is very much overdue. I appreciate the activity of the committee in bringing it to the floor.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] is recognized for a total of 5 minutes.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the chairman and the ranking member of our Fisheries Subcommittee for their leadership and the opportunity to work with them in bringing this bill to the floor today.

I want to begin by thanking the chairman and ranking member of our Fisheries Subcommittee for their leadership and for the opportunity to work with them in bringing this bill to the floor today. During the past 3 years we have brought several pieces of driftnet legislation before this body. We initiated the bill establishing the U.S. policy of securing a global ban on this fishing practice, and we repeatedly sent the message to our negotiators that they must seek nothing less.

H.R. 2152 builds upon these past efforts and is the most comprehensive and strongest step yet to ensure an end to large-scale driftnet fishing. It lets these driftnetting nations know that if they insist on plundering the world's marine resources, we will deny port privileges to their ships and ban imports of their fish, fish products, and sportfishing equipment.

This bill also strengthens current driftnet enforcement efforts by requiring the Department of Defense to supplement the Coast Guard's limited surveillance resources. These provisions are similar to H.R. 2920, a bill I intro-

duced last summer to crack down on pirate vessels that blatantly ignore national laws and international agreements.

Enforcement of these measures, however, must be more than a U.S. effort. We need a worldwide commitment to ensure that our marine resources are not depleted, and sustainable harvests are ensured for future generations. This is why I am introducing a resolution that calls upon our negotiators to seek international monitoring and enforcement agreements to ensure effective implementation of a global ban on large-scale driftnets. I hope we can act on this proposal—perhaps even including it in H.R. 2152—at a later date.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2152 includes two additional provisions that, while not directly related to large-scale driftnet fishing, reflect the same American frustration with the unwillingness of some nations to meet their obligation to conserve the fish and wildlife resources of our planet.

The first is based on a bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] to expand the President's embargo authority against nations that violate international agreements aimed at protecting our natural resources.

The second is based on a bill I introduced in response to a recent decision by a panel of GATT to restrict the use of trade sanctions to protect international resources.

The GATT decision, which was based on a United States embargo of tuna from Mexico, is troubling because it means that no country may have any law to protect the environment, or a species, outside its own geographic territory.

The implications of this ruling are enormous. It jeopardizes international programs to ensure rational management of migratory fisheries, compliance with an international whaling moratorium, and the international agreement to end large-scale driftnet fishing.

H.R. 2151 responds to these concerns by calling upon U.S. negotiators to address environmental issues during trade negotiations, and to develop trade policies that make GATT more responsive to national and international environmental concerns.

Strengthening our driftnet laws, expanding the President's embargo authority under the Pelly amendment, and reforming GATT are important steps toward environmentally sustainable management of the world's living resources. Unfortunately, the administration continues to oppose this bill based upon the strong driftnet language. I remind my colleagues that this is not the first time the administration has blindly opposed our legislation to end large-scale driftnet fishing. We have cast aside shortsighted administration objections before. I urge us to do so again.

□ 1400

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, without whose help we would never have pushed this legislation and this world policy to this point, and also thank the ranking members of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for their leadership in this area.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], for their roles in bringing the bill to the floor today.

It is a strong bill. It will ensure an end to the terribly wasteful and destructive practice of large-scale driftnet fishing and improve the international management of our living marine resources. Again, I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD] for her very active leadership in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to commend Chairman STUDDS, Chairman GIBBONS, Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and many other Members for once again, bringing the spectre of driftnet fishing to the forefront of public awareness.

As a Pacific Islander, I am acutely aware of the dangers posed by driftnet fishing.

To illustrate the extent of driftnet activity that occurs in the high seas, for example in 1990—according to a report from a meeting held in British Columbia between the United States, Japan, and Canada—approximately 106 million targeted squid were caught and that an estimated 41 million other forms of marine life and mammals from over 100 species were killed as bycatch. This bycatch included 39 million other fish species, 700,000 sharks, 270,000 sea birds, 141,000 salmon, 24,000 marine mammals, and 406 sea turtles.

When these numbers, which represent only 1 year's data for a high seas driftnet fishery in one region are considered globally and over a number of years, the destructive and wasteful nature of this indiscriminate fishing method simply cannot be denied.

Some scientists have noted that the rate of nontarget species bycatch may even be higher, since many animals drop out of the 30-40 kilometer long driftnets as the nets are hauled in.

The U.N. General Assembly was right to call the world's attention to this important global problem by adopting resolutions 44-225 and 45-197.

The largescale driftnet fishing countries have had ample opportunity in the 3 years since the 1989 resolution to

prepare to end this indiscriminate and wasteful fishing method by June 30, of this year.

In October 1989, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 214 to support regional efforts to end driftnet fishing in the South Pacific. I honestly believe this and other legislation passed by the Congress helped formulate a decision by Japan, Taiwan, and Korea to comply with U.N. Resolution 44-225 and withdraw their driftnet vessels from the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, some will argue that this legislation violates certain provisions of the GATT and constitutes an illegal barrier to trade.

In August 1991, a secret three-person dispute resolution panel of the GATT declared that "no country may have any law to protect the environment or a species outside of its own geographic territory."

In my opinion, this type of irresponsible reasoning will lead to massive destruction of the Earth's dwindling resources and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress must not yield its responsibility on environmental policy to satisfy the needs of those who take no responsibility for conserving the world's food resources.

It is now technologically possible to destroy a majority of the fish and wildlife stocks on the high seas—I ask my colleagues to "take another giant step for mankind," and support H.R. 2152—it is not too late to save us from ourselves.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone who has gone uncommended, at this point who deserve it, I think it is probably the fishermen of the State of Alaska, who first called this to our attention with the observation of netmarks on the salmon returning to spawn in the rivers of Alaska. They were the ones, I think, who sounded the alarm bell to their distinguished Representative, their distinguished and determined Representative, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and brought it to our attention.

Those are U.S. resources obviously being intercepted on the high seas. It really is, I think, fitting that this debate ended with a tribute to the fishermen of Alaska, who first brought that to the attention of Congressman YOUNG and to the rest of this institution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that no one deserves commendation more than the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG]. He has been an eloquent and tireless voice on behalf of those fishermen. We all owe him a debt. This is one of those areas where once again with some humility I can say on behalf of the gentleman from Alaska and myself that your humble and loyal Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have brought to this floor a bill that has genuine bipartisan

support and that is important to an awful lot of people and that matters and that will really accomplish something.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman. I commend the members of both committees.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the subcommittee. I will duplicate what the gentleman from Massachusetts said, that this bill is long overdue and that the gentleman has met the charge of the chairman. And now we have it through Ways and Means, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the gentleman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD]. Those people worked very hard, and I am glad that today we will pass this legislation.

I again compliment the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2152, legislation to enhance the effectiveness of the U.N. international driftnet fishery conservation program. I would like to thank Chairman STUDDS, Mr. YOUNG, and other members of the committee for their attention and commitment to this issue. I was able to work closely with Chairman STUDDS in the drafting of this bill and I am pleased to be an original cosponsor.

I am pleased that this bill has received such wide support in Congress, and I believe that it will give some teeth to the U.S. driftnetting policy. At this time, it is still profitable for foreign countries to engage in driftnetting. Much to my dismay, it has been said that driftnet activity has been increasing in areas across the globe such as the People's Republic of China, France, Ireland, Taiwan, and Korea.

H.R. 2152 would correct this problem by imposing economic sanctions and denying port privileges to countries that engage in driftnetting, as well as by requiring the State, Commerce, and Defense Departments to use their resources to enforce the U.N. driftnet ban.

There are no known driftnet fisheries that do not incidentally take marine mammals in the net as well. The National Marine Fisheries Service recently released data that showed that a mere 10 percent of Japanese driftnets caught more than 81,000 blue sharks, 30,000 sea birds, 1,700 whales and dolphins, and more than 10,000 salmon and steelhead. I believe that Congress must discontinue the importation of tuna from these nations as a demonstration of our disapproval of their inhumane treatment of marine wildlife.

I urge my colleagues to continue their support of this legislation and vote to pass H.R. 2152.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2152, legislation to impose tough sanctions of nations which fail to abide by international restrictions of the use of large-scale driftnets.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, Mr. STUDDS,

for his leadership in moving this important piece of legislation. I also want to commend the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, for his expeditious work in advancing this legislation.

This measure would deny entry into U.S. ports to vessels from nations which continue to use large-scale driftnets in violation of an international moratorium. Further, if these countries do not adhere to the U.N.-imposed deadline of December 31, 1992, to end this destructive fishing practice, fish, fish products, and sport fishing equipment from those countries will be denied access to U.S. markets. If 6 months after this deadline countries continue driftnetting, the President is given the authority to expand the embargo to any product from that nation.

This is tough legislation—some may say too tough—but the time for ignoring the environmental atrocities of some of our trading partners must come to an end. This legislation sends the clear signal that the United States will exercise its right to enforce its domestic environmental laws and support international efforts to stop environmental destruction.

The international community has taken steps to stop the senseless slaughter of marine mammals caused by the use of large-scale driftnets. Certain nations, however, are not prepared to abide by the U.N. resolution and insist on continuing this heinous practice. For the sake of our environment, and the economic welfare of nations which are observing the ban in good faith, we must be ready to respond with sanctions. This bill does that.

In this era of global economic interdependence, trade has the promise of strengthening cooperation between nations on a whole range of issues, including environmental protection. Given the ominous findings of late about the pace of global degradation of our air, water, land, and biological resources, environmental cooperation must become a top priority in our trade negotiations. I am very pleased that the bill brought to the floor contains language, which several of my colleagues and I sponsored in committee, to direct the administration to work for our environmental and economic interests in all trade negotiations.

This measure directs the U.S. Trade Representative to press environmental concerns during all trade negotiations and to work for changes in the international trade regime to stress environmental concerns and to ensure that the end result is a strengthening, not weakening, of environmental protections. In the past, U.S. negotiators have not emphasized environmental protection in international trade talks. This has allowed companies operating in nations with minimal environmental protections to enjoy a competitive advantage over firms operating in the United States, and permitted other nations to continue practices that threaten our global environment. The international system, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], allows negotiators to virtually ignore environmental issues. The word "environment" does not appear once in the text of the GATT's authorizing document. It is high time that that changes.

Americans should be proud that we have one of the most advanced environmental protection programs in the world, but those stand-

ards should not cost us jobs. It's time for the administration to stand up for the environment and U.S. workers and demand that our trading partners impose strong environmental protections within their borders. We can preserve our environmental laws and strengthen the economy, but only if our trade representatives make protecting the environment and U.S. jobs a priority.

Under the current system, nations can harm the environment, exploit their workers, and undercut the U.S. economy—all under the guise of free trade. This legislation requires the U.S. Trade Representative to fight for fair trade that will prevent countries from damaging the environment and siphoning off U.S. jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. AUCCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2152, a bill to enforce the total ban on open-sea driftnet fishing. I want to thank Chairmen JONES, STUDDS, and ROSTENKOWSKI for their work in bringing this bill to the floor. Many of our colleagues have worked hard on this issue, but I must especially commend Representative UNSOELD for her tireless efforts to end this devastating practice that has threatened marine mammals, birds, and fish in the Pacific.

There can be no doubt that our efforts in this body are largely responsible for the complete termination of driftnet fishing that is scheduled to take place by the end of this year.

We woke up the State Department on this issue. We convinced them to adopt a firm negotiating position. This led to Japan's concessions and culminated in the latest U.N. General Assembly resolution, which was adopted late last year. Without our efforts, this progress would not have been possible.

But if we won the driftnet war, we must now enforce the driftnet peace. This bill provides many of the tools we need to achieve this goal.

Successful enforcement also depends on our making sure that the Coast Guard and other Federal agencies have the resources to carry out their responsibilities.

For many years, I've worked to increase the Coast Guard budget during the appropriations process. This year, I intend to press for adequate support of the Coast Guard's driftnet enforcement activities as well as its many other responsibilities.

There is a broader lesson in the driftnetting issue. For too long, our efforts to protect the marine environment where frustrated as other nations argued that driftnetting was good economics.

That was never true. Driftnetting is bad economics because it makes effective resource management impossible.

That's why I'm pleased that H.R. 2152 calls for the careful coordination of trade policy with environmental concerns.

It's time to recognize that the global environment must have a place in our consideration of trade and other issues. We cannot afford to ignore environmental abuses in other lands, for they touch us all. Most certainly, we cannot allow environmental destruction to proceed in the name of open trading practices.

I strongly support passage of H.R. 2152. I hope it will be followed by many more con-

structive efforts to protect the environment of this planet.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the driftnet fishing sanctions legislation. This legislation represents part of the legislation I introduced last November to ensure a more stable economic market for sockeye salmon.

Specifically, the legislation would prohibit the fishing vessels of nations that engage in large-scale driftnet fishing from entering U.S. ports, and impose import sanctions against countries whose vessels continue to use large-scale driftnets on the high seas after December 31, 1992—the U.N. deadline for all nations to end such fishing.

The measure also would expand the authority of the President to impose import restrictions on any product of a nation which conducts fishery practices, or engages in trade, that diminish the effectiveness of international programs for fishery conservation or the protection of endangered or threatened species.

Currently, the salmon market is substantially impacted by large-scale driftnet fishing. Every summer, fishermen from my district and many others go to Alaska to fish for sockeye salmon in Bristol Bay. Prior to the Alaskan fishing season, fishermen from various countries are using large-scale driftnets on the high seas to catch U.S. sockeye salmon illegally. When salmon is caught on the high seas and subsequently sold on the black market, the price of our fishermen's salmon inevitably decreases. Consequently, our fishermen are receiving a ridiculously low price for their salmon catch. This past season the fishermen just broke even. This legislation will help put an end to this extremely unfair market.

Additionally, this legislation addresses the devastating effect that large-scale driftnet fishing has on the environment. Thousands of sea birds and endangered sea turtles, and hundreds of thousands of marine mammals, including whales and dolphins, are caught and killed in the large-scale driftnets. This legislation will put a vitally necessary halt to this environmental destruction.

Today we have the opportunity to show our strong support for putting an end to large-scale driftnet fishing and its deleterious effects. I urge you to support this legislation and, by doing so, support our fishermen, fair trade, and the environment.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in attacking the horrendous scourge of driftnet fishing by supporting H.R. 2152. This farsighted legislation will strengthen the U.N. moratorium against driftnetting, and it will signal to the world that the United States is prepared to take a leading role in protecting the environment.

Let there be no doubt about the destructiveness of driftnet fishing. A report released last summer by the National Marine Fisheries Service documents that thousands of animals are killed in large-scale driftnets each year. Observers monitored only 10 percent of the Japanese driftnetting fleet last year and found that those nets alone caught 81,000 blue sharks, 30,000 sea birds, 1,700 whales and dolphins, and almost 10,000 salmon and steelhead. That's just 10 percent of the Japanese fleet, and Japan is only one of many countries now driftnetting.

It is no wonder so many fish and other marine animals are swept up by these nets. Drift nets are up to 60 feet in depth and stretch for more than 30 miles—about the distance between here and Dulles Airport. They are literally walls of death. And the amount of net that is laid is extraordinary. The driftnet fleet in the North Pacific—about 1,200 vessels—casts more than 25,000 miles of net each summer night—enough net if laid end to end to wrap around the Earth's Equator.

Much is made, and rightly so, of the threat that driftnets pose to endangered species such as dolphins and sea turtles. But driftnets also threaten the balance, and the very existence, of our ocean ecosystems. With estimates that the world's oceans can only produce a total of 100 million tons of fish a year, and with present estimates suggesting that only about 85 million tons are now being produced, the indiscriminate destruction wrought by driftnets could play a part in an irreversible decline in marine life.

As a Representative of the island State of Hawaii, I fully appreciate the harm that can be done by these massive and destructive nets. Our tradition in the islands is to respect the ocean, take only what we need and can use, and leave the rest for another day. Preserving our most precious sources of life and sustenance on land and sea is a heritage too often forgotten by modern societies. Driftnet fishing is one of the most devastating examples of this.

The international community recognizes the problems posed by large-scale pelagic driftnet fishing on the high seas. In December 1989, the United States cosponsored Resolution 44-225 that was adopted by consensus by the General Assembly [UNGA], as was reaffirmation Resolution 45-197 a year later. UNGA Resolution 44-225 calls for an end to the use of large-scale pelagic driftnets on the high seas by June 30, 1992, unless jointly agreed conservation and management regimes can be put in place to prevent the unacceptable impacts posed by this fishing method on the marine environment.

But the U.N. moratorium is not enough. Despite indications that Ireland, Taiwan, and Great Britain intend to prohibit their fishermen from high seas driftnet fishing after the United Nations deadline, recent violations of existing agreements by Taiwan and the Republic of Korea and the reemergence of Chinese driftnet vessels in the North Pacific fishery has led many to question whether the United Nations moratorium will be fully implemented. That these violations came after the announcements of all of these nations that driftnet fishing would be halted doesn't help.

In fact, Japan has confirmed these doubts indicating that it intends to continue this practice after the United Nations deadline. On September 27, 1991, the Government of Japan filed a position paper with the United Nations challenging the moratorium called for in Resolution No. 44-225. They claimed at that time that the scientific data does not support the driftnet ban and, therefore, according to the language in the resolution, the moratorium should not be imposed. Although this prompted the United Nations to issue its reaffirmation resolution calling upon all nations to implement the moratorium without exception, it

is now clear that the resolution may be fought, and may be ignored.

H.R. 2152 will enhance the effectiveness of the U.N. moratorium by denying port privileges to any nation that engages in driftnet fishing. It will also allow the President to impose sanctions on certain imported goods of those countries. This will send a signal to the rest of the world that the United States is prepared to use the power of its markets to enforce measures that seek to protect endangered species and our environmental resources.

But this crucial legislation goes further. It declares it to be the policy of Congress that environmental issues should be addressed during all international trade negotiations. And it directs the President, acting through the office of the U.S. Trade Representative, to pursue changes to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] that would result in consideration of, and conformation to, the domestic environmental laws of the contracting parties to the GATT.

H.R. 2152 would also direct the President to seek to secure a working party on trade and the environment within the GATT as soon as possible. This working party would establish procedures to include environmental issues in ongoing and future GATT negotiations. Finally, it would direct the President to take an active role in developing national and global trade policies which make the GATT more responsive to environmental concerns, and to involve Federal agencies with environmental expertise in all trade negotiations.

H.R. 2152 is farsighted legislation that will signal to the world that the United States is prepared to take a leading role in confronting our environmental crises. And it will make it clear that we are prepared to back up U.N. regulations with our markets and our Government. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important bill. Vote yes on H.R. 2152.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2152, the U.S. International Driftnet Fishery Conservation Program. I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this legislation which will significantly enhance the effectiveness of the U.N. international driftnet fishing ban.

It is imperative that the United States support strong international and domestic enforcement of environmental laws. Large-scale driftnets, which often exceed 30 miles in length, entangle virtually everything with which they come into contact. For the past several years we have worked in the United Nations and in other international bodies to reduce driftnet fishing operations. Unfortunately, the practice has not been eliminated. Hundreds of thousands of fish, dolphins, whales, turtles, and sea birds have been killed.

In 1987 the Driftnet Impact Monitoring, Assessment, and Control Act was passed. This was intended to monitor, assess, and reduce the adverse impacts of large-scale driftnets. The year 1989 saw the inception of the Wellington Convention, or the Convention for the Prohibition of Fishing with Long Driftnets in the South Pacific. The convention prohibited fishermen of member nations, including more than 20 South Pacific nations, the United States, and France, from using large-scale driftnets in their operations and encouraged the same

practice in other countries. In addition, the convention set July 1, 1991, as the date for the elimination of this fishing practice in the South Pacific.

The United Nations addressed this problem when it adopted resolutions in 1989 and 1991 which recognized international efforts to stop large-scale driftnet fishing. Resolution No. 46-215 established a moratorium on all large scale driftnet fishing on the high seas effective December 31, 1992. The United States supported this recommendation and other attempts to discourage driftnet fishing by enacting the fishery conservation amendments in 1991.

However, some countries have already indicated that they will continue to use large-scale driftnets even after the U.N. deadline. With H.R. 2152, we have before us today an opportunity to address the issue and enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations resolution by broadening the import sanctions applicable under United States law to countries which engage in this type of fishing.

Specifically, this legislation provides for the implementation of U.S. sanctions and denial of port privileges for countries whose vessels continue to engage in large-scale driftnet fishing. Perhaps an even more important provision of the bill establishes Congress' policy that environmental issues should be addressed during all international trade negotiations.

It is imperative that international trade agreements not interfere with our environmental laws. H.R. 2152 codifies these goals and gives us some recourse against those nations which refuse to comply with the ban against large-scale driftnet fishing. I hope you will join me in supporting this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, when I visit students, schools, and constituents in the Second Congressional District of New York, one issue which invariably arises is the matter of driftnet fishing and the horrible toll it extracts on dolphins and other marine life. We must put a stop to this practice.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 2152, a bill that would impose certain sanctions against countries whose fishing vessels engage in large-scale driftnet fishing on the high seas after December 31, 1992. The bill's purpose is to discourage nations from continuing large-scale driftnet fishing on the open seas and to increase the effectiveness of the U.N. International Driftnet Fishery Conservation Program.

H.R. 2152 would impose sanctions against countries whose fishing vessels continue to use large-scale driftnets on the high seas after December 31, 1992—the U.N. deadline for all nations to end this method of fishing. It would prohibit these nations' ships from entering U.S. ports and expand the President's authority to impose import restrictions on any products of any nation that engages in driftnet fishing. It would also ban all fish, shellfish, and sport fishing equipment from offending nations. The Departments of State, Commerce, and Treasury would coordinate their notification of offending countries prior to the periodic publication of a list of countries or citizens who are engaged in large-scale driftnet fishing and who will be denied entry to U.S. ports.

This bill also expresses the sense of Congress that to assist in coordinating U.S. trade policy with U.S. environmental policy, the President, in expediting multilateral, bilateral, and regional trade negotiations, should address environmental issues related to negotiations; reform the International General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT] to include consideration of international environmental treaties and national environmental laws; create a GATT working party on trade and environment; work to make GATT more responsive to national and international environmental concerns; and include other Federal agencies with environmental expertise in U.S. trade negotiations.

Drift net fishing throughout the world threatens the viability of marine species and ecosystems for entire regions. Large-scale net or combinations of nets indiscriminately kill hundreds of thousands of marine mammals such as dolphins and whales, endangered sea turtles, sea birds, and millions of nontarget fish.

The Fifth Annual General Assembly of Global Legislators for a Balanced Environment—of which I am a member and which includes members of the European Parliament, the Japanese Diet, the Commonwealth of Independent States, and the United States Congress—recently approved a policy to promote the implementation of the United Nations resolution which calls for a global moratorium on driftnet fishing.

I call on my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2152. It will put the United States on record in support of sanctions against those countries who continue large-scale driftnet fishing on the open seas. It will express the resolve of the U.S. Congress to end the unintentional damage to our environment that this practice causes, and it will signal the importance the U.S. Congress attaches to addressing environmental issues in the context of trade negotiations.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2152, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STEAMTOWN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3519) to authorize the establishment of the Steamtown National Historic Site, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3519

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

TITLE I—STEAMTOWN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

SEC. 101. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) In order to preserve and interpret certain elements of railroading, especially steam-operated railroads during the period of 1850 to 1950, there is hereby established the Steamtown National Historic Site (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "historic site"). The purposes of the historic site shall include interpretation of the evolution of railroads and their impact on the development of this nation, including technological, economic, social, and political effects and the relationship of railroads to industrialization.

(b) The historic site shall consist of the lands and interests in lands within the area generally depicted on the map entitled "Boundary Map, Steamtown National Historic Site", numbered STTO-80,000A, and dated November 1991. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. No revisions may be made in the boundary of the historic site, except by Act of Congress.

(c) Sections 1 through 5 of the Steamtown National Historic Site Act of 1986 (Public Law 90-591; 100 Stat. 3341-248-249) are hereby repealed.

SEC. 102. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Secretary") shall administer the historic site in accordance with this title and with the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the national park system, including the Act entitled "An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2, 3, and 4). On or before September 30, 1993, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a new comprehensive general management plan for the historic site. The plan shall be consistent with this title, with section 12 of the Act of August 18, 1970 (16 U.S.C. 1a-1 through 1a-7) and with other applicable provisions of law.

SEC. 103. ACQUISITION OF LAND.

(a) The Secretary may acquire lands or interests in land within the boundaries of the historic site only by donation or by purchase with donated funds.

(b) The Secretary may not acquire any lands or interests in lands for purposes of the historic site unless such lands are not contaminated with hazardous substances which will require removal or remedial action at the expense of the United States. Any funds of the National Park Service expended, prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, on removal or remedial action with respect to any contamination of lands within the boundaries of historic site shall be fully reimbursed before the Secretary may accept title to any lands for purposes of the historic site. Any such reimbursement shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury. After the full amount of such reimbursement has been credited to miscellaneous receipts, funds expended prior to the date of enactment of this Act by the National Park Service for which such reimbursement was made shall not be treated as amounts expended by the National Park Service for development for purposes of applying the limitation on appropriations for development set forth in section 106.

SEC. 104. PARK SERVICE ACTIVITIES.

(a) The Secretary shall take such actions as necessary and appropriate to administer

the historic site, to maintain and preserve the facilities at the historic site, to interpret the resources of the site and their history to the public, and to provide essential services to the public at the historic site.

(b) The Secretary shall preserve the collection of railroad equipment, including locomotives and rolling stock, which is present at the historic site as of the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary may also preserve such equipment and essential machinery as is necessary for the maintenance of the locomotives and rolling stock. A maximum of 3 steam locomotives and one diesel locomotive may be restored, but only 2 steam locomotives and one diesel locomotive may be operational at any time. The Secretary may not reconstruct or construct new yard equipment or other historic structures or objects. No Federal funds may be expended to provide access between the historic site and any structure that is privately owned and operated for profit. The Secretary may exchange or purchase appropriate examples of locomotives and rolling stock to enhance the site's collection if the total number of such equipment does not increase and if all such actions are consistent with the general management plan for the historic site. The Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, seek donations and assistance from volunteers and other cost-sharing methods to restore the locomotives and rolling stock.

(c) The Secretary shall preserve the artifact collection and archival materials located at the site.

(d) To the extent that it furthers public understanding, and provided that appropriate interpretation is provided, the Secretary may provide a regular excursion from Scranton, Pennsylvania, to Moscow, Pennsylvania. For purposes of such excursions, the Secretary may provide essential visitor services at Moscow, Pennsylvania. The Secretary may not expend funds of the National Park Service for the restoration or maintenance of tracks, bridges or tunnels located outside the historic site, except that the Secretary may use funds appropriated prior to November 15, 1991 for restoration of tracks and bridges between the historic site and Moscow, Pennsylvania, pursuant to the cooperative agreement to be entered into between the Secretary and the owner of such tracks and bridges permitting the National Park Service to use such tracks and bridges for excursions authorized under this section. The Secretary may pay customary and appropriate track usage fees and may also provide 4 other excursions annually if no such excursion is longer than 50 miles one way.

(e) User fees charged for any rail excursion undertaken shall be established at a level such that a minimum of 75 percent of the costs of maintenance, personnel and equipment for the excursion shall be covered by revenues from the user permit.

(f) The Secretary may assist the owner of Bridge 60 and Bridge 60 Wye with track and switch rehabilitation to facilitate activities associated with the historic site.

(g) The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with appropriate authorities for law enforcement and for purposes of controlling rail traffic through the historic site.

SEC. 105. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) here is hereby established the Steamtown National Historic Site Advisory Committee (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "advisory committee") to provide professional expertise in railroad management and history and advice to the Secretary in the development and operations of the historic site. The advisory committee

shall be composed of 11 members appointed by the Secretary to serve for terms of 3 years. The advisory committee shall include 2 experts in the operation of historic railways, 2 experts in the operation of commercial railways, 2 historians of technology, and 2 historians of social history, and 3 members of the general public. Any member of the advisory committee appointed for a definite term may serve after the expiration of his or her term until his successor is appointed. The advisory committee shall designate one of its members as Chairperson.

(b) The Secretary, or his or her designee, shall from time to time, but at least semi-annually, meet and consult with the advisory committee on matters relating to the management and development of the site.

(c) The advisory committee shall meet at least 3 times annually.

(d) Members of the advisory committee shall serve without compensation as such, but the Secretary may pay expenses reasonably incurred in carrying out their responsibilities under this title on vouchers signed by the Chairperson.

(e) The provisions of section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. Appendix; 86 Stat. 776), are hereby waived with respect to this advisory committee.

(f) The advisory committee shall terminate on the date 10 years after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 106. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, but not to exceed a total of \$58,000,000 for development, reduced by all amounts appropriated for development since October 1, 1987. No Federal funds may be expended at the site for purposes other than those specified in section 104 and in section 105(d).

TITLE II—DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 201. BOUNDARIES.

Section 2(a) of the Act of September 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 612; 16 U.S.C. 4600-1(a)) establishing the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area is amended by striking "as generally depicted on the drawing entitled 'Proposed Tocks Island National Recreation Area' dated and numbered September 1962, NRA-TI-7100, which drawing is on file" and inserting "as generally depicted on the map entitled 'Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area' dated November 1991 and numbered DWGNRA-620/80,900A' which shall be on file".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on H.R. 3519.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3519, introduced by Congressman JOE MCDADE, establishes Steamtown National Historic Site in Scranton, PA. The House acted on the initial authorization in 1986 but the Senate did not act; rather the Steamtown unit first received authorization in 1986 through provisions that were inserted in the fiscal year 1987 Interior Appropriations Act. Since that time there has been considerable attention given to Steamtown in the press, almost all of it negative.

The National Park Service has already spent \$39 million on Steamtown with another \$13 million appropriated for fiscal year 1992 putting total spending at over 2½ times the \$20 million amount authorized for the site in the initial law.

Few people are neutral about Steamtown—most either love it or hate it. For Steamtown proponents, the site offers a unique educational experience in a historic setting. Steamtown opponents have decried its costs and argue that the locomotives and railcars, collected in Vermont and moved to Scranton, PA, lack integrity and significance.

Besides the scope and cost of the site, I have had serious concerns about the management of Steamtown. Considerable amounts of Federal funds have been spent on lands and interests in lands the National Park Service doesn't own. The National Park Service paid for cleaning up hazardous wastes on non-federally owned lands, raising serious issues of policy and liability. The National Park Service has been attempting to develop many of the railroad train excursions, raising questions whether the National Park Service is getting into the railroad tourism business in a major and inappropriate manner. Plans for the site have undergone little or no critical internal review. I am not pleased that the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in an action that appeared to be done in concert with the Steamtown operation expanded its boundary by 28 miles without any action by the authorizing committee, much less agreement.

Looking where we stand today, I believe Steamtown should continue as a National Historic Site but believe that future development and operation of the site should be consistent with Congressional and National Park Service policies and practices. Hopefully both advocates and opponents can agree today on such a format.

Unfortunately, all too common the view of Steamtown is as typified in a letter I received from Mr. Michael Boland, president of the Downtown Scranton Business Association. Mr. Boland in opposing the Interior Committee's effort to place limitations on Steamtown because, and I quote, "Without the full development of the park as now planned it cannot hope to

become a fully operating railroad museum capable of attracting tourists, who in turn will have a positive effect on our economy."

Mr. Speaker, the National Park System has a unique mission: To preserve and interpret nationally significant places of our heritage. While doing so the actions certainly assist local economies, but that should never be the primary purpose of national park units. Mr. Boland's letter illustrates my concern that Steamtown National Historic Site is less viewed as a national park unit than as an economic redevelopment package. Economic redevelopment should be the responsibility of such agencies suited to that purpose and mission, not of the National Park Service which has another—and unique mission.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has considered the Steamtown matter carefully, including having a GAO review done of the site. The committee has reported legislation to put this runaway steam engine back on the right track, with a law that provides both vision and parameters for Steamtown National Historic Site. In doing so, the committee has reined in what is widely perceived as a runaway project and scaled back both the development and operation of the site. As amended, the National Park Service is directed to preserve and interpret American railroading from 1850 to 1950. The site's boundary has been reduced by eliminating non-essential lands. The bill as amended directs that lands contaminated with hazardous substances be cleaned up before the National Park Service can accept title and requires reimbursement for the cleanup that the National Park Service has already done. The National Park Service may provide one regular train excursion to Moscow, PA. The amended bill establishes an advisory committee to provide some professional guidance in the park's operation, and authorizes a total of \$58 million for development rather than the \$73 million that has been proposed. Finally, the legislation deletes the 28 miles of rail line extending from the Delaware Water Gap National Recreational Area.

Mr. Speaker, as my statement has indicated, Steamtown has been a very controversial matter. The committee has addressed this issue in a fair and reasonable way and has provided the House with what I believe is a balanced approach to the future development and operation of what has been a controversial site. I know this has not been easy for Representative MCDADE who has been an enthusiastic and forceful supporter of the project. We have finally worked together on this matter and I appreciate the cooperation he has displayed. This has not been a simple matter but one that will have positive results, for the Steamtown unit.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3519, as amended, and recommend its adoption by the House.

□ 1410

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3519, a bill to establish Steamtown National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System. This park has been extensively scrutinized during the nearly 6 years since its establishment and has been criticized both inside and outside the Park Service as an area not worthy of inclusion in the park system. At the outset of my statement, I would like to commend the chairman of the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee for taking the initiative to bring this controversial project before the committee so that we could address these issues and develop appropriate authorizing legislation.

To those persons who would argue that Steamtown does not belong as a unit of the park system, I would simply suggest they consider the role that railroading, and steam railroading in particular, had in the development of this country. Can there be any doubt that a park system which has areas dedicated to such obscure topics as Maine Acadian Culture, the American Impressionist Painter Movement, Houses and Forts which are fabrications based on scant historic information and not even constructed in their historic location, and even fossil insects should also tell the story of railroading in America?

Some persons probably want to argue that Steamtown is not the best site which could have been chosen to reflect American railroading and that additional study should have preceded its designation. The fact is that new parks are currently added to the system on a piecemeal and opportunity basis, behind the driving force of a local constituency, or sometimes even a single individual. Every new park area should be thoroughly studied prior to designation. Unfortunately, neither Congress or the administration seems to be patient enough to wait for thorough study prior to rushing out to support the latest park expansion proposal. In fact, over half of the 115 areas added to the park system in the last 20 years have been added without benefit of any formal study. I must point out that unlike many new parks, which are objected to by the administration, Steamtown was enthusiastically endorsed by the former Park Service director. However, I would certainly agree with those who argue that the generic process for designating units of the park system needs vast improvement.

The one other issue which is raised by this legislation is the enormous cost

associated with designating industrial sites as units of the park system. At a reconstructed mill village in Massachusetts, the combined governmental expenditures at all levels have exceeded \$175 million in the last 15 years. In the southwest corner of Pennsylvania, the NPS has spent tens of millions of dollars in preserving steel industry sites in the last few years. We must begin to develop a national policy on how to address these potentially costly sites which reflect an important part of our cultural heritage.

I would like to recognize the efforts to Mr. MCDADE during development of this legislation. Mr. MCDADE has truly been the driving force behind the Steamtown project and he is to be commended for his efforts to support development of this park. Through his efforts, the total Federal cost of this project has been substantially reduced, through millions of dollars worth of donations of land, property and services. This project is just one of many undertakings by Mr. MCDADE, who has been a long-time supporter of the Park Service. His dedication to NPS goals through his efforts on the Appropriations Committee are to be commended.

I appreciate the spirit of compromise which Mr. MCDADE has brought into the development of this bill. He has agreed to numerous changes to his original bill, many of which were necessary to place reason limits on future Federal expenditures. I must say that there is some language in this bill which reflects excessive congressional micromanagement and which does not belong in any piece of legislation. While I would agree that concerns have surfaced during committee consideration of this matter regarding the manner in which this site was developed, those problems are best dealt with at the agency policy level, not in an authorizing statute, I would hope that the Senate would agree with this sentiment and make the appropriate changes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is a good one and reflects a lot of hard work on behalf of the chairman, Mr. MCDADE, and other committee members and I join with the administration in commending it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE].

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3519, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Steamtown National Historic Site.

I appreciate the efforts of my colleagues BRUCE VENTO, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and the ranking Republican, BOB LAGOMARSINO, in drafting this legislation and bringing it to the floor.

I want to point out that the authorization of Steamtown has broad, bipartisan support. The legislation was over-

whelmingly supported in both the subcommittee and full Interior Committee.

This bill, like the original authorization of Steamtown in 1986, was the subject of public hearings. The Director of the National Park Service spoke at congressional hearings in strong support of the creation of Steamtown. In October of this year, the Park Service testified in support of continued funding to complete development of this historic site.

The legislation before us is the product of compromise. Many of the provisions are unnecessarily restrictive in my view, but I also believe the bill is a fair and honest effort to address some of the concerns raised by the chairman. The legislation cuts back projected spending and caps appropriations, but it will allow completion of the complex.

Steamtown is well on the way to becoming the Nation's finest operating railroad museum, one which is both historically significant and easily accessible to millions of Americans. Development of this historic site will be 85 percent completed with funds appropriated in the fiscal year 1992 Interior appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3519 so that this historic project can be completed for the education and enjoyment of future generations.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). 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. 3519, as amended.

The questions was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, JOELLE HALL

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that we have an opportunity to address this House floor in recognition of someone of great honor and stead for the House, especially on this side, and today I would like to wish happy birthday to Joelle Hall and say that we wish she will have many, many more years of great health and honor, and we do appreciate her efforts on this side of the aisle.

THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY VERSUS THE WORLD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a few comments about the Uruguay round of GATT negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a substantial degree of misunderstanding about the U.S. position on concluding the round vis-a-vis the European Community, those 12 countries of Western Europe. What is it really all about? The major controversy blocking an overall agreement in the Uruguay round is a dispute over agriculture, primarily over agricultural subsidies, and there is some view that it is the United States versus the EC on this subject. Indeed it is not. It is the EC against the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the developing countries, which in many cases are one- and two-commodity exporters, are really very much impacted, in a negative sense, by the extraordinarily high subsidies, especially export subsidies, of the European Community. Many developing countries, like Australia and New Zealand, are likewise greatly damaged by European subsidies and by American subsidies that are used to counteract the European subsidies, and these developing and developed countries simply are not going to agree to the 13 or 14 other areas of reform in the GATT process unless the Europeans dramatically reduce their subsidy programs that impact their agricultural production and agricultural exports. For example, they are not going to agree to bringing services under the GATT umbrella for the first time or to a variety of anticounterfeiting or patent infringement reforms which are a part of the Uruguay round proposal unless they have some relief from the extraordinarily high subsidies of the European Community. After all, it is the developed countries like most of the EC countries, Japan, and the United States that have the most to gain from bringing services under the GATT umbrella and expanding the export markets for many of the more sophisticated manufactured products.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is the United States that simply carries the argument that the Cairns group of developed and developing countries also have as their great concern, as do many other developing countries across the world. And it is really the EC that is blocking this extraordinary trade breakthrough that we could see across the whole world if we simply had a successful conclusion of the Uruguay round.

So, this Member would hope that this group of countries called the European

Community, which is not a solid bloc on this issue, would come to their senses. And this Member would hope in particular that the politicians in France, and in Ireland, and, yes, too, in Germany, because of the situation in Bavaria, would come to their senses and realize how much is hanging in the balance simply because of the lack of an agreement in the agriculture area. It is the EC position on its trade distorting agricultural practices which can, if changed, result in the successful completion of the Uruguay round.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their attention to these remarks about this important trade issue.

TRIBUTE TO BILL LEHMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my honor to serve in this House of Representatives for 10 years and my good fortune to have served with some of the giants of this institution: Tip O'Neill of Massachusetts, Silvio Conte of Massachusetts, Claude Pepper of Florida.

Today in the well of this House of Representatives the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] stepped forward to announce that he was going to retire. It came as a surprise to many of us. We will really miss BILL LEHMAN. He is an extraordinary individual. For those who have not known of him or his service, I say, "It is unfortunate that you've not had that opportunity."

Mr. Speaker, several years ago BILL was diagnosed with cancer, but he fought back from that cancer to come back to this House of Representatives and to be a very effective Member.

□ 1420

Just last year, as fate would have it, he was felled with a stroke. Many people at that point in their lives might have given up, but not BILL LEHMAN. I see him regularly working with physical therapists and others to make sure he is back on his feet serving his people. But today he said that he did not feel he could continue to meet his own standard of physical performance and excellence and he was going to retire from this institution.

We will miss him. BILL LEHMAN is a gentle man. He works very effectively because he is bipartisan and he is gentle and he is honest.

The people in Florida, I am sure, take for granted many of their elected officials, but I can tell them that BILL LEHMAN has served them well as a Congressman from south Florida. Beyond that, he has served this Nation well,

and he certainly becomes one of the giants of this institution for many decades to come.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for paying tribute to BILL LEHMAN, who has certainly been an outstanding Representative of the people of Florida.

I have known BILL for many years. We came in about the same time. He is certainly an inspiration to all of us. Despite all of his hardships and obstacles that he has overcome by way of health, he has gone on to do commendable work in this institution. I am sure that all of my colleagues join in that complimentary message that the gentleman has delivered on the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Republican colleague, the gentleman from New York. I think his remarks indicate the bipartisan support that BILL LEHMAN has contributed to this institution.

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN UPON THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM CONGRESS

(Mr. EDWARDS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I learned with great regret a few moments ago about the retirement of Congressman BILL LEHMAN of Florida, and believe me, it was a great shock because BILL LEHMAN has not only been and is a dear personal friend but he has given magnificent service to this Congress and to the people of Florida and indeed the people of the United States.

I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that anybody knows more about transportation than BILL LEHMAN personally and as chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee handling transportation. BILL has been a friend of those who are trying to do something about getting us out of automobiles and into cheaper and more efficient transportation. I think he has done more along that line than anybody else. I know that the people of California are extremely grateful, and I know that the gentleman in the chair is, too, because he has made massive contributions to transportation in his part of the State.

But more than that, and perhaps more importantly, he is a true friend of all of us. He has a wonderful wife, and he is a great family man. He and I and the late Ben Rosenthal and Bob Kastenmeier and SONNY MONTGOMERY always played a game of tennis whenever we had a chance, and we would meet in

the gym for paddle ball, too. Unfortunately, Bob Kastenmeier is no longer here, and neither is Ben Rosenthal. Abner Mikva is still at the Court, and he is another close friend of BILL LEHMAN'S.

I think that all of us who know BILL LEHMAN know that even though BILL thinks he cannot come back and he thinks he ought to give up his career at this time, he is an indomitable soul and the people of America and of Florida still have not heard the last of him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], dean of the Florida delegation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Let me just simply add my words here to this shocking announcement by my dear friend. I had absolutely no idea he was retiring. We have been across the hall from each other for many, many years and have worked together for many years, so it was a real shock.

I agree with the distinguished gentleman from California when he says that very few Members of this House have the kind of tenacity and courage that BILL LEHMAN brought to his position as a public servant here and as chairman of a difficult and important subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Appropriations Committee.

Certainly all of us will miss him because BILL called the shots the way he saw them, and he is a remarkable person. In very many ways, with the depth of his education, his ability, and his keen sense of the political field, as well as all of his efforts with regard to legislation here in this body, I found him to be a great source of strength just in conversations on a daily basis as we met each other going to and from our offices and commenting on the activities of the day. That is certainly something I shall miss.

In a more direct way, let me say this as far as our area is concerned: BILL has been an outstanding public servant, not only because he tended to his duties but particularly with respect to the application of transportation. It has been a difficult job, but he managed to do that in a very strong way for us. I know that the people of Florida will certainly miss him, and the people of Dade County will certainly miss him because he has made a tremendous contribution for all of us.

I still cannot get over the surprise, frankly. I wish him well. I know that he has a lot of things to do. He is a great writer and a great reader. He has so many things on his mind that he wants to accomplish, and I am sure he will do them all. I cannot do anything but wish him and his wife and family all the best.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the dean of the Flor-

ida delegation for his enormous contribution to this dialogue about our good friend, BILL LEHMAN. I believe he will still be around. Anybody who has been as active in public service as BILL LEHMAN and who loves this Congress like he does and gets along with all of us as he does will not be able to stay away, and if he does stay away, we are going to have to send an airplane down to get him and bring him back because he is someone we need very badly.

Mr. Speaker, it really has been a great shock to all of us to hear this announcement today.

CONGRATULATING PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA FOR THEIR SUCCESSFUL PEACEFUL REVOLUTION

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 239) congratulating the people of Lithuania for their successful peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 239

Whereas on February 16, 1918, a gathering of 200 Lithuanian delegates first proclaimed that their country was independent and that their government would be based on democratic principles, and for this reason February 16 is considered to be Lithuania's independence day;

Whereas the people of Lithuania endured a 51-year foreign rule which began as a result of the infamous Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939;

Whereas the people of Lithuania courageously resisted the imposed communist dictatorship and cultural repression of this 51-year rule;

Whereas the people of Lithuania were able to mobilize and implement a nonviolent movement for social and political change which came to be known as "Sajudis";

Whereas the people of Lithuania supported and secured the right of a free press in Lithuania during the waning days of foreign rule;

Whereas on February 24, 1990, Sajudis, the peoples' movement, promoted through citizen action a peaceful transition to independence and democracy by fully participating in the first democratic election in Lithuania in more than half a century;

Whereas on March 11, 1990, the newly elected Lithuanian parliament, fulfilling its mandate from the people of Lithuania, declared the restoration of Lithuania's independence and the establishment of a democratic state;

Whereas the people of Lithuania and the civil servants of the government of Lithuania persevered in the building of democratic and independent institutions under conditions of economic blockade and armed assaults for over 17 months;

Whereas in January 1991, 10 months after the elected Lithuanian parliament restored independence, the people and government of Lithuania withstood a bloody assault against their democratic institutions by foreign troops; and

Whereas Lithuania's successful restoration of democracy and independence is remarkable for its use of nonviolent resistance to an oppressive regime: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates the people of Lithuania for their courage and perseverance in using peaceful means to regain their independence;

(2) pledges its support for the people of Lithuania as they establish and strengthen democratic institutions of government and a free market economy; and

(3) congratulates the people of Lithuania as they celebrate their well-deserved independence day on February 16, 1992.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TORRES). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I have moved to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 239, a resolution congratulating the people of Lithuania for their successful peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy. The Committee on Foreign Affairs completed action on this resolution on February 19.

The resolution: Congratulates the people of Lithuania for their courage and perseverance in using peaceful means to regain their independence; pledges support for the people of Lithuania as they establish and strengthen democratic institutions and a free market economy; and congratulates the people of Lithuania as they celebrate their well-deserved independence day.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO] for his leadership in introducing this resolution.

I also want to commend Chairman FASCELL and Mr. BROOMFIELD for their strong support and their willingness to move this resolution expeditiously.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 16, 1992, marked the 74th anniversary of the independent nation of Lithuania. For the first time in decades, independence day in Lithuania could be celebrated openly, without fear of retribution.

This moment did not come easily for Lithuania. That small Baltic nation, along with Estonia and Latvia, endured over 40 years of occupation by a Communist oppressor. However, the long night of Soviet repression has ended.

As we witness the dawn of a new Lithuania, it is important to remember the steep price that nation was forced to pay. The economy is ruined, the environment damaged, and generations of Lithuanians suffered the physical and psychological abuses of communism. And none of us can rest easy while the troops of the Soviet empire remain stationed on Lithuania territory.

I have had the pleasure of working closely with the Lithuania-American community over a period of years to-

ward the goal of independence. I think it is important to recognize their persistence and endurance in pursuit of freedom for Lithuania.

I would also like to give credit to the Lithuania Legation located here in Washington, DC. This outpost kept alive the hope of a free Lithuania throughout the period of Soviet occupation.

It is rare to see a journey of courage and determination such as that experienced by Lithuania through its fall into oppression and the rise to freedom. As important as our support was during the moment of deepest despair in Lithuania, it is far more important that we remain committed to helping confront the challenges of rebuilding that nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not come to this topic with impartiality. As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] know, my mother was born in Lithuania. I am a first generation American, and I am very proud of this tiny country, its courage and tenacity, and the success it has experienced because of its courage.

I want to commend my colleague from Chicago, IL [Mr. RUSSO], who introduced the underlying resolution which leads us to this debate today.

About 12 years ago I first visited Lithuania, and I saw it in the worst of times, under the dominance of Communist rule from Moscow. The people of Lithuania had lived under this burden for decades. I can recall the suppression of the basic freedoms which we enjoy in the United States.

I attended a Mass in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, at 6 a.m. on a Sunday morning and found the church packed, primarily by families with small children who came out in the darkness of the morning in the hope that the Communist officials would not detect the fact that they were keeping the hope of religious freedom alive.

I know at that same time that those representatives of the Catholic Church and the Jewish religion in Lithuania were denied the opportunity to practice their faith openly, and, if they did, they ran the risk that they would, of course, be blackballed by the Communist Party for any advancement. But they did keep their faith alive.

Two years ago the Speaker of the House asked me to head a delegation as I went back to Lithuania for the second time and as they had their first free election in almost half a century.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell you the celebration and jubilation in this small country that they would have their own election and elect their own representatives.

During the course of that visit, we visited with the Cardinal in Kaunas, Lithuania, Cardinal Sladkevicius. He is about 5 feet 2 inches and is perhaps 70 years old. He had a smile on his face and a twinkle in his eye, and he spoke English very well. He had just spent almost two decades under house arrest by the Communists. They kept him in the rural part of Lithuania. They would not let him come back to his cathedral in Kaunas.

Now he was back. With a smile on his face, he called me over to the side and said, "Congressman, you know, the Kremlin and Moscow are afraid of Lithuania."

When you thought about that statement on its face, it was incredible. How could the mighty Soviet machinery, the mighty Soviet Army, be afraid of 3 million people with no army, no navy, no air force, no nuclear weapons? And yet they were.

He pointed with pride to the fact that the Kaunas Cathedral was now being restored for religious services, and the same was true in Vilnius. Cathedrals decimated by the Communists and made into museums of atheism, were being restored, as was the hope and faith of the people of Lithuania.

Then, a year ago, Lithuania had a chance to announce its independence, but not without pressure from the Soviet Union. The dying gasp of the Kremlin and the Communists inflicted on that tiny nation, and Latvia and Estonia as well, were unspeakable crimes, innocent people killed in the streets, an embargo on the necessities of life, tanks rolling through the streets, the cobblestone streets of Vilnius and Riga.

The Soviets were trying one last time to stop Lithuanian independence. Blood was shed. Innocent people died.

But the Lithuanians never quit. They looked to us as a model and an inspiration. We should be humbled by that, that people continue to look to the West and the United States for that purpose.

I am glad that we have stepped forward and recognized them as the independent nation they are. But the fight is not over. Lithuania won independence one other time this century and lost it to the Nazis and the Communists. We do not want them to lose it again.

All of the Soviet troops must be removed from Lithuania. We must make certain that any humanitarian aid or technical assistance from the United States is shared with the Baltic nations. We must make sure that we have a close link with Lithuania and the other Baltic nations so that their dream of liberty and freedom which they have seen come true will endure forever.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 239 and I join my colleagues in commending the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO], as well as the distinguished chairman and ranking member of our Foreign Affairs Committee, Messrs. FASCELL and BROOMFIELD, for their outstanding, expeditious work on this measure.

We join in congratulating the people of Lithuania for their successful and peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy.

On February 16, 1918, a gathering of 200 Lithuanian delegates first proclaimed their independence and that their Government would be based on sound democratic principles. For 51 years that dream went unrequited. As a result of the infamous Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939, the people of Lithuania were forced to courageously resist the Communist-imposed dictatorship and cultural repression of 51 years of Soviet rule.

Despite the dark days of Communist rule, the people of Lithuania were able to mobilize and implement a non-violent movement for social and political reform which became known as the Sajudis. On February 24, 1990, Sajudis promoted, through citizen action, a peaceful transition to independence and democracy by fully participating in the first democratic election in Lithuania in more than 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, on March 11, 1990, the newly elected Lithuanian Parliament declared the restoration of independence and the establishment of a democratic state. Since that time, Lithuania has experienced the tumult of a bloody assault by foreign troops. Lithuania's successful restoration of stability and democracy is extraordinary.

Accordingly, I invite my colleagues to join in congratulating the people of Lithuania, for their courage and their commitments to those ideals we Americans hold so dear: democracy, freedom, and the pursuit of independence and national identity. I urge the unanimous adoption of this measure.

□ 1440

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member is pleased to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 239. For those who have long supported the legitimate Lithuanian aspiration of true self-determination, this is a long time in coming. It was 74 years ago that Lithuanians proclaimed an independent government that would be based on democratic principles. The intervening years have seen Lithuanian's losing its freedom because of the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Nazi tyranny, and So-

viet occupation. Now, as the proud people of Lithuania once again rediscover democracy, it is altogether appropriate that this body extends its congratulations on regaining its independence.

Returns your thoughts to the events of last year, when the notorious black berets sought to topple the Lithuanian Government. Desperate to put down dissent, the Red army and the KGB struck hard in January 1991. They sought to take over Government buildings, police stations, and television stations. The Lithuanian people took to the street and stopped the Soviet paratroopers in their tracks—but at a heavy cost. Fourteen Lithuanians died on the night of January 13, 1991, and over 500 were seriously injured. This body should not forget these brave individuals as we commemorate Lithuanian independence. If it wasn't for their courage and sacrifice, we may not be commemorating Lithuanian independence today.

Throughout Lithuania's darkest days, the United States remained the strongest supporter of its determination. This Nation never recognized the legitimacy of the forced annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Soviet Union. And, as important as our support was during the years of deep despair, it is just as important that we remain committed in confronting the challenge of rebuilding that nation.

We all look forward to continuing close and even enhanced relations with the free people of Lithuania. This Member would close his remarks by simply adding his personal congratulations to those contained within this resolution and urge adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 239 by a unanimous vote.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution to congratulate the people of Lithuania for their successful, peaceful revolution. For the first time in over 50 years, the yellow, green, and red tricolor flies over a free Lithuania. The Lithuanian people have emerged from their imprisonment and now can join the community of free people.

We celebrate February 16 as Lithuanian Independence Day. On that day in 1918, 200 delegates proclaimed Lithuania's independence from the disintegrating Russian Empire, which had conquered the country in 1795.

But Lithuania's freedom lasted a mere 22 years. They were occupied and repressed first by the Nazis and then the Soviets. The dark hand of totalitarianism, clothed both in black and in red, closed over the country as the 1930's moved into the 1940's. Nazi Germany occupied the city of Klaipeda and renamed it Memel in 1939, and the Soviet Union, per the Molotov-von Rib-

bentrop Pact, conquered the rest of the country in 1940, and immediately started murdering and deporting Lithuania's political, business, educational, religious, and social leaders. Nazi invasion in 1941 brought more horrors, and Soviet liberation in 1944 just brought more vicious repression. Lithuanian guerrillas continued armed resistance to Soviet occupation into the 1950's.

Although armed resistance proved hopeless, Lithuanians never gave up the struggle to free their nation. Despite the Soviet Government's ban on Lithuanian culture, religion, and language, Lithuanians refused to give in. They kept teaching their children about their heritage, and kept striving for their independence. Finally they achieved their aspirations, but not without one last incident of Communist repression. After Lithuania voted for its independence and peacefully insisted the Soviet Union accept the principle of self-determination, the Black Berets of the MVD brutally murdered 14 innocent people in January 1991. Yet now, there is not only an American Embassy in Vilnius, but a Russian one as well.

The praise for these dramatic events must go primarily to the people of Lithuania, who bore the brunt of the struggle and the suffering. Still, the Lithuanian-American community deserves its share of the credit as well, for keeping the issue alive in America, to ensure the plight of Lithuania would not be forgotten. They made sure that the Lithuanian people knew their pleas were heard, and that they did not suffer in silence. Now that Lithuania has been freed, the next essential task is to help it rebuild its economy, shattered by Communist subjugation. I strongly support the technical assistance Lithuania and the other Baltic nations need to establish truly free markets and democratic nations.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating not only the people of Lithuania but the people of Lithuanian extraction in America and throughout the world on this anniversary of their independence, on this recognition of the anniversary of their independence.

I have been to Lithuania more than once, the first time at the invitation of a man who would soon become its President. Sajudis was then a rump movement operating marginally legally, if not illegally, to defeat communism not just in Lithuania but in fact throughout the Baltics and by extension within the empire itself.

It is easy now that the Berlin Wall has fallen, now that Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe have all become free, now that the Soviet Empire itself has all crumbled, to think that this achievement was inevitable. It was not.

Lithuania and Lithuanians never faltered in their desire for freedom. They put up with a great deal that frankly even we in America were not helping them with enough. It was the American ideal that kept them going.

During my visit to Lithuania, having seen the results of Communist brutality, of the tanks rolling on the streets, of Mr. Gorbachev himself, whose Omani troops were committing the most extreme atrocities against democracy, I am surprised, frankly that they were able to stick with it.

America has been with Lithuania since 1939, since before that, but certainly since the Hitler-Stalin pact. America has stood shoulder to shoulder with the people of Lithuania. We never recognized their forcible incorporation into the Soviet empire.

Frankly, while some of us were encouraging America to move even beyond that position to early recognition, big power politics played a role. And as a result of big power politics, America did not recognize Lithuania's independence certainly as early as the people in Lithuania did. I think we have a great deal to learn about American ideals and, therefore, I conclude by thanking the people of Lithuania for what they have told us about what it means to be Americans.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSSO], who is the chief sponsor of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 239, a measure I introduced to congratulate the people of Lithuania on their newfound freedom.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana for moving the matter swiftly through the subcommittee, and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] for likewise moving it through the full committee.

For years the Lithuanian people have remained steadfast in their determination to see their children free. The Soviet Union desperately tried to extinguish not only Lithuania's sense of nationality, but its culture, its religion, and its commitment to democratic ideals and a free market economy. Last year after years of foreign domination, however, the Lithuanian people declared themselves a free and independent nation. For their strength and commitment to many of the freedoms our great Nation was founded on, they deserve our admiration and praise.

It is one thing never to have known freedom; it is quite another to have known freedom and lost it. For too long the Republic of Lithuania has understood this enigma all too well. The Soviet Union tried to force Lithuania

to the brink of cultural, ecological, and spiritual catastrophe—persecuting Lithuanian individuals for their religious convictions, ordering Lithuanian farmers to surrender their private farms in favor of collective farming practices, and forcing the Lithuanian people to accept the benefits of communism.

Throughout the years of persecution, Lithuania never ceded its belief in self-rule freedom. The Soviet Union tried everything to dissuade Lithuania from its commitment to democracy, including an 18-month economic blockade on the small republic and forcing the Lithuanian people to live under wartime conditions of rationing.

When Mr. Gorbachev announced his policy of perestroika, the Lithuanian people were among the first to exercise their new privileges. Independent political groups sprouted up and the heavy hand of communism was pried a little bit looser. Although last year the Soviets usurped control of the Lithuanian TV and radio tower, killed 13 people demonstrating against Soviet occupation, and forced the conscription of those Lithuanians not willing to serve in the Red army. Despite 50 years of subservience to Soviet will, however, Lithuania retained its national feelings and knew it wanted out. Heroically, Lithuania had the courage not only to say so, but to do so. Lithuania never lost sight of its ethnic self.

The resolution before us today commends the people of Lithuania for their courageous resistance to the imposed Communist dictatorship and their ability to mobilize and implement a non-violent movement for social and political change which came to be known as Sajudis. This people's movement promoted, through citizen action, a peaceful transition to independence and democracy. On March 11, 1990, the newly elected Lithuanian Parliament fulfilled the mandate of its people and declared the restoration of Lithuania's independence and establishing an independent state.

The people of Lithuania and the civil servants of the Government of Lithuania persevered in the building of democratic and independent institutions under conditions of economic blockade and armed assaults for many months. The people and Government of Lithuania withstood a bloody assault against their democratic institutions by foreign troops. Given this history, Lithuania's successful restoration of democracy and independence is remarkable for its use of nonviolent resistance to an oppressive regime.

This resolution pledges the United States Congress' support for Lithuania as they establish and strengthen democratic institutions of government and a free market economy. Passage of this resolution is the least that the United States Congress can do to express our support for the Lithuania people's

struggles and determination to live under their own free will. On behalf of the United States Congress, congratulations Lithuania.

□ 1450

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 4-day trip to Moscow, and in the midst of the snowstorms and the rioting in the streets on Sunday by Communists carrying the hammer and sickle attempting to break through police barricades to demonstrate on Defense of the Motherland Day on Red Square and being stopped by police with truncheons, and meeting with the head of the KGB and trying to ask him to be forthcoming on information about American POW's left behind at World War II, Vietnam, and yes, Korea also, and asking him about the files of all the spies in Great Britain and the United States over the years, meeting Mr. Gorbachev on the roof of the big palace building inside the Kremlin, where he forced Mr. Yeltsin not to come to a military reception after defense of the motherland banquet and musical celebration in that big palace, a lot of thoughts go through one's mind.

When I shook Mr. Gorbachev's hand, I observed that he was much shorter than we had built him up to be in this country, both literally and politically, and I thought about that scene in Lithuania where he argued with the man in the street across the hood of a car. He said to this Lithuanian citizen, "We are stuck with one another. Don't you understand that?" I remembered thinking at the time, "No, you may think that you are stuck with Lithuania, but Lithuania does not want to be stuck with you, Moscow, the Kremlin, or communism." Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia prevailed a decade or two before most of us who consider ourselves optimists thought they would.

It was not all sunshine and light, and it was not always upbeat for the Baltic States in this Chamber or in the Senate.

I remember just about a year ago Jack Germond, an otherwise pretty reasonable columnist and a commentator of Democrat persuasion, saying:

If only the right wing would stop making a scene about these three little Baltic nations. They don't matter.

Within a year before that, George McGovern, former Senator, standard bearer of the Democratic Party, in 1972 said:

Why don't we stop haranguing about the Baltic nations and east European countries? These people have the governments they want, and who in blazes are we,

and this is McGovern, these are his actual words,

who are we to tell them they should not be allowed to select communism.

I remember after Ed Derwinski, one of our former colleagues who is now the distinguished Secretary of Veterans Affairs, put in the Baltic resolution year after year in this House, and when he finally was gerrymandered out of his seat in 1982 I picked up that torch and would put in the Baltic nations resolution, how many times did I read in the dominant liberal media press and hear it demeaned on television and on the networks that the term "captive nations" was demeaning to Moscow, the Kremlin, and to the Communist government, and that we should stop making a scene over the Baltic nations, should stop referring to them as captive nations, and it went on and on like that until in spite of the dominant liberal media culture in this country, communism began to collapse so rapidly before our eyes that everybody tried to get on the bandwagon and pretend that somehow, somewhere in their lives they also had been an anti-Communist.

It was not that way in my first 10 years in this House, from 1976 to 1986. We were considered in some quarters a little kooky if we were talking about freedom for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. I visited all the legations in this town, two of them right up 16th Street from the White House, the one for Estonia up in New York, when I first got here 15 years ago to say why do we still recognize these countries, yet when it came time to recognize them for real as entities, as nations, my own administration dragged its feet.

It was not a proud moment for me to see one of my hero Presidents standing next to Brian Mulroney, the Prime Minister of Canada, saying, "We today recognize the three Baltic nations" and to have my side say, "We want to wait a little bit longer. The State Department feels the timing is not right."

No, now that they are free, now that we talk about this incredible courage of these people, now that we recognize the horrible death of 13 innocent people, 14, on that night of January 13, 1991, now everybody wants to get onto the bandwagon.

I have a good memory, as good as anybody in this Chamber or the Senate, and as long as I am around I am going to remember that there was ridicule, scorn, and derision for those of us that tried to keep the torch of freedom alive for the Baltic States and all the other nations, and for the Soviet Union's dissolution itself.

There are a lot of people who never lifted a pinkie in their lives that serve in this Chamber and the other. As a matter of fact, some of them befriended the Ortega brothers, have spoken up for Castro, and have delayed this collapse of communism.

Somebody, I guess it is I, has to be a bad person and say, "Where the hell were you when we needed you, when we were speaking up for these countries,

when we were proud to stand in the well of the House and the Senate and call ourselves anti-communist? Where were you when you were licking the boots of the liberal columnists who were ridiculing conservatives in this country and saying 'Leave these people alone, they have got the kind of government they want?'"

I looked at that chaos in the Soviet Union Friday and Saturday and Sunday and Monday morning when we left and thought, "How are we ever going to be able to help these people as long as there are still die-hard Communists inside that country still trying to tear it apart? It is a long, long way before those people will have a free parliament, as we have here and in the other Western European nations, and it is going to require a lot of good will on our part, and yes, some of our Treasury and probably some lives still to be lost."

This Congressman remembers when anticommunism, and still is with some liberal columnists, was considered a stupid, if not an ugly, thing to do.

I look back to those votes on captive nations and people on the other side of the aisle saying, "Why are you such a dinosaur? Why are you putting these things forward? Why do we not let this thing rest?" That impulse toward centrist government, whether it is in Belgrade or in Moscow itself, is still there, not only in the State Department, not only in the majority party, but yes, a few weakening voices in my party.

Freedom is indivisible anywhere in this world, and the great English poet of the 1600's, John Donne, said it best:

No man is an island unto himself, but rather a peninsula, a part of the whole. Every man's death in the cause of freedom diminishes me, because I am every man's brother.

I paraphrase him weakly there in the end, but those words of John Donne should have been the battle cry, the clarion call of the other body and this body throughout all of these years, but it was not.

I sat there and looked at the head of the KGB, Mr. Primakov, and I said, "Yevgeny Primakov, give us the records on Alger Hiss, on the Rosenbergs, on all of these prisoners that have disappeared."

□ 1500

"You tell us what happened to Raoul Wallenberg. Give us back again the files of Lee Harvey Oswald," as this hateful movie "JFK" makes the rounds teaching young Americans that President Kennedy was killed by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the CIA, the FBI, and the Dallas police force. "Give us all these records before you ask us for money."

There is a lot of history to be written, and it is fitting and proper that we do this for Lithuania, for all of the free countries that are seeking freedom today, but let us not forget it was a

hard-fought fight and some or our worst resistance came from our brothers and sisters right in this Chamber and in the other one.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Concurrent Resolution 239, congratulating the people of Lithuania for their successful, peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy. This bill was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on February 19, and by the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East in November 1991. I would like to thank Representative MARTY RUSSO for his excellent work in the formulation of this important and timely piece of legislation and Representative LEE HAMILTON for his expeditious consideration of the bill in subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, consideration of this bill comes at a pivotal and historic moment in the history of the Lithuanian people. On February 16, 1992, Lithuania celebrated its independence day, the first such celebration since the Lithuanian people achieved their much deserved and long awaited independence from the former Soviet Union in 1991. For 51 years Lithuania, together with Latvia and Estonia, has endured control from Moscow. For 51 years, the Lithuanian and other Baltic peoples courageously resisted the imposed rule of the Soviet State. In 1990, the new democratically elected Government of Lithuania declared the restoration of Lithuanian independence and subsequently in January 1991, the people and Government of Lithuania withstood a bloody assault against their new democracy and independence by Soviet forces unsuccessfully trying to turn back the clock.

House Concurrent Resolution 239, congratulates the people of Lithuania for their courageous, tenacious and ultimately successful and peaceful resolution, and for their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy. Through the adoption of this bill, the United States Congress pledges its support for the people of Lithuania as they establish and strengthen democratic institutions and a free-market economy.

I strongly urge my colleagues to give their full support to this timely and important bill.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 239. The time has come for the House of Representatives to go on record congratulating the people of Lithuania for the success of their peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to democracy.

On February 16, 1918, the people of Lithuania declared themselves to be the Independent Democratic Republic of Lithuania—an independent nation with all of the rights and privileges accorded every other independent nation. Unfortunately, their independence was short-lived. During World War II, the Soviet Union forcibly annexed Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors of Latvia and Estonia. The Soviets, in their zeal to integrate the Lithuanian people, began to systematically erase the unique culture, politics, language, and religion of the Lithuanian people.

Little more than a year ago, I was in Lithuania and saw democracy under siege firsthand. In Vilnius, the Lithuanian Parliament was surrounded by concrete and metal barricades, sandbags were stacked inside; and supporters

of independence held a constant vigil outside. In my meetings with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis and Prime Minister Gedyminas Vagnoris, I was impressed by their commitment to a free, independent, and democratic Lithuania.

For 51 years, the United States worked to help secure freedom and independence for Lithuania. As Americans, it was difficult to comprehend the sense of joy and satisfaction felt by the Lithuanian people upon the success of their long struggle for independence.

As we congratulate the people of Lithuania for their courage in the face of tremendous adversity, we must also reaffirm our commitment to support and assist them in their struggle to fulfill their dream. If they are to be successful in establishing democracy and a free market economy, Lithuania must feel secure in the continuing support of the United States and the world community.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 239, a resolution congratulating the people of Lithuania for their successful peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy. I commend my friend and respected colleague, Representative RUSSO for introducing this timely resolution, as it was only a few days ago, on February 16, that Lithuanians could celebrate, for the first time in over five decades, their national independence day in a free Lithuania.

The tragedy and triumph of the Lithuanian people in the face of the Communist Leviathan that kept them enchained for so many years is testimony to the strength, persistence, and faith of a people determined to throw off, by peaceful means, those who would repress them by force.

The cost, of course, has been high. Even last year, the year of the Paris Charter, adopted by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at the CSCE summit in 1990, the death toll for Lithuanians involved in the struggle for freedom was at least nineteen persons. And we will probably never know how many brave Lithuanians were killed by Stalin's NKVD or died in the murderous gulag.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I have had occasion to follow closely Lithuania's odyssey to freedom over the last 5 years. In 1986, on the eve of the opening of the Vienna CSCE followup meeting, I held a press conference in Vienna to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Lithuanian Helsinki Monitoring Group, several of whose members were in labor camps or exile at that time. Over the next 3 years, the Helsinki Commission held several congressional hearings on the issue of human rights and the independence movements in Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. We were privileged to hear the testimony of former Lithuanian political prisoner Vytautas Skuotas, and of the then-Chargé d'Affaires Stasys Lozoraitis, now Ambassador of Lithuania here in Washington. Later we would welcome representatives of the freely elected Lithuanian Government, such as Vice-President Bronius Kuzmickas and then-Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, and of course, President Landsbergis himself in May 1991.

In February 1991, following the brutal onslaught by Soviet forces on civilians at the

Vilnius television tower, I led a commission delegation to Lithuania, to visit the embattled Parliament building where Landsbergis was holed up. We also went to the television tower where there were fresh flowers on the makeshift shrines to the fallen victims and the candles still burned. While the grief at that time was almost palpable, I think all of us on that delegation were very much aware that, as had been said in another context, "this would not stand." Somehow we sensed, even in the dark shadow of Soviet armor, that the people of Lithuania would persevere in their peaceful struggle, not for revenge but for justice.

And persevere they did. When the Helsinki Commission returned to Vilnius in September 1991, Lithuania had finally secured its freedom and had gained recognition by the international community. When we descended into the basement of the abandoned KGB building, we were greeted by Balys Gajauskas, now a Lithuanian legislator in charge of investigating the KGB's crimes, one of the Lithuanian Helsinki Monitors whose cases we had raised in Vienna 5 years earlier.

With its independence still in place, Lithuania now faces great challenges. The dark tread of the tyrant remains long after he has passed on. The Lithuanian economy is suffering from Moscow's deliberate policy of over-centralization. Issues of property ownership remain unsettled. Nationality complaints have been raised. The former Soviet Army, now CIS Army under the control of Russia, is still on Lithuanian soil.

But if the past is any indication of what we can expect for the future, then we know the people of Lithuania will meet the challenge, as they proceed with establishing and strengthening their democratic institutions of government and a free market economy, in a spirit of tolerance and a system governed by rule of law.

And so I want to again thank Mr. Russo for bringing this important resolution to the House floor. The United States Congress hereby congratulates all of the Lithuanian people and their Government for their present remarkable achievements and pledges its support for their future endeavors.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues' support for House Concurrent Resolution 239, a bill which commends the people of Lithuania for their peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy and a free market.

I want to thank my Illinois colleague, Congressman MARTY RUSSO, for his leadership in sponsoring this historic legislation.

Lithuania displayed courage as they led Eastern bloc countries of the former Soviet Union in declaring their own independence in 1990. There are those in my Chicago district who remember when Lithuania was last a free nation—in 1940—when the Soviet Union forcibly annexed Lithuania as a result of a 1939 pact between Hitler and Stalin.

Fifty years later, despite attacks on their country by Soviet forces, Lithuania has persevered and today we can celebrate their independence.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues' support in passing House Concurrent Resolution 239 and commend Lithuania for their courageous stand which, I believe, contributed

greatly to the fall of communism in all of Eastern Europe.

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, today, as we consider House Concurrent Resolution 239, a bill to commend Lithuanian democracy, I am reminded of John F. Kennedy, who once said, "The most powerful single force in the world * * * is man's eternal desire to be free and independent." Two weeks ago, in Albertville, France, Lithuanians showed the fruits of their quest for freedom to the rest of the world. For the first time in almost 50 years, Lithuanian athletes walked under the Lithuanian flag in the opening ceremonies of the winter Olympic games. It is indeed gratifying that Lithuanians are now fighting for medals instead of fighting against tyranny. Although they did not win any medals during the winter games, I know they won the hearts of Americans who have watched for so many years, the struggle for Lithuanians to be free. Watching this event brought back memories of the historic events that took place over the past year in Lithuania and the former Soviet Union.

This 74th anniversary of Lithuanian independence is a special one for everyone who has fought for the end of Soviet rule. That longheld wish, in 1991, finally came true. Over the last year, the Lithuanian people have braved Soviet military raids and occupation, the killing of fellow citizens, and a failed Soviet coup attempt that massed Soviet troops in and around the country. Through all of this, they have persevered, voting overwhelmingly for independence from Soviet rule and establishing their own government and gaining the recognition of the United States Government, the United Nations, and the newly formed Commonwealth of Independent States.

The most rewarding event as an American and a Member of Congress representing Lithuanian-Americans, was this country's establishment of diplomatic relations with Lithuania on September 2, 1991. Some here in Congress and down Pennsylvania Avenue may think our job is finished. We have helped put pressure on the Soviet Union to release Lithuania from its strangling grip and now we can turn our efforts to their domestic needs. As hundreds of Lithuanian-Americans in my hometown of Omaha told me last week, we cannot turn our backs on the rest of the world at so crucial a time. After championing Baltic independence for 50 years, the United States must give moral, diplomatic, and technical help to these struggling democracies and emerging free-market economies.

As the Nation whose form of government so many others emulate, America must not close its eyes and or turn its back to the thousands of Lithuanians who look to us for guidance and help. Now that independence has been secured, we must help Lithuania maintain it. The fight for Lithuanian autonomy is not over. Military units of the former Soviet Army are still stationed in Lithuania. Russian President Yeltsin has made a commitment to all the Baltic Republics and the United States that he will withdraw the troops. But that has not yet happened.

Our Government must continue to support the ongoing efforts to normalize relations between all the new Baltic Republics and their former occupiers. In this way, and only this way, can Lithuania grow economically and po-

litically. Not only that but we must work for stability and prosperity in the entire region by providing technical assistance to help the governments formerly under Soviet rule create market-oriented economies and systems of government that protect individual freedom and the common good.

Mr. Speaker, I commend all my colleagues that have supported Lithuanian independence in the past and urge them to continue to support freedom in that country so that future generations of Lithuanians can carry their flag in the Olympic games. I am pleased to vote "yes" today for this bill commending the Lithuanian people.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice support for House Concurrent Resolution 239, which congratulates the people of Lithuania for their successful peaceful revolution and their continuing commitment to the ideals of democracy. I only wish the resolution had recognized the efforts of those in other countries of the former Soviet Union who served in the cause of freedom.

For nearly 50 years, the peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia struggled against their Communist masters to preserve their culture and restore their independence. The United States supported those aspirations, refusing to recognize the annexation of the Baltics by the Soviet Union.

Two years ago, the people of Lithuania took a courageous stand. They overwhelmingly supported Sajudis, the opposition party supporting independence, and rejected the Soviet-controlled parliament. They elected a new president, Vytautas Landsbergis, who vowed to regain for Lithuania the independence she had lost. The peoples of Estonia and Latvia soon followed suit and the struggle for freedom was joined.

With the collapse of the entire Soviet Union 6 months ago, it is easy to forget the tremendous courage and accomplishments of the Baltic peoples, and of those in other parts of the Soviet Union, such as the Ukraine. They stood resolutely but peacefully against a Soviet Government that threatened to crush their independence movements. When Soviet tanks rolled by the Lithuanian Parliament building and took the radio tower, the Parliament simply continued its work on establishing a new government.

Mr. Speaker, it is also easy to forget the difficult situation the peoples of the former Soviet Union now face. From Lithuania to the Ukraine to Russia, they are struggling against bitter odds to establish market economies and preserve their fledgling democracies.

Mr. Speaker, after standing with the Baltic peoples in their fight for freedom, we must not forget them or the newly freed peoples of the former Soviet Union at this critical juncture.

My visit to the Baltics and Russia in early September, and a subsequent meeting with President Landsbergis in Southfield, MI, convinced me that technical assistance and the development of trade between our countries offers the best hope for lasting change. That's why I introduced legislation to establish commercial export centers in the Baltics and the former Soviet Union, and I will continue to press at every opportunity for greater trade and contact between our peoples.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the sponsors of this resolution for their efforts in highlighting

the achievements of the people of Lithuania. Now I hope we will move on to the truly important task of cementing our bonds, commercial and cultural, in a way that benefits the American people and those in the Baltics and the former Soviet Union alike.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, the people of Lithuania celebrated the 74th anniversary of their independence. When we look back at those 74 years, we see a tale of relentless struggle of a spirited and determined people to maintain their hard won independence for future generations of Lithuanians.

When 200 Lithuanian delegates first proclaimed their country's independence on February 16, 1918, they knew that the independence of such a tiny, democratic nation, surrounded by powerful autocratic states, would be severely tested.

The ignominious Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939, followed by the Soviet invasion a year later, sealed the fate of the Lithuanians for the next 51 years. But to the dismay and surprise of their Soviet oppressors, the Lithuanians would not stop their struggle. They would not allow their separate identity to be melted into the cruel Soviet system.

Instead, they courageously persevered through the hard times and resisted their oppressors. Most importantly, they continued to pass their culture, their identity and their hope for independence on to their children.

With the advent of glasnost, the Lithuanian people could mobilize and implement a non-violent movement for social and political change which came to be known as Sajudis.

Finally, in February 1990, Sajudis held the first democratic election in Lithuania in over 50 years. The following month, the Parliament declared the restoration of Lithuanian independence.

What followed however, was Moscow's last ditch attempt to suppress Lithuanian independence. After months of economic blockade and other Moscow-imposed hardships, including armed assaults and outright murder, the Lithuanians and their democratic institutions persevered.

The resolution before us today congratulates the people of Lithuania for their courage and perseverance in using peaceful means to regain their independence. In it, we pledge our support for the people of Lithuania as they establish and strengthen democratic institutions of government and a free market economy. Finally, we congratulate the people of Lithuania as they celebrate their well-deserved independence day on February 16, 1992.

House Concurrent Resolution 239 is deserving of the unanimous support of the U.S. Congress. I urge all my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 239 in which the Congress, behalf of the American people, congratulates the people of Lithuania for their courage and perseverance in using peaceful means to regain their independence.

Our Nation and this Congress have steadfastly supported the people of Lithuania throughout their quest to restore freedom and democracy and this resolution pledges our continuing support as they establish and

strengthen democratic institutions of government and a free market economy.

In recognition of Lithuanian Independence Day earlier this month, Vice President Dan Quayle traveled to Vilnius to pay tribute to President Landsbergis and all the courageous people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia who kept the flame of freedom burning in the Baltic States.

Before a crowd of thousands of cheering Lithuanians who turned out in snow-covered Independence Square, the Vice President led a celebration of the collapse of Communist rule, and pledged the continued unwavering friendship and support of the American people. As one who has drawn tremendous strength from the freedom-loving character of the Lithuanian people, and stood by them throughout their quest for independence, I commend the Vice President for drawing the world's attention to this important independence celebration.

Mr. Speaker, following my remarks, I would like to include for my colleagues the text of the Vice President's speech to the joyous Lithuanians in Independence Square, so that we all may continue to be reminded of the value freedom holds, especially in those oppressed lands, and so that we might be inspired to continue to be the guardian of democracy throughout the world.

In approving this resolution today, we celebrate the new found freedom of the people of Lithuanian, Latvia, and Estonia and reaffirm our long-standing commitment to the Baltic people that we will stand by them as their allies and partners in maintaining peace and democracy in the region.

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA, FEBRUARY 7, 1992

President Landsbergis, Honorable deputies, and friends: Sveikinu Laisva Lietuva! (I greet free Lithuania!) I bring you special greetings from President George Bush and your friends, the people of the United States of America.

Let me begin by paying a special tribute to President Landsbergis, a true champion of freedom. For many years, he helped keep alive the hopes of you, his countrymen. He never gave up. He inspired a nation, and in so doing, inspired the world. And so today, I am deeply honored to be standing next to President Landsbergis in a free and independent Lithuania.

In the middle of this century, darkness fell upon the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Millions suffered at the hand of an oppressive empire. Tens of thousands were martyred, brutalized, and torn from family and homeland. There was tragedy and despair. But the people of Lithuania never gave up hope—the hope of freedom. For, in the words of the Psalmist, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning."

The long night has ended. Morning has broken, and there is joy: Estonia is free. Latvia is free. Lithuania is free. Long live freedom!

Over the course of five decades, you showed courage and moral strength * * * that no oppressor could overcome. Your resolve never weakened. Your hearts were never dominated. And your spirits were never defeated. After every injustice * * * every injury * * * every indignity * * * the spirit of your people would always reappear as boldly, and as proudly, as the Hill of Crosses.

My country, America, was born in a revolution of independence, and our people have

always had profound faith. This heritage makes Americans feel a special kinship with the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples. We have viewed with admiration your unshakable devotion to almighty God. And when you lifted your voice for freedom, you lifted the hearts of America—for you affirmed a great truth spoken by one of our founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson: "The God who gave us life gave us liberty."

For more than 50 years, we stood by you. America refused to recognize the Soviet occupation. The battle cry of freedom was sounded in March of 1990, when Lithuania reasserted its independence. The struggle intensified on January 12, 1991, where—at that television tower—your brave patriots gave their lives in the cause of independence. A short time ago I stood at the television tower and presented a wreath of remembrance from the American people. The events at your tower of bravery happened before a watching world, and the scene inspired others to fight as never before in the struggle of good against evil.

Now my friends, you are part of a new Europe—whole and free, and blessed with great opportunity. And let us remember that the world of tomorrow belongs to those who embrace democratic institutions and free markets. The great question of our time is settled: Freedom lives. Communism is dead. And the Russian soldiers are going home.

It is a privilege to stand at this place, on this day, with so many who made history. You changed a nation and helped change the world. I pledge to you the unwavering friendship of the American people in the months and years ahead. May God go with you, and may He always bless your dear, native land, Lithuania, the home of a free people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 239.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 239, the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THOSE WHO HAVE LOST THEIR LIVES FIGHTING DRUG-RELATED CRIME AND VIOLENCE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint

resolution (H.J. Res. 414) to honor, on the eve of the second drug summit, the hundreds of South Americans and North Americans who have lost their lives while defending their nations and the world community from the threat of drug trafficking and drug-related crime and violence as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 414

Whereas the Cartagena Summit, in which the leaders of the United States, Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru participated 2 years ago, resulted in progress toward the participants' common goal of stopping the cocaine trade;

Whereas cooperation between the United States and other countries on such diverse issues as control of precursor chemicals, port control, aerial interdiction, and investigation and prosecution of money laundering is necessary for an effective strategy on reducing the drug supply;

Whereas the Presidents of Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Mexico, will be hosted by President Bush and will meet on February 26 and 27, 1992, in San Antonio, Texas, to discuss increased cooperation in the hemispheric campaign to eliminate illicit growth of drug crops, drug processing, drug trafficking, street level drug distribution, and drug consumption;

Whereas drug traffickers throughout the Americas have used violent means to facilitate the production and sale of illicit drugs;

Whereas law enforcement officers, military personnel, journalists, and judges have been killed in the line of duty by drug traffickers because of their courageous, selfless, and patriotic efforts to oppose the illegal and immoral terrorism or intimidation of drug traffickers in South and North America;

Whereas the greatest tribute to those who have given their lives in the war against drugs is to complete the job they have begun by defeating the international scourge of drugs which still threatens the lives of millions of people around the world;

Whereas drug abuse and drug-related crime remain among the gravest social ills confronting the United States;

Whereas significant progress has been made in reducing overall drug use, especially drug use among young people, as shown by such diverse statistical sources as the National Household Survey, the Drug Abuse Warning Network, and the High School Senior Survey;

Whereas much work remains to be done to reduce the number of addicted drug users, especially drug users addicted to cocaine; and

Whereas, under the President's National Drug Control Strategy, interrupting the flow of cocaine into the United States is essential to reducing cocaine use: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) the President should build upon the success of the Cartagena Summit and use the upcoming San Antonio Summit—

(A) to reaffirm the mutual commitment of the participating countries to halting the international cocaine trade;

(B) to continue assisting the Andean Strategy nations in their efforts to curtail cocaine production;

(C) to encourage cooperation among the participating countries in dismantling drug trafficking cartels and arresting and incarcerating major traffickers;

(D) to strengthen the legitimate economies of the Andean Strategy nations through trade incentives and other assistance; and

(E) to motivate the participating countries, all of which are victims of drug use, to reduce consumption of illicit drugs within their borders, and thus remove the incentives for the existence of the drug trade; and (2) the honored dead in the war against drugs deserve the recognition and appreciation of all the nations for their ultimate sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 414 and I want to commend the sponsor, Mr. COUGHLIN, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], for their initiative in bringing this before the House and bringing it in such a timely fashion.

I also want to commend our chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. FASCELL, for moving the resolution in expeditious fashion so that we could pass the bill in advance of the convening of the antidrug submit.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is a call to all Americans to take time to remember the supreme sacrifice made by all the victims of the international campaign against drugs. It honors the hundreds of North and South Americans who have lost their lives while defending their nations in the fight against illegal drugs.

As President Bush meets with the Presidents of Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Mexico, it is altogether fitting that we honor the foot soldiers in the war on drugs. We honor people like Enrique Camarena, the slain United States drug enforcement agent, Senator Luis Carlos Galan, a Colombian Presidential candidate, and hundreds of police officers, judges and journalists who have paid the dearest price as a result of their uncompromising stance against the drug trade.

We look forward to the Presidential submit as an opportunity to rededicate ourselves to this mission, to refocus our efforts, and to reinforce the commitment of each nation in this hemisphere, none of which is immune to the effects of this scourge.

As the resolution points out, there is no better way to honor those who have fallen in the drug war than by committing ourselves to completing the job at hand. That means beating back the worldwide demand for drugs. It means confronting the drug cartels and dismantling their trafficking organizations. And it means providing economic opportunities and fighting the poverty that make people turn to the drug trade for money and to drug use to escape their circumstances.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution and I commend the sponsors for their efforts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of House Joint Resolution 414 as an important expression of congressional support on the eve of the San Antonio drug summit. The Foreign Affairs Committee marked up the resolution this morning, uniting the efforts of Congressman LARRY COUGHLIN and Congressman LAMAR SMITH.

Before commenting on the resolution itself, I would like to take a moment to offer tribute to Congressman COUGHLIN who just announced he would be retiring after the 102d Congress. His leadership and tireless work on all the issues relating to narcotics control will be sorely missed.

LARRY COUGHLIN was first elected to Congress in 1968. For almost a quarter of a century LARRY has faithfully represented the greater Philadelphia area. Only 11 Republicans—myself included—have served longer in this body.

LARRY COUGHLIN's distinguished record of public service includes his footprints on many issues: Arms control, opposition to Government waste, support for mass transit, and many more.

The issue for which LARRY COUGHLIN is best known, however, is the issue that brings us to the floor today: Fighting the spread of illegal drugs. As ranking Republican member of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, no member has had a stronger or more effective voice in the war on drugs.

LARRY has devoted countless hours to the issue and his leadership and experience will not be easily filled. I wish LARRY COUGHLIN continued success in whatever pursuits he may choose to follow, but I am sure I express the regret felt by many when I say the House of Representatives will miss his presence.

Beginning tomorrow in San Antonio, TX, President Bush will host a drug summit with six Presidents representing our international partners in the fight against illegal drug trafficking. This summit will represent another step forward in our international efforts to fight drug trafficking and all its associated evils. The drug summit also illustrates the increasing cooperation and attention we are receiving from our Latin American neighbors in this fight.

House Joint Resolution 414 also recognizes the terrible price paid by the foot soldiers in the war on drugs. Throughout our hemisphere, many have paid with their lives in trying to stem the flood of narcotics into the United States. Hundreds of policemen,

soldiers, judges and journalists have been brutally murdered by drug traffickers. Those slain range from New York City police officers to Colombian judges to Mexican policemen. Mr. Speaker, these men and women are the unsung heroes of the war on drugs.

I am pleased the Foreign Affairs Committee was able to act so rapidly on this resolution and am sure I am joined by my colleagues in wishing President Bush and his team the best for the San Antonio summit.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], the very distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me join with the previous speakers in support of House Joint Resolution 414.

My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], and I agree that this is the appropriate time for us to give support to our President and the Presidents from Peru, Bolivia, from Colombia, Mexico, Venezuela, and Ecuador, as they come together as world leaders to try to find some solution to the international problem of fighting drug trafficking from all over the world.

As we in the United States, those of us in the Congress and in public office, have to attend so many funerals of those in law enforcement who have fallen victim to drug traffickers and those engaged in criminal activities, we sometimes forget that we have friends and allies overseas who are in the countries that are producing the drugs that, against overwhelming odds, are prepared to go out, undermanned and underarmed against the drug lords and drug traffickers.

I remember when the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] and I were in Colombia talking with the widows and the families that were left behind as a result of the national Colombian police chief being slain. I remember how we looked at a building that had its inwards taken out by a tank as the drug lords had the arrogance to go and to destroy the records that were in what would be the equivalent of our Supreme Court and how we paused and looked at it with heavy hearts and seeing how many judges had lost their lives as the result of so many people in the United States consuming the very cocaine that these people were trying to protect ourselves from ourselves.

So it is altogether fitting and proper, while we are frustrated and wishing that we had more success, that we not forget those people who made the ultimate sacrifice in North America or

South America or Central America and that they, too, have to go down as heroes for the courage that they have had to stand up against overwhelming odds.

□ 1510

I do hope that sometime, somewhere, we in the United States and in Europe will be able to convey upon those people who are engaged in the recreational use of drugs or those who are addicted to drugs unknowing, that it is their habits and their consumption that causes the production that finds so many lives being lost.

I congratulate the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the leadership that they have provided to give us a chance in this small way to speak out for the people of these United States and of civilized society in general, in thanking those people and the families of those people left behind and sharing their loss and their sorrow and hoping one day that no further lives have to be lost because the war would have been won.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 414, honoring those international heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the war on drugs, and encouraging the President to work with the participants at the San Antonio summit toward stopping the trade in illicit drugs. I commend my distinguished colleague, the ranking Republican of the Select Narcotics Committee, Mr. LARRY COUGHLIN, as well as the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, for introducing the measures that have been combined in this resolution.

We are on the eve of a historic meeting of the heads of state from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, the United States, and Venezuela. The purpose of this summit meeting is to further hemispheric cooperation in the international control of narcotics production, trafficking, and consumption. This meeting will build upon the broad framework of cooperation in the control of precursor chemicals, alternative economic development, enhanced trade of legal goods, drug interdiction, and demand reduction, as established at the Cartagena summit in 1990.

I am pleased that seven heads of state have raised this issue to such a high priority level that they have agreed to 2 days of meetings in San Antonio, TX. This level of priority is most important, especially to those who have been waging this war all along.

Throughout the hemisphere, courageous men and women have openly and fearlessly fought drug production, drug trafficking, and drug abuse. They have risked their lives in order to make their communities and nations more safe and healthy for generations to come. Many of those who have been at the forefront of this war, both in the United States and throughout Latin America, have made the ultimate sacrifice at the hands of ruthless and greedy drug criminals.

The brave men and women came from all walks of life, and from all cultural, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. From courageous law enforcement officers to honest journalists to concerned community leaders, these good

people were slain for their work, their honesty, their dedication, and their integrity.

Mr. Speaker, to honor the memory of those who have given their lives to end the tremendous suffering caused by international drug trafficking and drug abuse, we must continue their mission. We must not allow their deaths to have been in vain. Their friends and families who mourn their loss need to know that the struggle of their lost loved ones continues; their cause is still very much alive.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that we are a long way from winning this war. Every day hundreds of thousands of people still abuse illegal substances, and every day there are still drug related deaths. Those whose lives have been touched by this tragedy understand all too well the importance of this fight against drugs.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to renew our commitment to combatting the drug trade from its inception in the coca, opium, and cannabis fields to its devastation among the young people of this hemisphere.

Let us never forget those brave men and women whose lives were ruthlessly taken because they dared to do the right thing. We owe them our deepest respect and our undying gratitude.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and many thanks again to the authors of this resolution.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who I should mention is not only a long-time member of the narcotics task force, but he has devoted many, many hours to this issue and we are very proud to have him on our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks and for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this measure, House Joint Resolution 414, a measure honoring the courageous men and women of North and South America who have made the supreme sacrifice in our war on drugs, and to do it a few days before the San Antonio Summit Conference on Narcotics. I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the ranking member of our Select Committee on Narcotics; our distinguished chairman of our Select Committee on Narcotics, Mr. RANGEL, whose eloquent words just preceded my rising on this measure; and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] for bringing this resolution to the floor in this timely manner.

Over 1,500 drug law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty in the United States over the past 10 years. That number is shocking. Each Member of Congress is painfully familiar with such incidents in their own districts.

On the afternoon of March 5, 1990, one of my constituents, New York State police officer Joseph T. Aversa, was gunned down while trying to purchase

two kilos of cocaine in an undercover operation in Manhattan's Lower East Side.

Officer Aversa, age 31, had been a member of the New York State Police since March 1984, proudly serving with State Police Troop F in Middletown, NY.

In October 1989, Officer Aversa's outstanding service was recognized by his promotion to investigator. It was in that capacity that he began work as an undercover narcotics officer with the State's Drug Enforcement Task Force.

An apparent buy-and-bust operation went amiss when an undercover officer was led into an ambush in a New York City housing project.

Joseph Aversa bravely ran to the aid of his fellow officer only to be met with deadly gunfire.

As we reflect on the tragic loss of Investigator Aversa, we cannot help being outraged by the ruthless acts of violence committed daily by the drug dealers of our cities and in communities throughout the world.

Each and every day, we are losing more and more of our young people to drugs.

Officer Aversa's family and community have suffered a great loss. All nations have suffered tremendous losses due to illicit narcotics. Officer Aversa was one of a select few law enforcement officers who care so much for their fellow man that they made the ultimate sacrifice.

The public outcry to these inhuman acts should be loud and resolute. As we remember Joseph Aversa, and the life he devoted to our protection, let us become more determined to do our part to fight drugs and crime. We should not have to lose proud, young men and women to corrupt, ruthless, murderous criminals.

The United States is spending billions of dollars every year just to manage the addicts we have today, to say nothing about the billions we spend on enforcement and interdiction efforts. However, one nation alone cannot hope to prevail against the enormous tide of drugs being produced and smuggled across international borders. In order to address the drug war fully, a regional approach, organized at the highest levels of government, is imperative.

President Bush deserves great credit for his role in organizing the forthcoming second drug summit in San Antonio TX, this week where the Presidents of Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Mexico will meet to discuss the illegal narcotics situation and work toward developing further regional cooperation in our war against drugs.

The violence of the drug trade is the greatest threat to our free society, and the grip of the suppliers is getting tighter. Last year we heard about the marriage of Colombian cocaine kingpins and the Italian Mafia. Only

through the cooperation of all the nations concerned can we hope to effectively combat this threat.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure, and support our President as he works with the Presidents of our neighboring nations to build cooperation in our fight against drugs.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], a cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

The timing of this resolution is especially important since tomorrow President Bush will be in my hometown of San Antonio for an international summit on a threat to all citizens of the world—drug dealing.

The drug crisis is real.

This week the leaders of Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela will meet with President Bush in San Antonio to coordinate the counternarcotics initiatives by our countries.

The drug summit will be effective as part of the ongoing efforts by the United States to curtail the stream of drugs into our country.

This resolution supports the drug-fighting goals of the drug summit and honors those who have lost their lives in the war on drugs.

This resolution will encourage cooperation among the summit countries for the purpose of dismantling the drug trafficking cartels and arresting major traffickers.

We must address the multinational nature of the drug problem in order to curb the supply of cocaine and other illegal narcotics that is smuggled into the United States.

One-third of the total quantity of illicit drugs that enters the United States is transshipped through Mexico into Texas.

While the administration has increased resources at the border, much of the border remains isolated, creating an open invitation for smugglers.

Investigators intercept only about 10 percent of the drugs entering this country.

This makes cooperation with Mexico and the Andean nations essential to stanching the flow of drugs into our country.

It is clear that we are fighting a two-front drug war.

On one front, the assault against casual drug use has gone very well.

Since 1985, we have reduced the total number of drug users from 23 million to about 12 million.

On another front, the difficult work remains—addressing the hardcore drug problem.

To do this, we need to better target our treatment dollars, our education dollars, and our money for community partnership programs.

We must make sure we are getting it to the people who need it.

To help in this regard, I urge Congress to pass the administration's drug legislation and to fund fully the President's drug budget for this year.

We also should keep pressure on our Andean allies to reduce the supply of drugs leaving their countries.

And that is why we are here today, to support the President as he meets with his Latin American counterparts in San Antonio this week.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and the goals of the drug summit.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the second hemispheric drug summit, it is appropriate that we pause to honor those who have given their lives in the international war against drugs. As the chilling numbers make clear, the use of the word war in this context is not hyperbole. Indeed, the numbers are at once staggering and sobering.

During the course of the past 5 years, Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in North, Central, and South America have lost approximately 3,000 men and women in the war on drugs. Colombia alone has lost 1,951 law enforcement agents in the last 5 years, on top of the 72 judges murdered since 1982. These heroic individuals made the ultimate sacrifice so that their countrymen and the citizens of allied nations might live free of the plague of illicit narcotics.

These casualties make clear that this battle for freedom is as real as the epic battle against global communism from which we so recently emerged victorious. And victory in this war will require similar resolve.

At this time, it is important that we commend the determination and the courage of the citizens of the Americas in prosecuting this war. No one has sacrificed more than the law enforcement officers, military personnel, justice officials, elected officials, and others who have placed their lives on the line in the defense of international law and domestic order.

And as this resolution declares, those who have fallen, and their families, deserve our profound gratitude, our solemn respect, and our earnest prayers.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from the Colombian Ambassador concerning tomorrow's drug summit and Colombia's efforts in the drug war.

I include the letter, as follows:

EMBAJADA DE COLOMBIA,
Washington, DC, February 20, 1992.

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Representative, U.S. House of Representatives,
Narcotics Abuse and Control, Washington,
DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OXLEY: On February 26-27, President Cesar Gaviria will join President Bush and the leaders of Mexico, Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, and Ecuador in San

Antonio, Texas to discuss increased international cooperation in the war against drugs. This Summit will follow-up on the work begun at the Cartagena Summit meeting hosted by Colombia in February 1990. As we approach the San Antonio Summit, I thought this an appropriate time to review the progress of the last two years and outline the task that remains ahead.

This Summit takes place at a critical time in the war against drug trafficking. For the past several years, the Colombia government has been engaged in a bloody struggle against some of the most dangerous, violent criminals in the world. Many of our country's "best and brightest" have died on the front lines of this war—presidential candidates, judges, policemen, military officers, journalists and thousands of ordinary citizens.

Yet since the Cartagena Summit, there have been important victories in the drug war. Colombia's law enforcement efforts resulted in a record level of cocaine interdiction in 1991—77 tons of cocaine, 13 tons of cocaine base and 167 tons of imported coca leaves were seized by Colombian authorities last year. In addition, 293 cocaine processing laboratories and 90 airstrips used by drug traffickers were destroyed. The leaders of the Medellin cartel, once the most feared and violent drug traffickers, are now dead or in jail. With help from the United States, new initiatives have been launched to attack the cartels at their financial nerve centers by disrupting international money laundering networks; recent actions in Cali are an example of these efforts. Finally, through reforms enacted under our new constitution, we are strengthening judicial mechanisms to better enable us to bring drug criminals to justice, including the protection of judges and witnesses and improved confidentiality of evidence.

But despite these efforts, there is still much to do. The flow of cocaine has not stopped. Faced with increasing pressure within Colombia, the drug lords have moved and expanded elsewhere. That is why an expanded group of Latin American leaders will meet in San Antonio to formulate a global strategy to curb drug trafficking—from the harvesting of coca leaves, to destroying laboratories, shutting down transportation and distribution networks and stopping buyers and dealers on the streets of America and Europe.

No matter how many drug traffickers we arrest and bring to justice, the production and distribution of narcotics will continue so long as the demand for these drugs exists in the United States and other countries. The battle against the drug cartels cannot and will not be won solely in the United States or in Colombia. Other countries must now join the battle with a heightened sense of commitment of resources and national will.

President Gaviria will reaffirm Colombia's commitment to this struggle at the San Antonio Summit. Colombia will also suggest renewed areas of cooperation with the United States and our Andean neighbors in all areas of fighting drug traffickers—stopping the flow of precursor chemicals used to process cocaine, controlling the flow of arms and weapons to the drug cartels and curbing international money laundering of drug monies. Of particular importance is the need to strengthen law enforcement and judicial cooperation—including improved information, intelligence and evidence sharing—among the Summit participants.

Our goal is clear. It is nothing less than to rid ourselves of a dangerous force that is per-

haps the single greatest threat to the social fabric of both our countries.

Sincerely,

JAIME GARCIA-PARRA,
Ambassador.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 414, which honors the thousands of South Americans and North Americans who have lost their lives while defending their nations and the world community from the threat of drug trafficking and drug-related crime and violence.

Tomorrow, February 26, President Bush will host the Presidents of Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, and Mexico at the second drug summit in San Antonio, TX. The objective of the summit is to find ways to increase the effectiveness of the hemispheric campaign to combat drug trafficking and abuse.

It was my hope in drafting this resolution to send a very clear message to our allies in Latin America in the war against drugs that their sacrifices in this struggle are understood and appreciated by the people of the United States. Just as our communities have seen dedicated law enforcement officers shot down in the line of duty because of drug-related crime and violence, our Latin American allies have had hundreds of their law enforcement personnel, judicial officials and even journalists murdered by powerful trafficking organizations. House Joint Resolution 414 acknowledges these sacrifices and honors those who have given their lives in this struggle.

I would like to express my deep appreciation to the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, especially Chairman FASCELL, ranking Republican BROOMFIELD, and the leadership of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Congressmen TORRICELLI and LAGOMARSINO for bringing up this legislation so quickly. My thanks also to the original cosponsors of this legislation, the chairman of the House Select Narcotics Committee, CHARLIE RANGEL, and Congressman, BEN GILMAN, co-chairman of the International Narcotics Task Force. I also want to thank LAMAR SMITH for his contribution to this resolution.

There are a lot of statistics which we talk about in the war against drugs. Those who have died serving their country in the war against drugs must be remembered more than as mere numbers, but as heroes in the international war against drugs. Colombia, in particular, has paid a heavy price. In the last year alone they lost 747 members of their national police in counternarcotics activities. In honoring these international heroes we rededicate ourselves to finishing the job they have begun.

In the words of President Abraham Lincoln, in reference to another great struggle, it is the responsibility of all to be "dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting in favor of House Joint Resolution 414.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 414, honoring those international heroes who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the war on drugs, and

encouraging the President to work with the participants at the San Antonio summit toward stopping the trade in illicit drugs. I commend my distinguished colleague, the ranking Republican of the Select Narcotics Committee, Mr. LARRY COUGHLIN, as well as the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, for introducing the measures that have been combined in this resolution.

We are on the eve of an historic meeting of the heads of State from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, the United States, and Venezuela. The purpose of this summit meeting is to further hemispheric cooperation in the international control of narcotics production, trafficking and consumption. This meeting will build upon the broad framework of cooperation in the control of precursor chemicals, alternative economic development, enhanced trade of legal goods, drug interdiction, and demand reduction, as established at the Cartagena summit in 1990.

I am pleased that seven heads of state have raised this issue to such a high priority level that they have agreed to 2 days of meetings in San Antonio, TX. This level of priority is most important, especially to those who have been waging this war all along.

Throughout the hemisphere, courageous men and women have openly and fearlessly fought drug production, drug trafficking and drug abuse. They have risked their lives in order to make their communities and nations more safe and healthy for generations to come. Many of those who have been at the forefront of this war, both in the United States and throughout Latin America, have made the ultimate sacrifice at the hands of ruthless and greedy drug criminals.

These brave men and women came from all walks of life, and from all cultural, ethnic and economic backgrounds. From courageous law enforcement officers of honest journalists to concerned community leaders, these good people were slain for their work, their honesty, their dedication and their integrity.

Mr. Speaker, to honor the memory of those who have given their lives to end the tremendous suffering caused by international drug trafficking and drug abuse, we must continue their mission. We must not allow their deaths to have been in vain. Their friends and families who mourn their loss need to know that the struggle of their lost loved ones continues; their cause is still very much alive.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that we are a long way from winning this war. Every day hundreds of thousands of people still abuse illegal substances, and every day there are still drug-related deaths. Those whose lives have been touched by this tragedy understand all too well the importance of this fight against drugs.

I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to renew our commitment to combatting the drug trade from its inception in the coca, opium and cannabis fields to its devastation among the young people of this hemisphere.

Let us never forget those brave men and women whose lives were ruthlessly taken because they dared to do the right thing. We owe them our deepest respect and our undying gratitude.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker,

and many thanks again to the authors of this resolution.

□ 1520

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 414, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

- H.R. 3490, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 4113, by the yeas and nays;
- H.R. 2152, by the yeas and nays;
- House Concurrent Resolution 239, by the yeas and nays; and
- House Joint Resolution 414, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

TELEPHONE DISCLOSURE AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3490, 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 Washington [Mr. SWIFT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3490, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 381, nays 31, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—381

Abercrombie	Allen	Andrews (TX)
Ackerman	Anderson	Annunzio
Alexander	Andrews (ME)	Applegate
Allard	Andrews (NJ)	Army

Aspin	Frost	Martinez
Atkins	Galleghy	Matsui
AuCoin	Gallo	Mazzoli
Bacchus	Gaydos	McCandless
Baker	Gejdenson	McCloskey
Barnard	Gekas	McCollum
Barton	Gephardt	McCrery
Bateman	Geren	McCurdy
Bellenson	Gibbons	McDade
Bennett	Gilchrest	McDermott
Bereuter	Gillmor	McEwen
Berman	Gilman	McGrath
Bevill	Gingrich	McHugh
Bilbray	Glickman	McMillan (NC)
Billrakis	Gonzalez	McMillen (MD)
Blackwell	Goodling	McNulty
Bliley	Gordon	Meyers
Boehlert	Green	Mfume
Bonior	Guarini	Michel
Borski	Gunderson	Miller (CA)
Boucher	Hall (OH)	Miller (OH)
Boxer	Hall (TX)	Mineta
Brewster	Hamilton	Mink
Brooks	Hammerschmidt	Moakley
Broomfield	Hansen	Molinari
Browder	Harris	Mollohan
Brown	Hastert	Montgomery
Bruce	Hatcher	Moody
Bryant	Hayes (IL)	Moorhead
Bunning	Hayes (LA)	Moran
Bustamante	Hefley	Morella
Byron	Hefner	Morrison
Callahan	Henry	Murphy
Camp	Herger	Myers
Campbell (CA)	Hertel	Nagle
Campbell (CO)	Hoagland	Natcher
Cardin	Hobson	Neal (MA)
Carper	Hochbrueckner	Neal (NC)
Carr	Holloway	Nowak
Chandler	Hopkins	Oakar
Chapman	Horn	Oberstar
Clay	Horton	Obey
Clement	Hoyer	Olin
Clinger	Hubbard	Oliver
Coleman (MO)	Huckaby	Ortiz
Collins (MI)	Hughes	Orton
Combest	Hunter	Owens (NY)
Condit	Hutto	Owens (UT)
Conyers	Inhofe	Oxley
Cooper	Jacobs	Packard
Costello	James	Pallone
Coughlin	Jefferson	Panetta
Cox (IL)	Jenkins	Parker
Coyne	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Cramer	Johnson (SD)	Patterson
Darden	Johnson (TX)	Paxon
Davis	Johnston	Payne (NJ)
de la Garza	Jones (GA)	Payne (VA)
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Pease
DeLauro	Jontz	Pelosi
Dellums	Kanjorski	Perkins
Derrick	Kaptur	Peterson (FL)
Dicks	Kasich	Peterson (MN)
Dingell	Kennedy	Petri
Dixon	Kennelly	Pickett
Donnelly	Kildee	Pickle
Dooley	Kleczka	Poshard
Doolittle	Klug	Price
Dorgan (ND)	Kopetski	Pursell
Downey	Kostmayer	Quillen
Duncan	Kyl	Rahall
Durbin	LaFalce	Ramstad
Dwyer	Lagomarsino	Rangel
Dymally	Lancaster	Ravenel
Early	Lantos	Ray
Eckart	LaRocco	Reed
Edwards (CA)	Laughlin	Regula
Edwards (OK)	Leach	Rhodes
Edwards (TX)	Lehman (CA)	Richardson
Emerson	Lehman (FL)	Ridge
English	Lent	Rinaldo
Erdreich	Levin (MI)	Ritter
Espy	Lewis (CA)	Roberts
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Roe
Fascell	Lightfoot	Roemer
Fawell	Lipinski	Rogers
Fazio	Livingston	Rohrabacher
Feighan	Lloyd	Ros-Lehtinen
Fields	Long	Rose
Fish	Lowe (NY)	Rostenkowski
Flake	Luken	Roukema
Foglietta	Machtley	Rowland
Ford (MI)	Manton	Roybal
Ford (TN)	Markey	Russo
Frank (MA)	Marlenee	Sabo
Franks (CT)	Martin	Sanders

Sangmeister	Smith (TX)	Towns
Santorum	Snowe	Trafficant
Sarpalius	Solarz	Traxler
Savage	Solomon	Unsoeld
Sawyer	Spence	Upton
Saxton	Spratt	Valentine
Schaefer	Staggers	Vento
Scheuer	Stallings	Visolovsky
Schiff	Stark	Volkmer
Schroeder	Stearns	Walsh
Schulze	Stenholm	Waters
Schumer	Stokes	Waxman
Sharp	Studds	Weber
Shaw	Sundquist	Weiss
Shays	Swett	Weldon
Shuster	Swift	Wheat
Sikorski	Synard	Williams
Sisisky	Tallon	Wilson
Skaggs	Tanner	Wise
Skeen	Tauzin	Wolf
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Wolpe
Slattery	Thomas (CA)	Wylie
Slaughter	Thomas (GA)	Yates
Smith (FL)	Thomas (WY)	Yatron
Smith (IA)	Thornton	Young (AK)
Smith (NJ)	Torres	Young (FL)
Smith (OR)	Torricelli	Zimmer

NAYS—31

Archer	Goss	Penny
Ballenger	Gradison	Porter
Barrett	Grandy	Riggs
Boehner	Hancock	Sensenbrenner
Burton	Houghton	Stump
Coble	Hyde	Taylor (NC)
Cox (CA)	Ireland	Vucanovich
DeLay	Kolbe	Walker
Dornan (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Zeliff
Dreier	Nichols	
Ewing	Nussle	

NOT VOTING—22

Anthony	Engel	Roth
Bentley	Kolter	Serrano
Coleman (TX)	Levine (CA)	Vander Jagt
Collins (IL)	Lowery (CA)	Washington
Crane	Mavroules	Whitten
Cunningham	Miller (WA)	Wyden
Dannemeyer	Mrazek	
Dickinson	Murtha	

□ 1545

Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. LEWIS of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. LIVINGSTON 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.

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1579) to provide for regulation and oversight of the development and application of the telephone technology known as pay-per-call, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1579

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 "900 Services Consumer Protection Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The pay-per-call telecommunications industry has grown into a national, billion-dollar industry as a result of recent technological innovations.

(2) Many pay-per-call businesses provide valuable information, increase consumer choices, and stimulate innovative and responsive services that benefit the public.

(3) Some interstate pay-per-call businesses, however, are engaging in practices which are misleading to the consumer, harmful to the public interest, and/or contrary to accepted standards of business practices.

(4) The improper activities of those businesses damage the reputation of the entire pay-per-call industry, causing harm to the many reputable businesses that are serving the public in an honest and honorable fashion.

(5) Many of the harmful practices of the pay-per-call industry are currently beyond the reach of regulatory agencies and existing legislation.

(6) The nationwide, interstate scope of pay-per-call services makes it impossible for the individual States to regulate these businesses within their individual borders.

(7) Therefore, Congress should enact legislation that provides for the proper and orderly regulation of the pay-per-call industry in order to protect the public interest and allow for the continued growth of pay-per-call businesses.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to put into effect a system of regulation and review of the pay-per-call business; and

(2) to give the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission authority to prescribe regulations, adopt enforcement procedures, and conduct oversight concerning the pay-per-call industry, to give State attorneys general authority to enforce Federal laws and regulations concerning that industry, to afford reasonable protection to consumers, and to assure that violations of Federal law do not occur.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) The term "pay-per-call service" means any information service, provided by telephone, which receives payment, directly or indirectly, from each person who calls that service by telephone, except that such term shall not include information services for which users are assessed charges only after entering into a presubscription or comparable arrangement with the provider of such service. The Federal Communications Commission shall, by regulation, specify in greater detail the kinds of information services that are included within such term and the criteria for determining whether a valid presubscription or comparable arrangement is created, consistent with the purposes of this Act.

(2) The term "common carrier" has the meaning given that term under section 3(h) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153(h)).

(3) The term "information service" does not include any regulated communication service provided by a common carrier.

(4) The term "provider of a pay-per-call service" does not include a common carrier when its sole action with respect to a pay-per-call service is—

(A) to carry such service over its network;

(B) to bill and collect for such service.

(5) The term "caller" means a person using a pay-per-call service.

(6) The term "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 5. FCC AND FTC REGULATIONS ON PAY-PER-CALL SERVICES.

(a) **RULEMAKING PROCEEDINGS.**—The Federal Communications Commission and Federal Trade Commission shall, within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, initiate coordinated rulemaking proceedings to establish a consistent system for oversight and regulation of pay-per-call services in order to provide for the protection of consumers in accordance with this Act, and other applicable Federal statutes and regulations. The final rules or regulations issued pursuant to such proceedings shall be effective within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR PAY-PER-CALL SERVICES.**—The rules or regulations issued by the Federal Trade Commission under subsection (a) shall require that a pay-per-call service—

(1) shall include an introductory disclosure message that describes the service being provided and the maximum charge per minute or per call and other charges, and informs the caller that charges for the call will begin at the end of the introductory message;

(2) shall enable the caller to hang up before the end of the introductory message without incurring any charge whatsoever;

(3) shall, after the institution of any increase in charges for the service, disable any bypass mechanism which allows repeat callers to avoid listening to the complete introductory disclosure message required under paragraph (1), for a period of time sufficient to give such repeat callers adequate and sufficient notice of the increase;

(4) shall not be aimed at children under the age of 12, unless such service is a bona fide educational service; and

(5) shall prohibit the use of a toll-free telephone number from which a caller will be automatically connected to an access number for a pay-per-call service.

(c) **COMMON CARRIER OBLIGATIONS.**—The rules or regulations issued by the Federal Communications Commission under subsection (a) shall include the following requirements for common carriers:

(1) A common carrier which contracts with a provider of a pay-per-call service shall make readily available on request—

(A) a list of the access numbers for each of the pay-per-call services it carries;

(B) a short description of each such service;

(C) a statement of the maximum charges per call or per minute, and any other charge, for each such service;

(D) a statement of its name, business address, and business telephone; and

(E) such other information as the Federal Communications Commission considers necessary for the enforcement of this Act and other applicable Federal statutes and regulations.

(2) A common carrier shall not disconnect a subscriber's local exchange telephone service, or long distance telephone service, because of nonpayment of charges for any pay-per-call service.

(3) A common carrier that provides local exchange service shall—

(A) offer telephone subscribers (where technically and economically feasible) the

option of blocking access from their telephone number to all, or to certain specific, prefixes used by pay-per-call services, which option—

(i) shall be offered at no charge (I) to all subscribers for a period of 60 days after the issuance of the rules or regulations under subsection (a), and (II) to any subscriber who subscribes to a new telephone number prior to and for a period of 60 days after the time the new telephone number is effective; and

(ii) shall otherwise be offered at a reasonable fee as established by the appropriate State regulatory commission; and

(B) offer telephone subscribers (where the Federal Communications Commission determines it is technically and economically feasible), in combination with the blocking option described under subparagraph (A), the option of presubscribing to or blocking only specific pay-per-call services for a reasonable one-time charge.

(4) A common carrier that engages in billing and collection of charges for pay-per-call services shall—

(A) give telephone subscribers the option of cancelling charges for pay-per-call services in instances of unauthorized use or misunderstanding of such charges at the time of use, subject to guidelines prescribed by the Federal Communications Commission to prevent subscribers from abusing that option;

(B) send, to every person subscribing to a new telephone number and, within 60 days after the issuance of such rules or regulations, to all telephone subscribers, and at least annually thereafter, a disclosure statement that—

(i) sets forth all rights and obligations held by the subscriber and the carrier with respect to the use and payment for pay-per-call services; and

(ii) describes the applicable blocking options required under paragraph (3) (A) and (B);

(C) in any billing to telephone subscribers that includes charges for any pay-per-call service, display any charges for pay-per-call services in a part of the subscriber's bill that is identified as not being related to local and long distance telephone charges; and for each charge so displayed, specify the type of service, the amount of the charge, and the date, time, and duration of the call;

(D) in instances when such carriers contract for the collection and distribution of charges by any provider of pay-per-call services that solicits charitable contributions, shall obtain from that provider proof of the tax exempt status of any person or organization for which contributions are solicited;

(E) have the right to recover such carrier's costs of complying with subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) from the provider of pay-per-call services for which such carrier conducts billing and collection;

(F) stop the assessment of time-based charges upon disconnection by the caller; and

(G) require that pay-per-call services be offered only via the use of certain telephone number prefixes.

(d) **ADVERTISING RESTRICTIONS.**—The rules or regulations issued by the Federal Trade Commission under subsection (a) shall—

(1) require that any provider of a pay-per-call service shall include, in any advertisement for a pay-per-call service a disclosure stating the maximum charge per call or per minute for calling the advertised number and such other information as the Federal Trade Commission shall consider necessary;

(2) require that, whenever the number to be called is shown in television and print

media advertisements, the provider of a pay-per-call service shall ensure that the charges for the call are clear and conspicuous and displayed for the same duration as that number is displayed;

(3) prohibit any person from advertising on any radio station, television broadcast station, or community antenna television station by means of an advertisement that emits electronic tones which can automatically dial an access number for a pay-per-call service;

(4) require that any telephone message soliciting calls to a pay-per-call service specify clearly, and at the audible volume of the solicitation, the maximum charge per call or per minute and other charges for such a call; and

(5) prohibit any person from advertising a toll-free telephone number from which a caller can or will be automatically connected to an access number for a pay-per-call service.

(e) MATTERS FOR FCC AND FTC CONSIDERATION.—(1) In conducting a proceeding under subsection (a), the Federal Communications shall consider requiring by rule or regulation that—

(A) a pay-per-call service—

(i) automatically disconnect a call after one full cycle of program; and/or

(ii) automatically disconnect interactive programs if no activity occurs within a reasonable, specified time period; and

(B)(1) a pay-per-call service providing a live interactive group program shall include a beep tone or other appropriate and clear signal during the program so that callers will be alerted to the passage of time; and

(i) such tone or other signal shall be explained in the disclosure statement required under subsection (c)(4)(B).

(2) In conducting a proceeding under subsection (a), the Federal Trade Commission shall consider requiring by rule or regulation that a pay-per-call service for which there is a nominal per-call charge shall be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b).

(f) EFFECT ON DIAL-A-PORN PROHIBITIONS.—Nothing in this section shall affect the provisions of section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 223).

(g) APPLICABILITY OF PENALTIES TO COMMON CARRIERS.—No common carrier shall be liable for a criminal or civil sanction or penalty under this Act solely because it provided transmission or billing and collection services for a pay-per-call service that violated a rule or regulation issued or prescribed under this Act.

SEC. 6. FEDERAL AGENCY ENFORCEMENT.

(a) FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.—Any violation of the regulations issued by the Federal Communications Commission under section 5 of this Act shall be treated as a violation of the rules and regulations under the Communications Act of 1934 and therefore shall be subject to the provisions of title V of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 501 et seq.), including—

(1) criminal penalties for willful and knowing violation of Commission rules, regulations, conditions, and restrictions, consisting of a fine of not to exceed \$500 for each day in which an offense occurs; and

(2) forfeiture penalties for the willful or repeated failure to comply with statutory provisions or Commission rules, regulations, or orders—

(A) of not to exceed \$100,000 for each violation or each day of a continuing violation by a common carrier subject to title II of the Communications Act of 1934, or by an applicant for any common carrier license, permit,

certificate, or other instrument of authorization issued by the Commission; and

(B) of not to exceed \$10,000 for each violation or each day of a continuing violation by a person that is not such a common carrier or applicant.

(b) FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—Any violation of any rule prescribed by the Federal Trade Commission under section 5 of this Act shall be treated as a violation of a rule under section 18 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a) regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices and therefore shall be subject to any remedy or penalty applicable to any violation thereof. The Federal Trade Commission shall prevent any person from violating a rule, regulation, or order of the Federal Trade Commission under this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this Act. Any person who violates such a rule, regulation, or order shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

SEC. 7. ACTIONS BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.

(a) AUTHORITY OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—Whenever the attorney general of any State has reason to believe that the interests of the residents of that State have been or are being threatened or adversely affected because any provider of a pay-per-call service has engaged or is engaged in acts which violate any rule or regulation of the Federal Trade Commission under this Act, the State may bring a civil action on behalf of its residents to enjoin such acts, to enforce compliance with any rule or regulation of the Federal Trade Commission under this Act, to obtain damages on behalf of its residents, or to obtain such further and other relief as the court may deem appropriate.

(b) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL COURTS.—The district courts of the United States, the United States courts of any territory, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all civil actions brought under this section against a provider of a pay-per-call service to enforce any liability or duty created by any rule or regulation of the Federal Trade Commission under this Act, or to obtain damages or other relief with respect thereto. Upon proper application, such courts shall also have jurisdiction to issue writs of mandamus, or orders affording like relief, commanding the defendant to comply with the provisions of any rule or regulation of the Federal Trade Commission under this Act, including the requirement that the defendant take such action as is necessary to remove the danger of violation of any such rule or regulation. Upon a proper showing, a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

(c) FTC RIGHTS.—The State shall serve prior written notice of any such civil action upon the Federal Trade Commission and provide the Commission with a copy of its complaint, except in any case where such prior notice is not feasible, in which case the State shall serve such notice immediately upon instituting such action. The Federal

Trade Commission shall have the right (1) to intervene in the action, (2) upon so intervening, to be heard on all matters arising therein, and (3) to file petitions for appeal.

(d) VENUE.—Any civil action brought under this section in a district court of the United States may be brought in the district wherein the defendant is found or is an inhabitant or transacts business or wherein the violation occurred or is occurring, and process in such cases may be served in any district in which the defendant is an inhabitant or wherever the defendant may be found.

(e) INVESTIGATORY POWERS.—For purposes of bringing any civil action under this section, nothing in this Act shall prevent the attorney general from exercising the powers conferred on the attorney general by the laws of such State to conduct investigations or to administer oaths or affirmations or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(f) EFFECT ON STATE COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit an authorized State official from proceeding in State court on the basis of an alleged violation of any general civil or criminal antifraud statute of such State.

(g) LIMITATION.—Whenever the Federal Trade Commission has instituted a civil action for violation of any rule or regulation under this Act, no State may, during the pendency of such action instituted by the Commission, subsequently institute a civil action against any defendant named in the Commission's complaint for violation of any rule as alleged in the Commission's complaint.

(h) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "attorney general" means the chief legal officer of a State.

SEC. 8. STUDY OF THE USE OF CALLERS' TELEPHONE NUMBERS.

(a) STUDY.—The Federal Trade Commission shall conduct a study of the acquisition and use, by providers of pay-per-call services, of callers' telephone numbers to generate, compile, and sell or lease lists of such numbers. Such study shall investigate the extent to which such numbers are obtained with or without the knowledge or consent of the caller and shall identify methods by which callers could be given the opportunity to grant or withhold that consent.

(b) REPORT.—The Federal Trade Commission shall, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Congress and the Commission a report on the results of the study required by subsection (a). To the extent that the study identifies any abuses in the acquisition and use, by providers of pay-per-call services, of callers' telephone numbers, such report shall include recommendations for administrative or legislative changes to prevent such abuses.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SWIFT

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SWIFT moves to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 1579, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3490, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: "An Act to protect the public interest and the future development of interstate pay-per-call

technology by providing for the regulation and oversight of the applications and growth of the pay-per-call industry, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 3490) was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

TRANSFER OF THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER U.S.S. "LEXINGTON" TO THE CITY OF CORPUS CHRISTI, TX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4113, 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 Florida [Mr. BENNETT] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4113, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair will remind the Members that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Borski	Cox (CA)
Ackerman	Boucher	Cox (IL)
Alexander	Boxer	Coyne
Allard	Brewster	Cramer
Allen	Brooks	Darden
Anderson	Broomfield	Davis
Andrews (ME)	Browder	de la Garza
Andrews (NJ)	Brown	DeFazio
Andrews (TX)	Bruce	DeLauro
Annunzio	Bryant	DeLay
Applegate	Bunning	Dellums
Archer	Burton	Derrick
Armey	Bustamante	Dicks
Aspin	Byron	Dingell
Atkins	Callahan	Dixon
AuCoin	Camp	Donnelly
Bacchus	Campbell (CA)	Dooley
Baker	Campbell (CO)	Doolittle
Ballenger	Cardin	Dorgan (ND)
Barnard	Carper	Dornan (CA)
Barrett	Carr	Downey
Barton	Chandler	Dreier
Bateman	Chapman	Duncan
Bellenson	Clay	Durbin
Bennett	Clement	Dwyer
Bereuter	Clinger	Dymally
Berman	Coble	Early
Bevill	Coleman (MO)	Eckart
Bilbray	Collins (MI)	Edwards (CA)
Bilirakis	Combest	Edwards (OK)
Blackwell	Condit	Edwards (TX)
Bliley	Conyers	Emerson
Boehert	Cooper	English
Boehner	Costello	Erdreich
Bonior	Coughlin	Espy

Evans	Lantos	Pursell
Ewing	LaRocco	Quillen
Fascell	Laughlin	Rahall
Fawell	Leach	Ramstad
Fazio	Lehman (CA)	Rangel
Feighan	Lehman (FL)	Ravenel
Fields	Lent	Ray
Fish	Levin (MI)	Reed
Flake	Lewis (CA)	Regula
Foglietta	Lewis (FL)	Rhodes
Ford (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Ford (TN)	Lightfoot	Ridge
Frank (MA)	Lipinski	Riggs
Franks (CT)	Livingston	Rinaldo
Frost	Lloyd	Ritter
Galleghy	Long	Roberts
Gallo	Lowey (NY)	Roe
Gaydos	Luken	Roemer
Gejdenson	Machtley	Rogers
Gekas	Manton	Rohrabacher
Gephardt	Markey	Ros-Lehtinen
Geren	Marlenee	Rose
Gibbons	Martin	Rostenkowski
Gilchrest	Martinez	Roukema
Gilmor	Matsui	Rowland
Gilman	Mazzoli	Roybal
Gingrich	McCandless	Russo
Glickman	McCloskey	Sabo
Gonzalez	McCollum	Sanders
Goodling	McCrery	Sangmeister
Gordon	McCurdy	Santorum
Goss	McDade	Sarpaluis
Gradison	McDermott	Savage
Grandy	McEwen	Sawyer
Green	McGrath	Saxton
Guarini	McHugh	Schaefer
Gunderson	McMillan (NC)	Scheuer
Hall (OH)	McMillen (MD)	Schiff
Hall (TX)	McNulty	Schroeder
Hamilton	Meyers	Schulze
Hammerschmidt	Mfume	Schumer
Hancock	Michel	Sensenbrenner
Hansen	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Harris	Miller (OH)	Sharp
Hastert	Mineta	Shaw
Hatcher	Mink	Shays
Hayes (IL)	Moakley	Shuster
Hayes (LA)	Molinar	Sikorski
Hefley	Mollohan	Sisisky
Hefner	Montgomery	Skaggs
Henry	Moody	Skeen
Herger	Moorhead	Skelton
Hertel	Moran	Slattery
Hoagland	Morella	Slaughter
Hobson	Morrison	Smith (FL)
Hochbrueckner	Mrazek	Smith (IA)
Holloway	Murphy	Smith (NJ)
Hopkins	Myers	Smith (OR)
Horn	Nagle	Smith (TX)
Horton	Natcher	Snowe
Houghton	Neal (MA)	Solarz
Hoyer	Neal (NC)	Solomon
Hubbard	Nichols	Spence
Huckaby	Nowak	Spratt
Hughes	Nussie	Staggers
Hunter	Oakar	Stallings
Hutto	Oberstar	Stark
Hyde	Obey	Stearns
Inhofe	Olin	Stenholm
Ireland	Oliver	Stokes
Jacobs	Ortiz	Studds
James	Orton	Stump
Jefferson	Owens (NY)	Sundquist
Jenkins	Owens (UT)	Swett
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Swift
Johnson (SD)	Packard	Synar
Johnson (TX)	Pallone	Tallon
Johnston	Panetta	Tanner
Jones (GA)	Parker	Tauzin
Jones (NC)	Pastor	Taylor (MS)
Jontz	Patterson	Taylor (NC)
Kanjorski	Paxon	Thomas (CA)
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Thomas (GA)
Kasich	Payne (VA)	Thomas (WY)
Kennedy	Pease	Thornton
Kennelly	Pelosi	Torres
Kildee	Penny	Torricelli
Kleczka	Perkins	Towns
Klug	Peterson (FL)	Traficant
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Traxler
Kopetski	Petri	Unsoeld
Kostmayer	Pickett	Upton
Kyl	Pickle	Valentine
LaFalce	Porter	Vento
Lagomarsino	Poshard	Viscosky
Lancaster	Price	Volkmer

Vucanovich	Weldon	Wylie
Walker	Wheat	Yates
Walsh	Williams	Yatron
Waters	Wilson	Young (AK)
Waxman	Wise	Young (FL)
Weber	Wolf	Zelliff
Weiss	Wolpe	Zimmer

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—20

Anthony	Dickinson	Murtha
Bentley	Engel	Roth
Coleman (TX)	Kolter	Vander Jagt
Collins (IL)	Levine (CA)	Washington
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Whitten
Cunningham	Mavroules	Wyden
Dannemeyer	Miller (WA)	

□ 1555

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit the transfer before the expiration of the otherwise applicable 60-day congressional review period of the obsolete training aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Lexington* to the Corpus Christi Area Convention and Visitors Bureau, Corpus Christi, Texas, for use as a naval museum and memorial."

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.

U.N. INTERNATIONAL DRIFTNET FISHERY CONSERVATION PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2152, 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 Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2152, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair will announce that this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Atkins	Bilbray
Ackerman	AuCoin	Bilirakis
Alexander	Bacchus	Blackwell
Allard	Baker	Bliley
Allen	Ballenger	Boehert
Anderson	Barnard	Boehner
Andrews (ME)	Barrett	Bonior
Andrews (NJ)	Barton	Borski
Andrews (TX)	Bateman	Boucher
Annunzio	Bellenson	Boxer
Applegate	Bennett	Brewster
Archer	Bereuter	Brooks
Armey	Berman	Broomfield
Aspin	Bevill	Browder

Brown Green
 Bruce Guarini
 Bryant Gunderson
 Bunning Hall (OH)
 Burton Hall (TX)
 Bustamante Hamilton
 Byron Hammerschmidt
 Callahan Hancock
 Camp Hansen
 Campbell (CA) Harris
 Campbell (CO) Hastert
 Cardin Hatcher
 Carper Hayes (IL)
 Carr Hayes (LA)
 Chandler Hefley
 Chapman Hefner
 Clay Henry
 Clement Herger
 Clinger Hertel
 Coble Hoagland
 Coleman (MO) Hobson
 Collins (MI) Hochbrueckner
 Combest Holloway
 Condit Hopkins
 Conyers Horn
 Cooper Horton
 Costello Houghton
 Coughlin Hoyer
 Cox (CA) Hubbard
 Cox (IL) Huckaby
 Coyne Hughes
 Cramer Hunter
 Darden Hutto
 Davis Hyde
 de la Garza Inhofe
 DeFazio Ireland
 DeLauro Jacobs
 DeLay James
 Dellums Jefferson
 Derrick Jenkins
 Dicks Johnson (CT)
 Dingell Johnson (SD)
 Dixon Johnson (TX)
 Donnelly Johnston
 Dooley Jones (GA)
 Doolittle Jones (NC)
 Dorgan (ND) Jontz
 Dorman (CA) Kanjorski
 Downey Kaptur
 Dreier Kasich
 Duncan Kennedy
 Durbin Kennelly
 Dwyer Kildee
 Dymally Kleczka
 Early Klug
 Eckart Kolbe
 Edwards (CA) Kopetski
 Edwards (OK) Kostmayer
 Edwards (TX) Kyl
 Emerson LaFalce
 English Lagomarsino
 Erdreich Lancaster
 Espy Lantos
 Evans LaRocco
 Ewing Laughlin
 Fascell Leach
 Fawell Lehman (CA)
 Fazio Lehman (FL)
 Feighan Lent
 Fields Levin (MI)
 Fish Lewis (CA)
 Flake Lewis (FL)
 Foglietta Lewis (GA)
 Ford (MI) Lightfoot
 Ford (TN) Lipinski
 Franks (CT) Livingston
 Frost Lloyd
 Gallegly Long
 Gallo Lowey (NY)
 Gaydos Luken
 Gejdenson Machtley
 Gekas Manton
 Gephardt Markey
 Geren Marlenee
 Gibbons Martin
 Gilchrist Martinez
 Gillmor Matsui
 Gilman Mazzoli
 Gingrich McCandless
 Glickman McCloskey
 Gonzalez McCollum
 Goodling McCrery
 Gordon McCurdy
 Goss McDade
 Gradison McDermott
 Grandy McEwen

McGrath Schaefer
 McHugh Scheuer
 McMillan (NC) Schiff
 McMillen (MD) Schroeder
 McNulty Schulze
 Meyers Schumer
 Mfume Sensenbrenner
 Michel Serrano
 Miller (CA) Sharp
 Miller (OH) Shaw
 Mineta Shays
 Mink Shuster
 Moakley Sikorski
 Molinari Siskis
 Mollohan Skaggs
 Montgomery Skeen
 Moody Skelton
 Moorhead Slattery
 Moran Slaughter
 Morella Smith (FL)
 Morrison Smith (IA)
 Mrazek Smith (NJ)
 Murphy Smith (OR)
 Myers Smith (TX)
 Nagle Snowe
 Natcher Solarz
 Neal (MA) Solomon
 Neal (NC) Spence

Spratt Upton
 Staggers Valentine
 Stallings Vento
 Stark Visclosky
 Stearns Volkmer
 Stenholm Vucanovich
 Stokes Walker
 Studds Walsh
 Stump Waters
 Shaw Sundquist
 Shays Swett
 Shuster Swift
 Sikorski Synar
 Siskis Tallon
 Skaggs Tanner
 Skeen Tauzin
 Skelton Taylor (MS)
 Slattery Taylor (NC)
 Slaughter Thomas (CA)
 Smith (FL) Thomas (GA)
 Smith (IA) Thomas (WY)
 Smith (NJ) Thornton
 Smith (OR) Torres
 Smith (TX) Torricelli
 Snowe Towns
 Solarz Traficant
 Solomon Traxler
 Spence Unsoeld

Boehner Gillmor
 Bonior Gilman
 Borski Gingrich
 Boucher Glickman
 Boxer Gonzalez
 Brewster Goodling
 Brooks Gordon
 Broomfield Goss
 Browder Gradison
 Brown Grandy
 Bruce Green
 Bryant Guarini
 Bunning Gunderson
 Burton Hall (OH)
 Bustamante Hall (TX)
 Byron Hamilton
 Callahan Hammerschmidt
 Camp Hancock
 Campbell (CA) Hansen
 Campbell (CO) Harris
 Cardin Hastert
 Carper Hatcher
 Carr Hayes (IL)
 Chandler Hayes (LA)
 Chapman Hefley
 Clay Hefner
 Clement Henry
 Clinger Herger
 Coble Hertel
 Coleman (MO) Hoagland
 Collins (MI) Hobson
 Combest Hochbrueckner
 Condit Holloway
 Conyers Hopkins
 Cooper Horn
 Costello Horton
 Coughlin Houghton
 Cox (CA) Hoyer
 Cox (IL) Hubbard
 Coyne Huckaby
 Cramer Hughes
 Darden Hunter
 Davis Hutto
 de la Garza Hyde
 DeFazio Inhofe
 DeLauro Ireland
 DeLay Jacobs
 Dellums James
 Derrick Jefferson
 Dicks Jenkins
 Dingell Johnson (CT)
 Dixon Johnson (SD)
 Donnelly Johnson (TX)
 Dooley Johnston
 Doolittle Jones (GA)
 Dorgan (ND) Jones (NC)
 Dorman (CA) Jontz
 Downey Kanjorski
 Dreier Kaptur
 Duncan Kasich
 Durbin Kennedy
 Dwyer Kennelly
 Dymally Kildee
 Early Kleczka
 Eckart Klug
 Edwards (CA) Kolbe
 Edwards (OK) Kopetski
 Edwards (TX) Kostmayer
 Emerson Kyl
 English LaFalce
 Erdreich Lagomarsino
 Espy Lancaster
 Evans Lantos
 Ewing LaRocco
 Fascell Laughlin
 Fawell Leach
 Fazio Lehman (CA)
 Feighan Lehman (FL)
 Fields Lent
 Fish Levin (MI)
 Flake Lewis (CA)
 Foglietta Lewis (FL)
 Ford (MI) Lightfoot
 Ford (TN) Lipinski
 Franks (MA) Livingston
 Franks (CT) Lloyd
 Frost Long
 Gallegly Lowey (NY)
 Gallo Luken
 Gaydos Machtley
 Gejdenson Manton
 Gekas Markey
 Gephardt Marlenee
 Geren Martin
 Gibbons Martinez
 Gilchrist Matsui
 Gillmor Mazzoli
 Gilman McCandless
 Gingrich McCloskey
 Glickman McCollum
 Gonzalez McCrery
 Goodling McCurdy
 Gordon McDade
 Goss McDermott
 Gradison McEwen

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—21

Anthony Dickinson Miller (WA)
 Bentley Engel Murtha
 Coleman (TX) Frank (MA)
 Collins (IL) Kolter Vander Jagt
 Crane Levine (CA) Washington
 Cunningham Lowery (CA) Whitten
 Dannemeyer Mavroules Wyden

□ 1605

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.

CONGRATULATING PEOPLE OF LITHUANIA FOR THEIR SUCCESSFUL PEACEFUL REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 239.

The Clerk read the Title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 239, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—411

Abercromble Archer
 Ackerman Arney
 Alexander Aspin
 Allard Atkins
 Allen AuCoin
 Anderson Bacchus
 Andrews (ME) Baker
 Andrews (NJ) Ballenger
 Andrews (TX) Barnard
 Annunzio Barrett
 Applegate Barton

Bateman Bellenson
 Bennett Bereuter
 Berman Bevil
 Bilbray Bilirakis
 Blackwell Bliley
 Boehert

Rowland

Roybal	Smith (IA)	Torres	Bereuter	Gallo	Luken	Roemer	Skeen	Thornton
Russo	Smith (NJ)	Torricelli	Berman	Gaydos	Machtley	Rogers	Skelton	Torres
Sabo	Smith (OR)	Towns	Bevill	Gedensson	Manton	Rohrabacher	Slattery	Torricelli
Sanders	Smith (TX)	Traficant	Billbray	Gekas	Markey	Ros-Lehtinen	Slaughter	Towns
Sangmeister	Snowe	Traxler	Billrakis	Gephardt	Marlenee	Rose	Smith (FL)	Traficant
Santorum	Solarz	Unsoeld	Blackwell	Geren	Martin	Rostenkowski	Smith (IA)	Traxler
Sarpalius	Solomon	Upton	Billey	Gibbons	Martinez	Roukema	Smith (NJ)	Unsoeld
Savage	Spence	Valentine	Boehert	Gilchrest	Matsui	Rowland	Smith (OR)	Upton
Sawyer	Spratt	Vento	Boehner	Gillmor	Mavroules	Roybal	Smith (TX)	Valentine
Saxton	Staggers	Visclosky	Bonior	Gilman	Mazzoli	Russo	Snowe	Vento
Schaefer	Stallings	Volkmer	Borski	Gingrich	McCandless	Sabo	Solarz	Visclosky
Scheuer	Stark	Vucanovich	Boucher	Glickman	McCloskey	Sanders	Solomon	Volkmer
Schiff	Stearns	Walker	Boxer	Gonzalez	McCollum	Sangmeister	Spence	Vucanovich
Schroeder	Stenholm	Walsh	Brewster	Goodling	McCrery	Santorum	Spratt	Walker
Schulze	Stokes	Waters	Brooks	Gordon	McCurdy	Sarpalius	Staggers	Walsh
Schumer	Studds	Waxman	Broomfield	Goss	McDade	Savage	Stallings	Waxman
Sensenbrenner	Stump	Weber	Browder	Gradison	McDermott	Sawyer	Stark	Weber
Serrano	Sundquist	Weiss	Brown	Grandy	McEwen	Saxton	Stearns	Weiss
Sharp	Swett	Weldon	Bruce	Green	McGrath	Schaefer	Stenholm	Weldon
Shaw	Swift	Williams	Bryant	Guarini	McHugh	Scheuer	Stokes	Wheat
Shays	Synar	Wilson	Bunning	Gunderson	McMillan (NC)	Schiff	Studds	Williams
Shuster	Tallon	Wise	Burton	Hall (OH)	McMillen (MD)	Schroeder	Stump	Wilson
Sikorski	Tanner	Wolf	Bustamante	Hall (TX)	McNulty	Schulze	Sundquist	Wise
Sisisky	Tauzin	Wyllie	Byron	Hamilton	Meyers	Schumer	Swett	Wolf
Skaggs	Taylor (MS)	Yates	Callahan	Hammerschmidt	Mfume	Sensenbrenner	Swift	Wolpe
Skeen	Taylor (NC)	Yatron	Camp	Hancock	Michel	Serrano	Synar	Wyllie
Skelton	Thomas (CA)	Young (AK)	Campbell (CA)	Hansen	Miller (CA)	Sharp	Tallon	Yates
Slattery	Thomas (GA)	Young (FL)	Campbell (CO)	Harris	Miller (OH)	Shaw	Tanner	Yatron
Slaughter	Thomas (WY)	Zeliff	Cardin	Hastert	Mineta	Shays	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Smith (FL)	Thornton	Zimmer	Carper	Hatcher	Mink	Shuster	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)
			Carr	Hayes (IL)	Moakley	Sikorski	Thomas (CA)	Zeliff
			Chandler	Hayes (LA)	Molinari	Sisisky	Thomas (GA)	Zimmer
			Chapman	Hefley	Mollohan	Skaggs	Thomas (WY)	
			Clay	Hefner	Montgomery			
			Clement	Henry	Moody			
			Clinger	Herger	Moorhead			
			Coble	Hertel	Moran			
			Coleman (MO)	Hoagland	Morella			
			Collins (MI)	Hobson	Morrison			
			Combest	Hochbrueckner	Murphy			
			Condit	Holloway	Myers			
			Conyers	Hopkins	Nagle			
			Cooper	Horn	Natcher			
			Costello	Horton	Neal (MA)			
			Coughlin	Houghton	Neal (NC)			
			Cox (CA)	Hoyer	Nichols			
			Cox (IL)	Hubbard	Nowak			
			Coyne	Huckaby	Nussle			
			Cramer	Hughes	Oakar			
			Darden	Hunter	Oberstar			
			Davis	Hutto	Obey			
			de la Garza	Hyde	Olin			
			DeFazio	Inhofe	Oliver			
			DeLauro	Ireland	Ortiz			
			DeLay	Jacobs	Orton			
			Dellums	James	Owens (NY)			
			Derrick	Jefferson	Owens (UT)			
			Dicks	Jenkins	Oxley			
			Dingell	Johnson (CT)	Packard			
			Dixon	Johnson (SD)	Pallone			
			Donnelly	Johnson (TX)	Panetta			
			Dooley	Johnston	Parker			
			Doolittle	Jones (GA)	Pastor			
			Dorgan (ND)	Jones (NC)	Patterson			
			Dornan (CA)	Jontz	Paxon			
			Downey	Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)			
			Dreier	Kaptur	Payne (VA)			
			Duncan	Kasich	Pease			
			Durbin	Kennedy	Pelosi			
			Dwyer	Kennelly	Penny			
			Dymally	Kildee	Perkins			
			Early	Kleczka	Peterson (FL)			
			Eckart	Klug	Peterson (MN)			
			Edwards (CA)	Kolbe	Petri			
			Edwards (OK)	Kopetski	Pickett			
			Edwards (TX)	Kostmayer	Pickle			
			Emerson	Kyl	Porter			
			English	LaFalce	Poshard			
			Erdreich	Lagomarsino	Price			
			Espy	Lancaster	Pursell			
			Evans	Lantos	Quillen			
			Ewing	LaRocco	Rahall			
			Fascell	Laughlin	Ramstad			
			Fawell	Leach	Rangel			
			Fazio	Lehman (CA)	Ravenel			
			Feighan	Lehman (FL)	Ray			
			Fields	Levin (MI)	Reed			
			Fish	Lewis (CA)	Regula			
			Flake	Lewis (FL)	Rhodes			
			Foglietta	Lewis (GA)	Richardson			
			Ford (MI)	Lightfoot	Ridge			
			Ford (TN)	Lipinski	Riggs			
			Frank (MA)	Livingston	Rinaldo			
			Franks (CT)	Lloyd	Ritter			
			Frost	Long	Roberts			
			Galgely	Lowey (NY)	Roe			

NOT VOTING—23

Anthony	Engel	Roth
Bentley	Kolter	Vander Jagt
Coleman (TX)	Levine (CA)	Washington
Collins (IL)	Lowery (CA)	Wheat
Crane	Miller (WA)	Whitten
Cunningham	Mrazek	Wolpe
Dannemeyer	Murtha	Wyden
Dickinson	Rangel	

□ 1613

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THOSE WHO LOST THEIR LIVES FIGHTING DRUG-RELATED CRIME AND VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 414, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 414, as amended on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair will remind Members this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Annunzio	Baker
Ackerman	Applegate	Ballenger
Alexander	Archer	Barnard
Allard	Armedy	Barrett
Allen	Aspin	Barton
Andrews (ME)	Atkins	Bateman
Andrews (NJ)	AuCoin	Bellenson
Andrews (TX)	Bacchus	Bennett

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Dickinson	Murtha
Anthony	Engel	Roth
Bentley	Kolter	Taylor (NC)
Coleman (TX)	Lent	Vander Jagt
Collins (IL)	Levine (CA)	Washington
Crane	Lowery (CA)	Waters
Cunningham	Miller (WA)	Whitten
Dannemeyer	Mrazek	Wyden

□ 1620

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint Resolution regarding the San Antonio drug summit."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, due to pressing business in my district, I was unable to be present for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 3490 and "aye" on H.R. 2152. I respectfully request that I be announced for both those bills.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on House Joint Resolution 414, rollcall No. 21, I was recorded as not voting. I was in the House and turned in an "aye" card.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, due to travel scheduling, I was unable to vote on rollcall votes 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21. If I would have been able to attend, I would have voted "yea" on each of the measures.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I returned to my district to attend the funeral of a close family friend. Because of my sudden departure, I was unable to vote on H.R. 3490, H.R. 4113, H.R. 2152, House Concurrent Resolution 239, and House Joint Resolution 414. If I had been present, I would have voted in favor of each bill.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—RETURNING TO THE SENATE THE BILL S. 884, DRIFTNET MORATORIUM ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1991

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 373) returning to the Senate the bill S. 884 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 373

Resolved, That the bill of the Senate (S. 884) to require the President to impose economic sanctions against countries that fail to eliminate large-scale driftnet fishing, in the opinion of this House, contravenes the 1st clause of the 7th section of the 1st article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such a bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution returns the bill S. 884 to the Senate because it contravenes the constitutional requirement that revenue measures originate in the House of Representatives.

S. 884, the Driftnet Moratorium Enforcement Act of 1991, requires the President to impose economic sanctions against countries that fail to eliminate largescale driftnet fishing. Foremost among the sanctions provisions are those which impose a ban on certain imports into the United States from countries which continue to engage in driftnet fishing on the high seas after a certain date. These changes in our tariff laws constitute a revenue measure in the constitutional sense, because they would have a direct effect on customs revenues.

While the House, by adopting this resolution, will preserve its prerogative to originate revenue matters, I want to make it clear to all Members that our action in no way constitutes a rejection of the Senate bill on its merits. Indeed, the House has passed its own bill, H.R. 2152, which also provides for economic sanctions, including import

sanctions, against countries which engage in largescale driftnet fishing on the high seas on or after December 31, 1992. This bill will provide effective enforcement authority for U.N. Resolution 46-215, which forbids the use of such type of fishing as of December 31, 1992, and was agreed to by all nations last December.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, our action today returning S. 884 to the Senate is intended solely to protect the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives. It makes it clear to the Senate that the appropriate procedure for dealing with tariff matters that affect revenues is for the House to act first on a revenue bill and for the Senate to add its amendments to it and then seek a conference.

I urge all Members to protect the prerogatives of the House, agree to this resolution, and return S. 884 to the Senate.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VOLKMER). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING SPECIAL ORDER AND GRANTING SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to vacate my 60-minute special order on today's calendar and in lieu thereof, I request a 5-minute special order for today.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

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

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

There was no objection.

THE 1991 ANNUAL REPORT ON ALASKA'S MINERAL RESOURCES—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 Interior and Insular Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1991 Annual Report on Alaska's Mineral Resources, pursuant to section 1011 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487; 16 U.S.C. 3151). This report, containing pertinent public information relating to minerals in Alaska, was gathered by the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, and other Federal agencies. This report is significant because of the importance of the mineral and energy resources of Alaska to the future well-being of the Nation.

GEORGE BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1992.

□ 1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of House Resolution 194.

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

There was no objection.

ASK TOUGH QUESTIONS ABOUT AID TO IRAQ

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

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of questions about exactly what this administration's policy was toward Iraq prior to their invasion of Kuwait.

This weekend the Los Angeles Times broke a story I find very alarming. It has been spread on the newspaper pages across this country, and the story that I have with me is one carried in the Topeka Capital Journal. The headline reads "Bush Aided Iraq's Buildup," and the other headline is "Bush Used Top-Secret Plan To Aid Iraq's Buildup."

I call my colleagues' attention to this story because it contains some very, very important information. The information is corroboration of the rumors that we heard, and that is, according to secret documents, apparently this President was attempting to help Iraq prior to their invasion of Kuwait in many ways.

□ 1240

In fact, according to this story there are members of his own administration that strongly advised him against continuing to make loans to Iraq when we had information that the proceeds from these loans were being diverted to buy arms.

What in the world was going on in the corridors of this administration?

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is time for us to ask some tough questions of

the President and get to the bottom of this and find the truth. This is something the American public has a fundamental right to know.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Topeka Capital Journal of February 23, 1992:

[From the Topeka Capital-Journal, Feb. 23, 1992]

BUSH AIDED IRAQ'S BUILDUP

(By Douglas Frantz and Murray Waas)

WASHINGTON.—In the fall of 1989, when Iraq's invasion of Kuwait was only nine months away and Saddam Hussein was desperate for money to buy arms, President Bush signed a top-secret National Security Decision directive ordering closer ties with Baghdad and opening the way for \$1 billion in new aid, according to classified documents and interviews.

The \$1 billion commitment, in the form of loan guarantees for the purchase of U.S. farm commodities, enabled Saddam to buy needed foodstuffs on credit and to spend his scarce reserves of hard currency on the massive arms buildup that brought war to the Persian Gulf.

Getting new aid from Washington was critical for Iraq in the waning months of 1989 and the early months of 1990 because international bankers had cut off virtually all loans to Baghdad. They were alarmed it was falling behind in repaying its debts but continuing to pour millions of dollars into arms purchases, even though the Iran-Iraq War had ended in the summer of 1988.

In addition to clearing the way for new financial aid, senior Bush aides as late as the spring of 1990 overrode concern among other government officials and insisted that Saddam continue to be allowed to buy so-called "dual use" technology—advanced equipment that could be used for both civilian and military purposes. The Iraqis were given continued access to such equipment, despite emerging evidence that they were working on nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction.

"Iraq is not to be singled out," National Security Council official Richard Haas declared at a high-level meeting in April 1990, according to participants' notes, when the Department of Commerce proposed curbing Iraqi purchases of militarily sensitive technology.

Evoking Bush's personal authority, Robert Kimmitt, undersecretary of state for political affairs, added: "The president doesn't want to single out Iraq."

And the pressure in 1989 and 1990 to give Saddam financial assistance and maintain his access to sophisticated U.S. technology weren't isolated incidents.

Rather, as classified documents obtained by the Los Angeles Times show, they reflected a long-secret pattern of personal efforts by Bush—both as president and as vice president—to support and placate the Iraqi dictator. Repeatedly, when serious objections to helping Saddam arose within the government, Bush and aides following his directives intervened to suppress the resistance.

In the case of the \$1 billion in commodity loan guarantees, for instance, senior Bush aides, armed with the presidential order—NSD 26—insisted the credits be approved despite objections by officials in three government agencies.

These officials warned that aid was being diverted to buy weapons in violation of American law, that the loans wouldn't be repaid and that earlier assistance efforts were plagued by financial irregularities.

Bush's involvement began in the early 1980s as part of the so-called "tilt" toward Iraq initiated by then-President Reagan to prop up Saddam in his war with Iran. Saddam's survival was seen as vital to U.S. efforts to contain the spread of Islamic fundamentalism and thwart Iran's bid for dominance in the Middle East.

Many in the American government, including Bush and Reagan, also hoped U.S. aid would gradually cause Saddam to moderate his ways and even play a positive role in the Middle East peace process.

But classified records show Bush's efforts on Saddam's behalf continued well beyond the end of the Iran-Iraq War and persisted in the face of increasingly widespread warnings from inside the American government that the overall policy had become misdirected.

Moreover, it appears that instead of merely keeping Saddam afloat as a counterweight to Iran, the U.S. aid program helped him become a dangerous military power in his own right, able to threaten the very U.S. interests that the program originally was designed to protect.

Clearly, U.S. aid didn't lead Saddam to become a force for peace in the volatile region. In the spring of 1990, as senior Bush administration officials worked to give him more financial aid, the Iraqi leader bragged that Iraq possessed chemical weapons and threatened to "burn half of Israel."

What drove Bush to champion the Iraqi cause so ardently and so long isn't clear. But some evidence suggests it may have been a case of single-minded pursuit of a policy after its original purpose had been overtaken by events—and a failure to understand Saddam's true nature.

Much of the blame for failing to perceive Saddam's expansionist ambitions and the dangers of building him up has fallen on middle-level officials and on agencies such as the Department of Commerce, which approved the sale to Iraq of \$1.5 billion worth of American technology, and the Department of Agriculture, which authorized a total of \$5 billion in loan guarantees.

However, classified documents from several agencies and interviews over the last two months demonstrate it was foreign-policy initiatives from the White House and State Department that guided relations with Iraq from the early 1980s to the eve of the Persian Gulf War—and that Bush and officials working under him played a prominent role in those initiatives.

For example:

In 1987, Vice President Bush successfully pressed the federal Export-Import Bank to provide hundreds of millions of dollars in aid for Iraq, the documents show, despite staff objections that the loans weren't likely to be repaid as required by law.

After Bush became president in 1989, documents show senior officials in his administration lobbied the bank and the Department of Agriculture to finance billions in new Iraqi projects.

After Bush signed NSD 26 in October 1989, Secretary of State James A. Baker III personally intervened with Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter to drop Agriculture's opposition to the \$1 billion in food credits. Yeutter, now a senior White House official, agreed and the first half of the \$1 billion was made available to Iraq in early 1990.

As late as July 1990, one month before Iraqi troops stormed into Kuwait City, officials at the National Security Council and the State Department were pushing to deliver the second installment of the \$1 billion in loan

guarantees, despite the looming crisis in the region and evidence Iraq had used the aid illegally to help finance a secret arms procurement network.

A Department of Agriculture official cautioned in a February 1990 internal memo that, when all the facts were known about loan guarantees to Iraq, the program could be viewed as another "HUD or savings-and-loan scandal."

Of the \$5 billion in economic aid over an eight-year period, American taxpayers have now been stuck for \$2 billion in defaulted loans.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AMERICAN COAL JOBS AND CREATE AMERICAN CONSTRUCTION WORK

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

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker—today, I am introducing, along with my colleague Congressman ANDY JACOBS, an important member of the Ways and Means Committee, legislation that will help protect American coal jobs and create American construction work. In the coming days, weeks, and months, this Congress will labor to find ways to jump-start the nation's trouble economy. I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support my proposal as a practical, cost effective method of strengthening our economy.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

I do not need to tell Members of this body the desperate situation our Nation is in. There are 8.9 million American without a job and the current recession is the longest in the United States since the Great Depression. The American people need and want action from this Congress and the administration. I applaud members of the Ways and Means Committee and others who have worked tirelessly to come up with a comprehensive growth proposal.

COAL INDUSTRY CONDITIONS

Though there are provisions of the different growth packages that I support, I feel that the plans under consideration are lacking a basic formula for economic stimulus. I am particularly disappointed in the apparent lack of concern about protecting existing jobs, especially those employed in coal mines across the United States. Regions of the country dependent on coal mining, such as southern Illinois, are currently experiencing some of the highest unemployment rates and the worst economic hardships in the Nation. My bill would provide a tangible incentive for utilities to speed up their environmental compliance plans, which would have a direct, positive effect on the rate of job creation for large-scale construction workers, and the rate of job retention among American coal miners.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

My bill would modernize and expand the definition of environmental prop-

erty and make available accelerated or straight line depreciation using a 5-year life. Under present law, 5-year straight line amortization is only available under limited conditions and only includes a narrow view of environmental property. This measure would also adjust the alternative minimum tax requirement to account for the unique problems faced by installers of pollution control equipment.

PROMOTING U.S. COMPETITIVENESS

This legislation would also put U.S. companies on a level playing field with other industrialized nations. Countries such as Japan and Germany understand that the cost of installing, maintaining, and operating antipollution devices and structures are often enormous. Countries of the world have responded to the cost of pollution control equipment by offering businesses valuable and reasonable tax incentives. By far the most common tax provision offered by our international competitors is the same type offered in my bill—accelerated depreciation. There is little disagreement that U.S. companies need to become more competitive and more aggressive in the international marketplace. I have complete confidence that the American worker can manufacture product or provide a service as well as anyone in the world. But should not be placed upon American workers and companies Government mandates that will be difficult to overcome. They deserve our cooperation and assistance in conforming to the laws and regulations that Congress has instituted.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRESS

In addition to job creation and preservation, this legislation will encourage environmental progress. Existing cost recovery rules applicable to environmental property are antiquated and out of step with current environmental regulations. This proposal will encourage businesses to invest capital in property that results in a cleaner environment.

If we are serious about getting this economy running again, then we must start by making a commitment as a congress to the jobs we have in place. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and give American workers an opportunity to make a living.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT OF DEPRECIATION RULES RELATING TO CERTAIN ENVIRONMENTAL PROPERTY.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 168(e)(3)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "and" at the end of clause (v), by striking the period at the end of clause (vi) and inserting ", and", and by adding after clause (vi) the following new clause:

"(vii) any environmental property."

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL PROPERTY.—Section 168(i) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) ENVIRONMENTAL PROPERTY.—The term 'environmental property' means a new identifiable item of property—

"(A) which is used in connection with a plant or other property in operation before January 1, 1991, to prevent, abate or control water or atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, disposing, storing or preventing the creation or emission of pollutants (including dust), contaminants, wastes, or heat, and property which monitors the creation or emission of pollutants (including dust), contaminants, wastes, or heat,

"(B) which does not significantly—

"(i) increase the output or capacity, extend the useful life, or reduce the total operating costs of such plant or other property (or any unit thereof), or

"(ii) alter the nature of the manufacturing or production process or facility,

"(C) which is not a building or its structural components, other than a building which is exclusively a facility described in subparagraph (A), and

"(D) the original use of which begins with the taxpayer, or, in the case of the first lessor, an item of property which is sold and leased back to the person with respect to which the original use began within 90 days of the date originally placed in service."

(c) ALTERNATIVE DEPRECIATION SYSTEM.—Paragraph (3) of section 168(g) of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(F) ENVIRONMENTAL PROPERTY.—In the case of environmental property (other than property described in subparagraph (A) or (D) of paragraph (1)), the recovery period used for purposes of paragraph (2) shall be 5 years."

(d) ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.—

(1) Paragraph (1)(B) of section 56(a) of such Code is amended by inserting before the period "or in paragraph (14) of section 168(i)".

(2) Paragraph (4)(A)(v) of section 56(g) of such Code is amended by inserting "or in paragraph (14) of section 168(i)" after "section 168(f)".

(e) REPEAL OF SECTION 169.—

(1) Section 169 of such Code is hereby repealed.

(2) The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to section 169.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after December 31, 1991, in taxable years ending after such date.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ILLINOIS VETERANS LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Illinois Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program [IVVLP] and the many Vietnam veterans it has served.

The IVVLP was founded 10 years ago as a comprehensive veterans employment service. Since its creation, the organization has assisted hundreds of veterans in Chicago and throughout Illinois to find gainful employment. The IVVLP's contributions are visible throughout the community.

Through the IVVLP's work, the Chicago Vietnam Memorial Fountain in Herald Square was constructed and dedicated by business

leaders and officials of the city of Chicago. In addition, the Vietnam Veterans Act was passed by the Illinois State Legislature to fund seven community-based, State-wide veterans organizations which have placed over 27,000 veterans.

The IVVLP is also concerned with education. Through the development and publication of "A Look Inside the War," the IVVLP seeks to present junior high and high school students with a broader view of the Vietnam conflict than that of a textbook. This supplemental reading guide conveys the experiences of those who fought in Vietnam to schoolchildren throughout Illinois.

Finally, the IVVLP has developed a pro bono legal service for veterans which has contributed over \$125,000 of free legal services. In doing so, the IVVLP has assisted those in need with cases ranging from child custody to home foreclosures.

I believe the Illinois Vietnam Veterans Leadership Program is a model for groups throughout the Nation to emulate. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commending the IVVLP on its 10th anniversary and to join me in recognizing its work in veterans employment services, education, and public service. I look forward to celebrating many more anniversaries of this fine organization in the years to come.

THE INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT ROLE OF FORAGE CROPS IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Speaker, forage crops are an increasingly important agricultural resource on both private and public lands in the United States. According to the National Academy of Sciences, approximately 25 percent—550 million acres—of the land in the United States is classified as cropland and pastureland. These lands provide most of the food that our Nation produces, including forage and feedgrains for domestic livestock, and most natural fibers—cotton and wool—as well. Rangelands cover another 20 percent—400 million acres—of the Nation's land area. They provide food for livestock and habitat for diverse populations of birds, fish, and other wildlife.

Forage resources on both pasture and range lands have traditionally played a vital role in U.S. livestock production, particularly beef cattle and sheep, and they will play an even more important role in these industries in the future, because of the need to achieve greater resource conservation and lower production costs. The dairy industry is a part of this trend as well.

Agricultural research and policy professionals now recognize that environmental, ecological, and human health benefits are obtainable from sustainable livestock grazing systems. Under these systems, livestock grazing in itself is recognized as food for land use

management on pasture and range lands, with improved livestock product quality and production efficiency as auxiliary benefits.

In addition to the traditional uses of forages to provide livestock weight gain, the cultivation of forage resources—grasses, legumes, grass-legume mixtures, and grass-legume-small grain mixtures—is increasingly important for meeting goals of soil conservation, water quality protection, and promoting soil fertility and pest control with reduced chemical use. To promote greater chemical adoption of these crops, Congress enacted the Integrated Farm Management Program option [IFM] as part of the 1990 Farm Act.

Mr. Speaker, the 1992 signup period for this program started on February 10 and will run until April 17. It is my hope that farmers who participate in the farm program will strongly consider enrolling in this program for the economic and environmental benefits it offers, and for the added benefit of assisting them to meet conservation compliance requirements by 1995.

The IFM allows producers to convert 20 percent or more of their acreage base to resource-conserving forage crops. The program gives the producer flexibility to adopt sustainable practices, because neither the acreage base nor deficiency payments are diminished. Some of the acreage placed in the IFM Program is eligible for haying and grazing, thus adding economic value to the IFM system.

Under related integrated resource management research provisions in the 1990 Farm Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to assist livestock producers by conducting on-farm research to develop site-specific resource management practices that improve production and financial efficiency, environmental stability, and food safety. Pasture and range-based forage systems, if properly managed, may offer livestock producers lower cost methods of production; improved herd health maintenance; more humane animal care practices; improved conservation of soil, water, and forage resources; and a leaner meat product.

On the public lands, there is increasing public awareness about the condition of forage resources, not only because they are the primary sustaining factor underlying domestic livestock production on those lands but also because of concern about maintaining biological diversity in plant and wildlife species, promoting water quality, and protecting riparian areas from degradation.

An increasing number of ranchers, other users of public lands, and environmentalists are seeking to improve land stewardship methods on the public lands in order to promote greater forage growth and forage diversity, increased overall biodiversity of plant and animal species, and to achieve en-

vironmental quality. This often involves joint management of contiguous tracts of private and public lands which form one ranching or farming unit.

Researchers are gathering data which concludes that the grazing management practice known as rotational grazing can significantly increase forage utilization by livestock and stimulate forage regrowth on both private and public pasture and rangeland areas—thus contributing to the creation of a more sustainable livestock grazing system.

Researchers at land grant universities and at private research facilities are currently determining a greater range of alternative uses for forage resources, including the production of renewable biofuels such as ethanol. The requirements of the Clean Air Act which go into effect this year have increased demand for cleaner, blended gasolines, such as ethanol, and ethanol can be produced from grasses and legumes as well as from corn.

Despite the above benefits of forage crops to U.S. agricultural and environmental goals, under present U.S. policies forage resources are not being utilized to their full economic and conservation capacity for the benefit of livestock producers, other agricultural crop producers, and for conferring environmental benefits upon the general public. More specifically, due to lack of adequate research and policy development, forage resources are managed less productively and efficiently than other major crops, such as the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] price-support program crops—wheat, feedgrains, rice, and cotton.

I believe that it is in the best interests of U.S. agricultural producers and the general public that forage crops be produced in an integrated manner which enhances the production of other, traditional agricultural crops—such as livestock and ASCS program crops—while also promoting resource conservation on both private and public lands.

We should give full recognition to forage crops as a resource whose cultivation and use are valued equally to those of other crops grown by U.S. agricultural producers under USDA price-support programs. To this end, a policy of integrated management of forage crop resources should be established as a foremost objective of agricultural public policy in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that agricultural producers in the farm program will utilize the economic and environmental benefits of forage crops by enrolling in the IFM Program, and even further, that producers on farms and ranches look for additional opportunities to develop other similar land stewardship practices which involve forage crops on private and public lands.

□ 1640

THE DEMOCRATS' TAX PACKAGE

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, 2 years ago we were having some economic difficulties and some revenue difficulties, and, rather than cutting spending, we had what was called a budget summit agreement. The Democrats in the House and the administration got together and they had a series of meetings, very highly publicized meetings, and during that period of time they reached an agreement on what should be done about the tax situation and the economic situation in this country.

Over the past decade the amount of tax revenues coming into the Treasury of the United States have gone from \$500 billion a year to \$1.1 trillion. We more than doubled the tax revenues, but we were still deeply behind the eight-ball as far as spending was concerned.

The problem was not that we did not have enough money; the problem was we were spending too much. What was the answer they came up with 2 years ago? To raise America's taxes by \$181 billion over a 5-year period, the largest tax increase in history. That is what the Democrat Party wanted to do. They held the Republican administration's feet to the fire, and ultimately they were successful. They said that would solve our deficit problems. It was not a spending problem, as far as they were concerned, just that we did not have enough money. Never mind that we had more than doubled the tax revenue over the last decade.

They said we needed more money. So, they raised America's taxes \$181 billion. They said that that would reduce the deficit down to \$200 billion a year and we would have a downward mode to a balanced budget in about 5 or 6 years.

What happened? They raised taxes by \$181 billion, and instead of the deficit going down, it went up. We have the largest deficit in U.S. history last year, \$400 billion-plus, following on the heels of the largest increase of taxes in America's history.

What does that tell us? It tells us when you take money out of America's pockets, they cannot spend it; if they cannot spend it, they cannot buy products; if they cannot buy products, then you do not produce the products; and if you do not produce the products, you start laying people off, unemployment goes up, and for each 1 percent of unemployment if costs the taxpayers of this country and the treasury \$42 billion—that is, for each 1 percent.

So, raising taxes is not the answer. But that is what they did instead of cutting spending.

So, now we come to the Democrat proposal, which we are going to be talking about later this week. We will be voting on it on Thursday.

What do they want to do to solve the problems? They want to raise America's taxes again, by \$93 billion. They say it is a tax shift, but the fact of the matter is they are taking \$93 billion out of some taxpayers' pockets that they will not be able to buy products with, and it is going to exacerbate, not solve, the economic problems facing this Nation.

What are they going to do in return for that? They are going to give a tax break to the middle-income families that is going to amount to one candy bar a day, 50 to 60 cents a day. A \$93 billion tax increase, and a candy bar in exchange for it.

And they wonder why we have economic problems.

I want to tell you just a few things before I yield to some of my colleagues. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that the plan that we are proposing on this side of the aisle will create 500,000 new jobs over the next few years. The plan that they are proposing will cost us, will cost America, at least 100,000 jobs. They did not learn anything 2 years ago. They raised our taxes by \$181 billion. We have got more unemployment than we have had before. We have more economic problems than we had before. The deficit is \$400 billion. What do they want to do? Raise taxes again.

The problem is not that we do not have enough revenues; we are just spending too much.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, "You are on the wrong track again," my Democratic colleagues, "you are on the wrong track again."

The way to get the economy moving is to have tax incentives, to get Government off the backs of the private sector in this country, to lower taxes, if anything, not to raise taxes; and to stimulate economic growth.

Cut the capital gains tax. They say that is a tax break for the rich. The fact of the matter is about 70 percent of the people in this country would benefit from a capital gains tax cut. It would stimulate more investment in the private sector, and when you invest in the private sector for capital improvements, more machinery and equipment, you create more jobs. More jobs means more taxpayers. More taxpayers means more tax revenue. You reduce the deficit and you get the economy moving.

When Ronald Reagan led the charge to cut the top tax rate 70 to 28 percent, that catapulted this country into an economic recovery the likes of which we have never seen. We created 21 million jobs over a 7-year period, 21 million new jobs. That is why we had more money coming into the Treasury, because we cut taxes, we put money in

people's pockets, there was more capital investment, more people buying products, more products produced and you had to have more workers to produce the products. So, we had more employees paying more taxes, less welfare, and less expenses, and hence we had economic progress.

Now they are doing the wrong things; they did it 2 years ago and they want to exacerbate the situation by doing it again.

We must not allow that to happen.

We are already in a recession, and the way to get out of it is not to tax Americans more, it is to tax them less.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman from Indiana taking this special order, because I think it is very important to start today the education of the American people on who is running this Congress and what is coming out of this House and the other body in terms of a deceit, if you will, on the American people. I have heard time and time again the Democrat leadership talking about, "We are going to give tax relief to the middle class, that the middle class were those who suffered the most in the Reagan years, and we have got to return taxes to the middle class." I have no problem with that. But if you look at their package, if you look at how they structured this package—and, by the way, I might point out to the gentleman from Indiana that we do not really know what is in the package because, once again, we are going to be asked to come down to this floor and to debate a very complicated piece of legislation without having really seen it until we get down to the floor. Sometimes we do not even see it then. It is more of a trust-me type of mode.

But what we are talking about here is the latest information that we have on the Democrats' package that they are going to bring to the floor.

□ 1650

So, some of our figures may be a little off, but the story is still the same. That is a sham on the American people. This will not cause any growth, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has pointed out. In fact, it will do just the opposite.

Be forewarned. The American people should be forewarned that this is only the beginning of the increase of their own taxes, and we will get into how that happens in a minute as we describe this package. It has no semblance whatsoever to good economic philosophy, to free-market philosophy, to the strong philosophy on economics that this country was built on. It has no rhyme or reason. It is just a hodgepodge of different special interest gifts versus a total political bent in how they take their approach.

For instance, most people have heard that the Democrats are going to give

them a \$2 to \$400 tax cut, but that is only temporary for 2 years, whereby the increase in taxes is permanent. They are going to raise the top rate of income taxes to 35 percent permanently.

Now what are they going to do with that money after 2 years? In fact, if we analyze this package, this package costs the Federal Government \$30 billion in the first 3 years, and because of that this will force one of three options: An OMB sequester, which means an across-the-board cut, or a declaration that the Democrat tax plan has caused a national emergency, thereby waiving the budget agreement, allowing spending to continue and deficits to rise, or it will bust the budget agreement to increase that spending and also increasing the deficit.

We all understand what is going on here. This is a bait-and-switch. The Democrats need more money for their spending habits, and they have figured out a way to do that, by raising income taxes on the rich, soon to be followed, because they will have to pay for these higher deficits by other taxes, and they will not be able to raise more taxes on the rich.

So, who is next? The next bracket. Within 2 or 3 years they will be right back wanting to raise taxes on the middle-income Americans, and that is not supposition. That is history; that has always been history. When we have gotten the tax rates low, then they start creeping up a little bit, and always they creep up on the rich first, and then, soon to follow because they still want to spend money, soon to follow they raise taxes on middle incomes and lower incomes, and we end up with the kinds of tax rates that we saw in the 1970's.

Believe me, this is the beginning of increasing taxes on all Americans, and they do such silly things. For instance, they eliminate the deductibility of compensation for corporate executives in excess of \$1 million, yet they put a 10-percent surtax on all those that make over \$1 million. Now I do not understand this. They are going to be penalized for paying an executive over \$1 million, and so then most companies will try to hide that kind of compensation through benefits and other means, and they are going to put a surtax on 10 percent on all those over \$1 million. It just does not make a whole lot of sense. Who is going to pay that millionaire's surtax if we prevent million-dollar salaries?

And it also provides a 2-year extension of the temporary phaseout of the itemized deduction and personal exemptions for high-income taxpayers. The original date was extended from 1995 to 1997, and this is the crunch:

They say they are raising taxes on the rich. Now granted, average Americans do not make \$85,000, but I content that what they are doing is they are raising taxes on the American dream.

Consider the young man or woman that comes from a low-income or middle- to low-income family, that that family works hard, scrimps and saves, that young man or woman works hard to put themselves through school trying to realize the American dream of being successful, living better than their parents, and their parents wanting their children to live better than they, so they make sure that they go through college, maybe go through higher education beyond college, like maybe they get a master's, or maybe they go to law school, or maybe they become CPA or a doctor. Yet what we are telling these young people is, "The more successful you get, the more the government is going to confiscate from you."

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of attitude that the Democrats of this House have when it comes to the American dream: "The more you make, the more you're going to pay." We are going to tax and penalize those people that are productive, that are out there creating jobs, and it has no, absolutely no—they have absolutely no concept of what drives this engine of our economy.

What drives it, Mr. Speaker, are people that dream about a future, that want to participate in the future. They want to go to school, better themselves, become a successful, productive American citizen. Yet we have no faith in that, or they do not have any faith in that in this House, and what they want to do is they want to tax that American dream. I think it is pitiful. I think this is a crazy package.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are going to realize that the Democrats are totally out of touch with what is real in this country, what drives this economic engine of this country, and they have totally lost it.

So, I just think that, as we get into analyzing this package during the hour of this special order, I think the American people are going to start to realize that this is a sham, and this is nothing more than a way of raising taxes so that they can spend more money.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I think each and every one of us has been home for the Christmas break since Thanksgiving and has talked to various and sundry people all over the area, and I represent the most heavily industrialized district in the United States, and, when I sat down and talked with people there, they do not want a candy bar a day, they do not want a \$400 tax cut. They would like to see something building for the future, the idea of new job creation and so forth.

I just was thinking of that \$93 billion tax that they are talking about, or whatever the amount of money was. If

that money were allowed to be spent by business and industry in buying equipment, think of the jobs it would create.

In my own company back home we are currently talking about buying a printing press, and the basic idea is we would like to be able to buy a printing press, but we are not sure whether we can afford it right now. But if some assistance came from the Federal Government, we could place an order for a printing press made in Wisconsin. Immediately they are going to pick up all kinds of jobs up there, and, when that printing press comes back to North Carolina, we are going to create 600 more jobs. That is the way to create for the future, not raising taxes and promising all kinds of crazy things like, "Well, the government is going to save you. Don't worry. We'll take care of you. We've got the big money. We're going to take care of everything."

Mr. Speaker, the people really want us to plan for the future, and we have not done that, and, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] said, and I think I have used this case over and over again, when Reagan put in his tax cuts in 1982 and things started moving, he created additional income, increase in income tax, every year, and I think it averaged about \$80 billion a year, that we added more income than we had the year before. But what happened? Say we have to have half of that to take care of Social Security increases, and veterans benefits increases and so forth. That leaves us \$40 billion left, \$40 billion. He has 6 more years in office. Six times 40 is \$240 billion. That balances the budget. It should have balanced the budget, but what happened? Congress comes along and spent every bit of it and more.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Way more.

Mr. BALLENGER. There is no way to trust anybody in this place. I have said that over and over again, and I think we all agree that a tax increase to give more money to Congress is actually creating a situation where they are going to spend it all on some other crazy ideas they have got instead of creating new jobs. It is sick.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER]. I think the analogy a lot of people give is: Giving Congress more taxes is like pouring gasoline on a fire.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to stand with my colleagues and comment on the proposal before us, which is the Democrat tax package that will be coming up here in the next day or two.

□ 1700

I have an interesting analysis prepared by the National Center for Policy

Analysis that really I think tells the true story. Let me just quote from this.

It says:

The economic plan devised by the Democrat leadership in the House of Representatives would lead to a net loss, a net loss of more than 100,000 jobs over the next six years, and prolong the current recession, according to the National Center for Policy Analysis. By contrast, the Republican plan would create almost 600,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this country are tired of all the posturing and all the empty rhetoric that we hear coming out of the other side. Let us face it, this recession was brought on beginning in 1986, when the liberal Democrats in the Congress insisted that the 1986 Tax Reform Act be revenue-neutral. That meant we had to make a bunch of changes in the tax laws that were negative to real estate that began to push us into the recession, that started slowing the economic growth down.

Then when the Democrats in the Congress forced their position on President Bush in 1990 and gave us the budget summit agreement and we enacted the luxury tax, which we all said would put people out of work and which, in fact, did put people out of work, we all said that when that agreement was struck and the taxes were raised, the largest single-year tax increase, as far as I understand, in U.S. history, we all understood that that would take us and push us right off the cliff into recession, and that is exactly what happened.

Now we are supposed to suspend our beliefs once again and indulge in the fiction that this plan being put forth by the Democratic leadership is going to result in anything positive for the economy of this country?

I think the National Center for Policy Analysis made it pretty clear what the impact of this disastrous plan is going to be, and the thing that strikes me, Mr. Speaker, is that we have the power, the people in this Chamber and the other body have the power to make a great difference in the lives of the American people.

By the policies that we enact, we could lift everybody up, make the economy grow faster, give people jobs, opportunities. We have that within our grasp, and it strikes me as criminal that we do not exercise correctly that tremendous lawmaking power that the people of this country have vested in us.

It is quite obvious that what we need right now for this country are measures that bring jobs and economic growth.

I would like to say a word about the middle-class tax relief. I strongly believe that the middle class is overtaxed and they desperately need tax relief. They do not need a dollar a day in tax relief. They need far more than that.

It seems to me it is incumbent upon us as Members of the House of Rep-

representatives to enact a package of economic growth and job creation that will lift this economy out of the recession and will get us going so that we are strong, so that we can then enact the real middle-class tax relief that is needed, and is it ever so desperately needed.

The taxation, I believe, is destroying the American family. It has gone from the point in 1948 with an average family of four with a median income where that family paid 2 percent of its total income to the Federal Government in taxes, to the point today where that same family of four with a median income pays 24 percent of its total income to the Federal Government in taxes of all kinds, a twelvefold increase.

Mr. Speaker, this is hurting America. For the long term we need to make some significant changes that will bring real middle-class tax relief. But for now we ought to create jobs and stimulate the economy so we can get strong again and do the real job that must be accomplished.

Let me just point out one thing in this bad package. You have heard already testimony that we are going to get like a 2-year temporary tax cut for the middle class, financed by a permanent tax increase, hiking the rates. It is interesting to see what would have to be accomplished by the Democrat leadership if they were going to make permanent, as may think they will try to do, this middle-class tax relief, so-called middle-class tax relief.

Analysts have performed the studies and have found that if the Democrats want to make their 2-year tax credit permanent, then they would have to increase the tax rate on individuals with incomes of more than \$35,000 per year and couples earning more than \$70,000 per year. Mr. Speaker, if they think that those people constitute the rich for whom taxes can be raised, then they are as out of touch as their worst critics have been suggesting.

These people are the middle class. They are the people who ought to be paying less taxes, not more, as our Democrat colleagues are proposing, and we should reject out of hand this terrible package that is going to be proposed which will do nothing to create jobs but which indeed, as this analysis from the National Center for Policy Analysis has concluded, will cost 100,000 jobs over the next 6 years. This is a disaster and should be rejected.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California. I appreciated very much his comments.

I see my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is here.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to have a very large debate in this body over what policy proposals might best help the American economy overcome its current doldrums. It is going to be surprising when we realize all the different ways in which the Government of the United States imposes taxes on the American people, and therefore, all the different ways in which the Government of this country might reduce taxes on the American people, that so much of the debate is going to be around the question of increasing or decreasing cuts in the tax on capital gains.

One has to wonder why this should be the centerpiece of such a debate. Let me see if I can help to understand it.

There is a body of noneconomic thought afoot in the country today that suggests that there is somehow or another a conflict between workers on the job and the machines with which they work over a fair share of the Nation's output.

The fact of the matter is, anybody that has actually been involved in a job on a production line producing a real product, and not ensconced in some ivory tower or somehow or other held aloof from the real process of production in the real economy, carried out by real people in their real jobs in the real world, knows that in fact it is the combination of the machine and the laborer, the skills of the machine and the science and engineering knowledge built into the machine, called technology, in conjunction with the skills of the worker, that actually produces a product and generates what we want more of these days, increased productivity.

So in fact if we are going to increase productivity and thereby increase chances for working Americans to have greater salaries from greater output, we have to have an increase in capital investment through which the new technology is applied, and that capital and labor come together and join in this production process and thereby give the Nation its product or goods and services that make our lives well.

It is very difficult for us to approach the problem of economic expansion, then, without trying to find ways to increase investment in real capital. It is their view that the benefits of increased investment in real capital and therefore the increased product of real capital in the working place go only to the owners of the capital. But we know better.

The fact is that 90 percent of the direct benefits from the utilization of capital and production, and the investment in capital, accrue to the workers. Without that capital investment these workers would not have a job.

That is illustrated to me by a working man on a production line in a plant in my district who was showing me the

new machine that he was working with. This was a skilled machinist, a very long-term employee of the company, very excited about the new machine that he had to work with, who pointed out the increased output he gets every hour and every day because he has got this new machine, and how that has led to his raise because he was generating greater output. He was very fond of the machine.

□ 1710

I asked the gentleman what this machine cost if you were going to buy it? He said that this machine cost over \$1 million. Then he turned to me and said, "You know, Congressman, if I worked to the best of my ability all my life and saved every dime I could save from taking care of my family, there is no way in my lifetime I could get together enough money to buy that machine."

It is those savers and investors across the country that made that machine available and made his increased output per hour, per day, greater, and allowed his salary to go up. That is the way capital and labor work together.

Now, what we have seen is that when you decrease the cost to people who invest of taxes on earnings from that investment, they tend to invest more. When they invest more, more workers have more machines with greater technology with which to work. Their product goes up, GNP goes up, their incomes go up, they get their raises, and they pay more taxes.

We have seen when you increase the cost to investors by raising taxes, telling them that you will get less of a reward by making that investment, they invest less. Therefore, fewer machines are put in place, fewer jobs are created, fewer raises are earned. Because less technology is increased, productivity goes down. That is the historical record.

So the extent to which this Nation accumulates capital through investment becomes a key to whether or not the Nation grows in its economy, or declines. It is extremely important that we measure this accurately.

Let me get to the debate. In this debate tomorrow those people who believe capital and labor compete with each other for relative "fair shares" are going to argue that when you decrease the cost of capital by cutting the capital gains tax it is not fair to the workers, as they did in 1989 when we had this issue before us in the Bill Archer-Congressman Jenkins proposal. Then they will say it is just a tax break for the rich.

Well, it turns out that the owners of capital that get the 10-percent benefit that do not go to the workers who work along with the capital are 69 percent either retired Americans or working Americans who own capital in their retirement program.

To give you an example, in the State of Texas, my home state, the State

Teachers Retirement Program is held 100 percent in capital instruments in the private sector of the economy. That would be General Motors stock, Ford Motor bonds, AT&T stock. And to the extent that that capital is made more productive and more valuable and that stock benefits, their retirement program goes up.

Thirty-one percent of the capital then is owned by individuals. I guess a fair estimate might be that half of those individuals, say 15 percent, let's say 16 to 17 percent, might be people with super normal incomes. Let us say 20 percent.

So what this side that is hostile to increasing the benefits of capital investment to the American people are suggesting is the American people are so full of greed and envy and jealousy and spite that they are willing in order to punish that 20 percent of the recipients of 10 percent of the benefits of capital investment so much that they are willing to take the benefits away from the 90 percent who are the primary beneficiaries.

They misjudge the character of the American people. They misjudge the sense of the American people. They have demonstrated they do not know how to measure the earnings of capital.

I am going to finish with this point, and this is a point I want to emphasize. This debate will rest tomorrow on the evaluation of the real impact of capital spending on the American economy, on the wages of the American workers, and on the tax receipts of the U.S. Treasury, by the Congressional Budget Office.

This is an official scoring agency of the Congress that is totally under the control of the Democrat majority of Congress. This is not a nonpartisan or bipartisan economic analytical group. It is a very partisan Democrat-controlled agency of the U.S. Congress called the Congressional Budget Office.

Every single employee of this organization is hired, promoted, given raises, and fired by the Democrat majority in Congress. I will guarantee you these hard-working men and women in the CBO, as we call it, know darned good and well who butters their bread and who can unbutter their bread.

They have given us forecasts. In the great debate in 1989 over the Archer-Jenkins proposal they projected that in 1990, there would be \$254 billion worth of capital gains earnings in the United States. How they made that projection, we do not know. We have found one way you can duplicate that projection. You can take the patterns of earnings that we experienced from 1978 to 1979, demonstrate that trendline to a fourth grader with a color crayon, and if the fourth grader can draw a straight line from there, they can come to that number.

So I would suggest to you that the Congressional Budget Office in 1990 was

no more accurate than would have been a fourth grader with a color crayon.

Now, what really happened? Incidentally, they argued then that if in fact you cut the capital gains tax by 2 percent, that all you would have to do is take 2 percent times \$254 billion and you would find out how much is a tax break to the rich. Because in their estimation, only rich people own capital. Never mind the 69 percent of the ownership that is in the hands of retired American citizens or working men and women in their retirement fund, like the Texas teachers. Only rich fat cats in their understanding own capital. So they said this would be an unfair thing to do for the rich.

Now, what really happened in 1990? Real capital gains earnings realizations in 1990 were \$120 billion. They had an error of \$134 billion. That is to say the Congressional Budget Office was more than 100-percent wrong in just telling what would be the total earnings in a given year, let alone what would be the impact to the economy, on the lives of working men and women, on the lives of retired American citizens, on the Treasury from tax receipts, on the productivity of the Nation.

They could not even guess within a 100-percent margin of error what would be the level of capital gains earnings a year away from where they were already. In fact, during 1989 when the debate was taking place, during the time the experience was happening around them, they were guessing that total capital gains earnings were going to be \$225 billion. Total capital gains earnings in that year was about \$125 billion. So they were \$100 billion off.

Looking at the world in which they were trying to live and saying what is happening in this world, they were \$134 billion off saying what is going to happen by the end of next year.

These people coming down here tomorrow who are going to tell you that it is not productive for the American working men and women's opportunity to have a better job, to have a job, to have taxable income with which to get a tax reduction, or retired people to have a better retirement program, for the Treasury to have more money rather than less money, are going to rely on the estimates and scoring practices of the Congressional Budget Office, which is more than 100-percent wrong.

Incidentally, let me say that last year when I discovered this \$134 billion error I called it to the attention of the Congressional Budget Office. They told me, "Oh, yeah, we had seen our error and we corrected it in technical corrections."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. A \$134 billion technical correction?

Mr. ARMEY. I do not know how things are in your home, but if I have a \$134 billion error in my checkbook, I do not call that a technical correction.

I call that a disaster. I think if General Motors had a \$134 billion error in their checkbook, they would call that a disaster.

□ 1720

They said, "We corrected it." In fact, they had not corrected it. In fact, they covered it up. In fact, they continued making the error.

We are talking about whether or not we can make responsible public policy like what must be made as responsible personal or corporate or business policy by real people in the real world, and what this tells me is that if I have a business and I hire an accounting firm to project my sales, to project my earnings or to project what will be the change in sales earnings if I raise my price or lower my price and that accounting error makes over a 100-percent error, I either find the error and fire the accounting firm or I go out of business. If I do not find the error and correct the error, I go out of business. That is what happens in the private sector.

If one makes errors and one does not find them and correct them, one goes broke.

What we are seeing here, given the increased, get this, increased congressional appropriations for the Congressional Budget Office during the time these errors were being made, they have demonstrated that in government, if you make an over 100-percent error and you do not admit to the error, even when somebody else finds it for you and you do not correct the error, you go into a budget cycle with more money.

So we have a Congress that is appropriating to this agency more tax dollars to make more bad business analyses where they cannot even get within 100 percent of the truth. And I do not know how one can get that bad. One cannot get that bad by accident, I will guarantee. A 4-year-old with a colored crayon could do that by accident.

And they have the audacity to come down here tomorrow in this debate and cite the so-called analysis of the Congressional Budget Office. I have to tell my colleagues, I would be embarrassed.

I for one am probably a little more inclined to offer as testimony the prognosis of my 4-year-old nephew with his color crayon. I think I would have a better chance of getting somewhere close to the mark. That is the kind of intellectual gantry we are going to see behind this debate tomorrow that says capital gains tax reductions are not fair to working men who in fact get 90 percent of the benefits of increased output, increased investment, increased productive capacity, and increased productivity which they can then share with the working women on those same production lines.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank Professor Archer, and I

hope tomorrow when the Democrats start quoting CBO, the gentleman will be down here to set them straight.

Mr. ARMEY. I might mention that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] thanks you, too.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] brought up some interesting propositions there. I think it just points out the fact that the Democrats have been pushing us to the wall here, trying to make truth out of lies. I cannot believe that they would, as the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] points out, not want to change that luxury tax which in effect everyone knows costs the country dollars in revenue, costs the country jobs, somewhere 30,000 or more.

It is not the big guy that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] was talking about that gets hurt. It is the little guy that loses his job when those businesses close down. It is America giving away their industry to somebody else because we do not want it here, because we want to tax it and overtax it.

In this bill tomorrow the Democrats are going to try to tax you, raise your taxes by \$93.5 billion over 6 years. And we know what that is going to do. That is going to increase the deficit even more.

What happened this year? Every time an appropriations bill went through this House, we increased our deficit by an infinite amount, and it added up to somewhere near \$400 billion. Now we are talking about \$30 billion more in the next year by raising taxes.

Come on, Americans. We know better than that. The National Center for Policy Analysis has said that if we reduce taxes on savings or other personal income, we will, for every \$1 billion reduction, put \$25 billion into the economy in the form of support and business and jobs.

In addition to that, about \$11 billion will come back to the U.S. Government in other forms of revenue, which means that if we reduce taxes instead of raising them, we are going to not only stimulate the economy, stimulate jobs, but return a revenue increase after only about 6 months of operation.

That is what I call stimulating the economy. What the Democrats are doing is stimulating death.

This country is ready to turn around. The people of this country are ready to go to work and to try to say, "No more jobs is crazy." Their so-called middle-income tax relief does not provide relief for Americans. It does not even give retired Americans a break. They are still living on interest. They are living on a fixed income, and we are saying they are too old to get the advantage of any tax break. They are not part of America any more.

I do not think our retired Americans feel that way. I think they feel just as much as American as you and I, and they deserve that tax relief just as you and I.

Also we keep seeing and talking about cutting our military. In some conversations that I have had with some of the defense officials, it appears to me that when we cut our military, I am not sure we get the bonus that we are talking about. We are putting people back into the economy. We are taking away jobs in a decreasing economy. So how does that help this Nation? And yet we have got the Democrats calling for us to reduce the military, not just by what the administration wants but by another 50 percent.

And what that says is we want to put more out of work people out in our economy. This is a great time to do that. Let us put them out there and then 5 years from now take those savings and put them back into social programs, not reduce our budget which is what we are supposed to try to be doing.

You and I have to balance our check book. This Government, it is time we started balancing our check book. It is time we put this petty partisan politics aside and started thinking about America first. I wish that we could get the Democrat Party to come to us, work with us and help form an economic development plan that will work for America.

We had one, and they have torn it apart.

It does not even include the administration's \$5,000 tax credit for first-time home buyers. So what are we doing? We are giving another bad signal. We are telling new Americans out there, "You cannot buy a house because you cannot afford it, and we are not going to help you get it."

I am not sure that anything we are doing right now is helping America save. The savings in America have gone from somewhere around 7 or 8 percent of the personal income, gross income, down to something around 4½ percent. And do my colleagues know what they are in our biggest competitors' countries, Germany and Japan? They are up around 17 to 18 percent or double or triple what ours is, which means that when we do have a recession, we have nothing to fall back on.

Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] know why in the world would Americans not want to save? Because the Democrats want to tax them to death. There is a tax on our savings. There is no incentive to save, and here we are with a bill that they are going to try to pass tomorrow that does not want to give us capital gains to stimulate the economy.

It only gives temporary tax cuts, but permanent tax increases, raising taxes, again as I said, to \$93 billion.

It violates the budget agreement, really, by letting us go into debt the

way we are. So what have they done? They have gone back on their word, have they not?

I think that is gross. I really think that we owe it to the American people.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for giving me the opportunity to straighten this thing out.

□ 1730

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his very salient points he has made.

In addition, BILL GRADISON on the Ways and Means Committee sent a letter around today which indicated that this will trigger the sequester of \$30 billion. So this is going to cause all kinds of chaos, this Democrat plan. And I think we need to come down here tomorrow in force and point out all of the deficiencies in it as we debate it.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

There is floating around here a letter, which I cannot find about the sequester the gentleman talked about, about automatic cuts, and, I believe on Medicare and on farmers programs. On the one hand the Democrats I think are telling the American people, "We are here to help you," and on the other hand they are trying to pass a plan that has automatic cuts in it for those particular programs.

But that leads to some other things that I think are very important to bring up before we run out of time and to point out how ridiculous this plan is was not only the idea of class warfare, pitting higher income against middle-class income, but it is sort of a very deceitful way that they are doing things. I mentioned earlier about raising tax bracket is going to be permanent, while the tax relief is going to be temporary. Let me show how it will force the tax bracket to be increased for middle income Americans, because what happens here is they raise the current 31-percent tax bracket to 35 percent on individuals making \$85,000 and couples making \$185,000 to pay for the tax relief of \$200 to \$400 per family. That tax relief is only for 2 years.

Here we come into the third year. Do you really believe that the people that control this House are going to let that tax relief phase out and not extend it like they extend everything else around here? A lot of the things we do are on a temporary basis, and we just keep extending them, because once you create a constituency for tax relief, it is not going to go away. If they extend that tax cut that in their bill is set to expire in 1994, which by the way is an election year, if the Democrats wish to continue that tax cut, which will be popular in that election year, they will have to lower the threshold for the rich

tax bracket to individuals making \$40,000 and couples making \$75,000.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I might inquire of the gentleman, what he is saying is that the \$85,000 wage earner that is going to get the 35-percent tax rate will now be a \$40,000 wage earner in order to meet the financial requirements to give that tax break to the so-called middle-income people?

Mr. DELAY. Or for a couple that makes \$75,000. That is what I am talking about. They want to tax the American dream.

There are some other things in this bill that I think people are going to find very interesting. No Member of this House better vote for this bill that has a real estate market in their district that is in decline, because what they do is they require slower depreciation of real estate, which will further depress real estate prices, which puts more pressure on S&L's and banks, by the way, and that is the last thing that we need in a declining real estate and banking market.

What is really interesting about this is how they give to one and take away from the other. They tax the employee that has been laid off. So all these automobile employees that worked for GM and are going to be laid off, what they do is they very cleverly stick in there where right now we have a key deduction, a tax here that has to move at least 35 miles to qualify for a moving expense deduction, what they do is they raise that test to 75 miles. So if you lose your job, you will have to move 75 miles to get that little bit of tax relief on moving. Any economist will tell you that it is dumb to raise taxes on job-related moves during a recession or during times of high unemployment.

There is another alternative in there, and I will quickly end and get through some of these. The Democrat alternative provides a maximum tax credit of \$400 on a joint return for a typical family of four. This amounts, as we have pointed out, to 27 cents per person per day. Furthermore, it is available only for 1992 and 1993. In 1994, an election year, they will extend that so that it drops the bracket, and that cannot be emphasized enough. It drops the income by which you have to pay 35 percent.

But also they have that temporary tax credit applying only to wages subject to Social Security taxes. So Americans who work for State and local governments or who do not participate in Social Security or are subject to Social Security tax, they get none of this middle-class temporary tax cut. And retired people living on fixed incomes, they get no tax relief either.

And unlike the President's personal exemption increase proposal, the Democrat tax credit provides no benefit for children. A family with several children will get no more tax relief than a

couple with no children. Indeed, what they do, because we give a tax break for day care, and people that stay home or choose to stay home and take care of their kids will get no tax relief in comparison to those who choose to work, both parents working outside the home and putting their kids into day care. So they are choosing between different kinds of Americans, and I think that is just disgusting.

Also, and I will finish with this, on small business, no Member of this House ought to vote for the Democrat package that is interested in small business relief, because what they do is they tax productive small businesses. Prior to last year taxpayers could meet their estimated tax obligations by paying 100 percent of what they paid last year, or 90 percent of the current tax liability. In other words, trying to estimate their tax liability, they not only want to conform with the laws of the land, but they want to avoid a pretty hefty tax penalty for not making sure that they have estimated their taxes properly and given the Government its money up front, before they really deserve it. But at least they had it at 100 percent of last year's taxes. You could pay that or 90 percent of the current year's tax liability. The Democrat package would take that 100-percent safe harbor away and make it 115 percent. So the President is changing the withholding tables to put more cash in people's hands and the Democrats are doing just the opposite by forcing cautious taxpayers to overpay their taxes. It is not good enough for the Government to get their taxes up front, now they want 115 percent of their taxes up front. So they are penalizing the honest Americans that are trying to do the best they can in estimating their taxes.

I think this thing is so full of these kinds of things and the American people are not stupid. I think the Democrats feel that the American people are stupid because they throw them a few crumbs expecting to buy off their support when in fact what they are doing is they are absolutely jeopardizing their jobs by jeopardizing the economy of this country.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I just want to say to the chairman of the Republican Study Committee that I really appreciate all of the research he has done on this and his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to end up tonight with our Republican floor leader, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]. I think he has come down to participate in our special order. He has been very active in trying to combat the terrible package that the Democrats are presenting to the Congress, I think tomorrow.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding to me. I want to thank him for hosting this special order to lay out the choice that the American people will face.

I just want to repeat something I said earlier in a 1-minute speech today, and that is that the Democratic Party seems to have a passion every 4 years for returning to the left. For 20 years now, starting with McGovern, and then Carter, and Mondale, and then Dukakis, we see this sort of leftward scurry for higher taxes and a bigger welfare state. And when we look at what the House Democrats are bringing to the floor this week, it is astonishing that they would have taken the President's State of the Union speech and his appeal for tax cuts and turned it into tax increases, that they could have taken the President's appeal in the State of the Union to create jobs and turned it into a program which the National Center for Policy Analysis estimates would kill 100,000 jobs. It is astonishing to me that in their passion for a larger welfare state, and in their passion for more tax money in the kind of economy we have right now, in the middle of a recession, that they could come in here with a massive tax increase proposal.

□ 1740

I think it is going to be very interesting to see how many of the more independent-minded Democrats are whipped into line by the machine and how many decide that they just cannot vote for a tax increase in the middle of a recession and that they feel compelled to vote no this week on the Democratic tax increase.

So I appreciate my colleague and my other friends coming over and discussing this. I hope in a few minutes to put a framework of thinking about economic growth into the RECORD.

I will just close by noting that you now have a Democratic tax-increase bill which their frontrunner, Paul Tsongas, has indicated he would veto. Now, when you write a bill so bad that not only would George Bush veto it, but the Democratic frontrunner would veto it, I would hope an awful lot of independent-minded Democrats would think twice before they would get dragged into voting for this kind of a tax increase.

I very much want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for hosting this and giving us a chance to discuss the Democratic tax bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I thank the Republican floor leader.

I see I am about out of time, so let me just end up by hitting a few of the highlights of the Democrats' proposal that is going to really put this economy into an even worse tailspin.

Their tax proposal would cost 100,000 jobs. The Republican tax proposal would create 500,000 to 600,000 jobs. There is a net switch of between 600,000 and 700,000 jobs; 500,000 to 600,000 new jobs created by the Republican proposal, 100,000 jobs lost with the Democrat proposal. They want to raise

America's taxes again by \$93 billion followed on the heels of a \$181 billion tax increase just 2 years ago that put us into this economic tailspin we are in today.

The fact of the matter is that we do not need more taxes in this country. We need less taxes. We do not need more Government regulation. We need less regulation.

If you let the free-enterprise system work its will, if you turn the free-enterprise advocates loose, if you let the small businessman do his job without Government interference and more taxes, we will create more jobs.

When Ronald Reagan lowered taxes from 70 percent to 28 percent, the tax rate, we created 21 million new jobs over a 5- to 6-year period, and that brought in more than \$600 billion in new tax revenues.

So what we need to do is cut taxes, not increase them. Their answer is to always tax and tax and spend and spend, and we cannot tolerate that anymore.

DEMOCRATIC TAX INCREASE KILLING JOBS

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk this evening about the Democratic tax increase killing jobs, and I think it is a magnificent example of the power of ideology over reality that in the middle of a recession the House Democratic leadership would decide that they had to bring in a class-warfare tax increase, an ideological bill, rather than cooperate with President Bush in developing a tax-cut, job-creating bill.

Let me make very clear, every American has an interest in this economy in passing a tax-cut program that would create new jobs. Every American has an interest in this recession in trying to find a way to put people back to work.

Let me give you a very practical example: The average new job at \$25,000 gross income provides \$346 in increased revenues to Medicare; that is taxes paid toward the Medicare fund; \$1,050 toward Social Security; and \$2,914 in income tax to the Federal Government. So every time we create a new job at the average salary in America, the Federal Government gains \$4,827 in tax revenue for Social Security and the General Treasury, and by taking that person off of unemployment and taking them off of welfare, we save the Government the money it is currently spending. So the net effect on the deficit of having any one person go from unemployment and potentially food stamps and welfare to having an average job, the net change in the deficit is over \$10,000.

So if you have a program which, as the President's chief economic adviser suggested, would create 500,000 new jobs, and that is the estimate of Dr. Michael Boskin, the head of the Council of Economic Advisers, 500,000 new jobs, each of them changing the deficit by a factor of \$10,000, becomes a \$5 billion shift immediately in the deficit. It means that the Government is creating \$2.5 billion in additional revenue this year, and that that goes on every year, and that it is saving money on the spending side, because people are not at that point having to be on food stamps and welfare and unemployment.

In addition, I would say that the Congress could get its act together and put the country ahead of the party and actually pass a bipartisan tax-cut job-creation plan that the President could sign, and I think that that would stimulate confidence among consumers. They would go back out and buy cars and buy houses and make the kinds of investments that create jobs. And I think you would see another 2 or 3 million jobs created by the multiplier effect as consumer confidence went up and people went back and developed an opportunity to create new jobs.

We are at a real crossroads. The President of the United States came here, President Bush, in January and spoke in this Chamber at a State of the Union Address, and he asked the Democratic leadership to work with him in passing a tax-cut, job-creation program, a program designed for the free market, for the private sector, a program that recognizes what we are learning from Russia, Ukraine, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, and that is that big centralized bureaucratic welfare state governments simply do not work. They do not create jobs. They do not create wealth. They do not increase the standard of living.

So if we are going to stimulate the private sector, the business communities, small-business entrepreneurs, create an environment to create jobs, the President wanted to pass a tax-cut program that would encourage people, a \$5,000 tax credit for first-time home buyer to give them a real incentive to go out and get involved in the community and buy that very first home.

The use of the individual retirement account, the IRA, allowing people to take the money out and use it to buy a home, again, creates a sense of community and recognizing that building homes is the biggest single stimulator to get out of the recession, because when you build a home, you not only pay for the carpenter and the plumber and electrician, you also pay to buy the wood. You pay to buy the parts. You pay to buy the washer, the drier, and the refrigerator and the curtains and the furniture, and so that homebuilding is the most powerful multiplier of job creation in the economy.

The President's program has a very powerful stimulus to create home buying and to create homebuilding.

We could go a stage further. The President was also suggesting that we cut the capital gains tax. Now, the capital gains tax matters, because it is a tax on job creation. All we are suggesting is that there are about \$400 billion in private money locked up today in stocks and bonds and funds and small businesses and savings accounts, people who will not liberate that money because the tax is too high, and we believe, and experts believe, that if we were to open up a tax incentive and encourage people to go out and to invest and to create new jobs, to shift their money out of old businesses to new businesses, to shift their money out of old investments to new investments, we believe it would create a tremendous improvement.

Now, let me give you a nonpartisan analysis. The National Center for Policy Analysis issued the following press release today:

Study: Democratic economic plan would cost jobs, make the recession deeper. The economic plan devised by the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives would lead to a net loss of more than 100,000 jobs over the next 6 years and prolong the current recession, according to the National Center for Policy Analysis. By contrast, the Republican plan would create almost 600,000 jobs.

The House is expected to begin debate on both plans on Wednesday.

"The difference is striking," said MCPA President John Goodman, "the Republican plan creates jobs. The Democratic plan destroys them. The higher taxes on investment income in the Democratic plan would discourage investment and more than offset the positive effects of new tax incentives the Democrats propose for capital gains and investment in equipment." Republicans in the House of Representatives are proposing a fast-track version of President Bush's economic plan. Key elements include a reduction in the maximum capital gains tax rates from 28 percent to 15.4 percent and liberalized depreciation rules for business investment in new equipment.

□ 1750

The Democratic plan also calls for cutting capital gains taxes (through inflation indexing) and adopts the Republican proposal for investment in equipment, but the Democratic plan also includes a tax credit for workers, worth \$400, a higher tax bracket for higher income families, an increase to 35 percent from 31 percent, and an additional surtax of 10 percent on income above a million dollars.

The millionaire surtax may be good politics, but it is bad economics.

Goodman said:

Almost all the investment income in excess of a million dollars is investment income. The Democratic plan would impose an additional 14 percent tax on wealthy investors and encourage them to buy tax-exempt bonds rather than make job-creating investments.

The NCPA analysis was conducted by Gary and Aldona Robbins, two econo-

mists formerly with the U.S. Treasury Department. According to the Center's analysis, over the next 6 years the Republican proposal would create 593,000 jobs, while the Democratic proposal would lead to a loss of 103,000 jobs. The Republican proposal would increase the Nation's output of goods and services by \$476 billion through 1997, while the Democratic proposal would actually do a loss of \$69 billion in output.

The Republican proposal would be self-financing. Greater output would create new revenue which offsets the revenue loss from tax cuts by 1997, while the Democratic plan would increase the Federal Government's 6-year deficit by \$53 billion. "The biggest difference in the two plans is the effect on investment * * * said Goodman. "The Republican plan rewards investors, while Democrats punish them."

According to the NCPA analysis, the Republican plan would increase investment spending by almost \$200 billion a year.

By contrast, the Democrats tax on high-income investors would more than offset the stimulus provided by capital gains indexing. As a result, the Democratic plan would decrease investment by about \$40 billion a year through 1995. "In order to create jobs and stimulate the economy, we must have more investment," said Goodman. "The Democratic leadership has lost sight of that fact."

The NCPA's formal forecast really outlines it. That is the end of my quoting from them in terms of a general thing, but let me cite the difference. They suggest that cumulatively the difference would be 617,000 jobs created by the end of the decade by the Republican plan and 24,000 jobs killed by the end of the decade, but the peak destruction would be 103,000 jobs killed by 1997.

Now, the reason is very direct and very simple. Imagine that we came on the floor and said, look, we have two proposals. One proposal would lead private citizens to invest an extra \$240 billion a year, private money, not raising taxes, not having a government bureaucracy do it, not having Washington do it, not having Harvard professors do it, private money, privately saved, and privately invested to create jobs.

On the one hand you have a Republican program, which President Bush supports, which would create \$240 billion in additional investment, and by the way, by doing that, that new proposal would lead to 617,000 new jobs in the private sector, permanent jobs, tax-paying jobs, creative jobs, productive jobs.

On the other hand let us say you had a program that would have \$240 billion less in annual investment, and instead of creating 617,000 new jobs at its peak, it would actually kill 100,000 jobs.

Now, you can appreciate why if you are a Democratic national political

strategist and your only hope for being in the White House in 1993 was to make the recession deeper, you might be attracted to a plan which according to the National Center for Policy Analysis kills 21,000 jobs in 1992, kills 62,000 jobs in 1993, lowers the gross national product or the gross domestic product by \$3 billion this year, by \$8½ billion next year and peaks in 1995 with a reduction in gross national product of \$19 billion.

Now, you might say to yourself, well, I understand if I were a Democratic political strategist why surely for party political purposes I would like to deepen that recession, keep it going longer, and in fact put the country in a position where the country is in such pain by November that they vote Democrat; but if you are an American citizen who wants a job, if you are a business who wants more customers, if you are a citizen who thinks about your country's long-range health, if you are a grandparent worried about your grandchildren coming on the job market, if you are a parent worrying about your child coming on the job market, if you are a young person out there today looking for a new job, there is a pretty big difference between the Republican plan which ultimately creates 617,000 new jobs and the Democratic plan which at its peak kills 100,000 jobs.

Let me point out that is a gap of over 700,000 jobs between the two plans.

Now, what are 700,000 jobs worth? Well, I had one of my staff develop a relatively simple analysis which suggests that the Republican plan over the decade will increase revenue for the Government by \$17 billion in additional income from taxes because more people are at work and more people are out there creating new jobs and creating new opportunities. But let me carry it a step further.

Why, you might ask, is there such a huge gap between on the one hand the National Center for Policy Analysis and the White House Council of Economic Advisers, both of which estimate very large increases in jobs? The President estimates at least 500,000 new jobs. The National Center for Policy Analysis concludes 617,000 new jobs.

And the Democratic plan, which by the way, the Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation [IRET] says the Democratic plan is "a threat to growth."

Why is there such a big difference then between that and what you might get from say the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Committee on Taxation? I think the reason is fairly simple and fairly direct. The Joint Committee on Taxation or the Joint Tax Committee essentially has a socialist model. It is an astonishing model. I really fully came to appreciate this when Senator PACKWOOD, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee in 1989, asked the Joint

Committee on Taxation how much money could be raised if we simply confiscated all the money above \$200,000 a year. They said if you earn any money above \$200,000 a year, we will take up all of it.

He wrote them a letter and he said please estimate how much would you get.

Now, imagine if you will, all of you who watched Paul Tsongas on the New Hampshire primary night when he said, "No goose, no eggs. No job creators, no jobs. You can't be pro-jobs and hate job creators. You can't be pro-jobs and engage in class warfare."

This is the Democratic front runner, Paul Tsongas. This is not a conservative. This is not George Bush or DAN QUAYLE. This is a former liberal Democratic Senator from Massachusetts who has worked in the private sector, and like Boris Yeltsin and like Mikhail Gorbachev has come to the conclusion that socialism and the welfare state do not work.

What did the joint committee say in answer to Senator PACKWOOD's question? They said that they would raise \$104 billion the first year by confiscating all the wealth above \$200,000. They would raise \$204 billion the second year. They would raise \$232 billion the third year, \$263 billion the fourth year, and \$299 billion the last year.

And Senator PACKWOOD called the joint committee back and he said, "Wait a minute. You mean to tell me that even at a 100-percent tax rate, you think we will be getting these increased quantities of money?"

At that point, the Joint Committee on Taxes sent back a letter and said they do not take into account any kind of human response. In other words, all of us know that if we raise taxes dramatically on the Jay Rockefellers and the Teddy Kennedys and the other wealthy millionaires in America that they are going to go out and find tax shelters. They are going to find municipal tax free bonds. They are going to find some way to avoid the taxation. We know that, and we know as commonsense people that if taxes go up dramatically, people will do less of what is being taxed. We know that in the real world, because we do it ourselves. We know that if you had 100 percent taxation, you would have an astonishing amount of cash transactions. You would have an amazing number of people who say, "I will build you a house for half price if you pay me in cash. I will sell you a new car for half price if you pay me in cash," because they would want to avoid the taxes. So we know in the real world of real human beings that when you have a 100-percent tax rate, you in fact are discouraging the behavior.

□ 1800

Yet the Joint Tax Committee assumes that nobody will be smart

enough to figure out that if they engage in 100 percent taxation they might as well not work.

Now, Ronald Reagan knew this. Why did he know it? Because in World War II we went to a 93-percent tax on earned income. He had friends who were movie stars who would make one movie a year. They would get into the 93-percent bracket, and they would stop. They would go fishing for the rest of the year or they would go to play golf or they would go skiing. But they would not work when 93 cents out of every dollar was being taken by the Government.

But that is how Ronald Reagan personally, in the real world, learned the practical impact of high taxes.

Now, what do we come to? Once again, having forgotten every lesson of the Jimmy Carter years—and remember, under President Carter we got to 13-percent inflation, 23-percent interest rates. The economy was disintegrating and headed into the deepest recession since World War II. And the country woke up and said,

Whoa, let's cut taxes, let's cut spending, let's slow down the welfare state, let's cut out redtape and regulations, let's give business a chance to create jobs.

What have we seen for the last 3 years? We have seen that our friends in the Democratic Party, with the unusual exception of Paul Tsongas, have not learned anything. The House Democratic leadership is right back at the same old welfare-state stand with the same old welfare-state tax increase.

The House Democratic leadership is going to come in this week and ask its members to walk the plank, to vote for a program that will kill 100,000 jobs, that will actually increase the deficit.

By the way, when you increase the deficit, the Government borrows the money. When the Government borrows the money, interest rates go up. Guess what happens? There is a second round of killing jobs. First, the Democrats kill jobs by raising taxes, and then they kill jobs by having a bigger deficit, which raises the interest rates, which further kills jobs, because, as you all know, when interest rates go up, people do not buy homes, people do not buy cars, people do not do the things you ought to do in order to create jobs.

Now what we are faced with is a core intellectual argument about the nature of reality. Some of us believe, with Boris Yeltsin, Mikhail Gorbachev, Lech Walesa, Vaclav Havel, with all the people who have given up on communism and socialism, we believe that the only effective way to create lots of permanent jobs is to stimulate private savings, stimulate private investment, private job creation, private business; to have thousands of new small businesses, to encourage people to go out and open up new businesses, to hire

people to create the kind of private sector that is true permanent job creation.

Our friends on the left believe that you cannot risk doing that, that if you actually feed the goose, it will run off and do bad things; that you have to get golden eggs from a dead goose, and they are prepared to starve the goose with tax increases even if it kills the economy.

I think it is a very simple choice. What the American people have to decide is: Do you want higher taxes? Do you trust the Congress enough that you want it to have more money? Do you like Capitol Hill enough that you want it to spend more? Do you want it to do the things you read about, about the Congress and the Capitol, to make you feel that they ought to have more of your take-home pay? Or do you want us to cut spending in Washington, cut taxes? Would you rather have the Congress buy marble floors for elevators, \$5,000 a piece; or would you rather have us buy \$200 carpets so you have \$4,800 at home to buy a new carpet for your living room? Do you want the Congress to spend more and more money on pork barrel, or do you want us to cut taxes so you can have the money at home so you can buy things for your family and your neighborhood, and give to your church or synagogue, or the charity in which you believe?

So, you have a very fundamental choice. It is not complicated at all. On the one hand you have a Democratic Party, the party of McGovern, Carter, Mondale, and Dukakis, which in the House is still committed to a welfare-state program of massive tax increases. On the other hand you have one Democrat running for President, Paul Tsongas, and the Republicans, led by President Bush, who believe you need to cut taxes to create jobs, who believe that you need to be serious about what you are doing and you have got to find real incentives and you have got to move ahead toward real opportunities.

Now, I believe it is important for us to have this focus because I believe people need to look at real jobs. We are never going to compete with Germany or Japan by starving our factories. We are never going to have workers who are productive as they need to be by blocking the purchase of new equipment. We are never going to create the jobs for our children and grandchildren by taxing the job creators and taxing the people who want to invest.

And, frankly, when you have a very high capital gains tax, all you do is guarantee that people will keep the money where it is. I talked to a young couple the other day. Their grandfather owns some timber. He had a firm position. As long as the tax is as high as it is now, he is not selling it, because he does not want to give the money to the Government. He would rather just let the trees keep growing,

pay real estate tax, property tax, and wait because he just hates the idea that the Government is going to take that much of his money.

I talk to people who say, "Well, I have a little stock I would like to sell, but, frankly, with the current tax rate, it is too high. I won't sell."

What are the Democrats proposing to do? They have proposed to raise taxes.

Now, you would think, having watched Governor Florio in New Jersey have a tax revolt, that they would decide that raising taxes does not make any sense. But they said,

Oh, no, we have to have a tax increase. We have to prove that class warfare is more important than job creation.

Let me pose this simple challenge to our friends in the Democratic Party: I do not believe there is a town in America where, if you went in and said, "We want to create a thousand new jobs," they would say, "Yes, but will you punish the rich first?"

I do not think there is a town in America where, if you went in and said, "We want to encourage young people to go out and have a better future," and they would say "No, no, you have to tax the American dream, you have to tax the dream of rising, you have to tax the dream of succeeding."

I do not think there is a town in America where people who are unemployed—and notice what we do, we offer tax breaks to Japanese factories, offer tax breaks to German factories and all over America. There are local-State programs that have a special tax rate.

If you will build your factory here, you will get 5 years of tax abatement, if you will come over and create jobs here.

All over this country today, I have talked to city and county officials, I have talked to chamber of commerce officials, and they love the idea of industrial revenue bonds. Have a little tax-free bond that would help build that next factory.

So, as long as you are a foreigner, if you want to come and build the next auto plant, "We will give you a tax break to build your factory."

Now we come to that American who has a new idea, the person who invented the next computer or the next videotape recorder or has invented the newest kind of medicine. They say,

You know, I think I can create a new company that would grow as fast as Polaroid or Apple Computer or IBM or Xerox. I think if you will give me a chance to work and save and keep my money and invest it, if you will give me a chance to go out here and issue a little stock and create a small company, I believe I might create 5,000 new jobs here.

Now, I say this from personal experience.

In Carrollton, Georgia, they have a company called Southwire. It is 40 years old and employs over 5,000 people. There are 5,000 families earning a good permanent income because we en-

couraged somebody to go out and create a new factory and that factory today is the largest single independent wire producer in the world.

I had lunch recently at Coca-Cola. In the 1880's Coca-Cola was a small company in Villa Rica, GA. It had a brand new idea. Today it spans the world, 150 countries.

Each of these ideas started small. I fly Delta Air Lines occasionally. Delta originally was comprised of two crop-dusting airplanes, the whole company, two cropdusters in Louisiana.

Now, you start with that idea that the genius of America has been dynamic, it has been exciting, it has been growth-oriented. The genius of America has been to say to people,

If you will go out and you will work your heart out and you will save and maybe even take a second job, if you will do what it takes, someday you can succeed.

What do our good friends, the liberal Democrats, say?

No, we got to tax that success, we got to tax that dream, we got to tax that opportunity. If you are breathing, tax it; if you are drinking water, tax it; if you are standing still, tax it.

It does not seem like there is anything they cannot find some excuse to tax.

If you were to take all the tax increases their Presidential candidates are proposing—different candidates are proposing different tax increases, whether it is a 50-cents-a gallon gas tax increase or some other increase, a surcharge here, a big tax there—it is astonishing how creative they are at raising taxes. And yet I would argue that there are two challenges to the Congress this year; one I have described in earlier speeches as a necessary revolution to replace the welfare state. In those speeches I cited the Reader's Digest article from January entitled "How the Unions Stole the Big Apple." And I cited the case in Reader's Digest in January of the \$57,000 a year janitor in a school, \$57,000 a year, who was required by his contract to mop the school three times a year—not three times a week, not three times a month, not three times a quarter, but three times a year.

Now, when you are paid \$57,000 a year to mop once every 4 months, you are clearly never going to be able to afford that kind of Government because they can always find a new reason not to work and charge you more money. Where do we see the biggest calls for tax increases? For big-city mayors, mayors who will not make their bureaucracy work, who will not go through and make them efficient, will not take the steps necessary to reform them, but who instead turn to working Americans and say, "I want you to pay more taxes out of your hard work so I can give it to the bureaucracy that is not doing its job?"

□ 1810

And again, in the Reader's Digest article in January, "How the Union Stole the Big Apple," there is an entire section about the sanitation workers' contract which was written in such a way that, as they got more efficient, garbage trucks; they now have crews that work 4 hours a day and are paid 4 hours a day to do nothing, paid 4 hours a day to go to the health spa; and now let me contrast that, if I might—and by the way, lest someone thinks I am exaggerating, the New York Times has twice in the last 2 weeks editorialized because Mayor Dinkins in the middle of a massive deficit, \$1,900,000,000 deficit, in the middle of screaming for everybody else to raise their taxes to transfer money to New York City, according to the New York Times he has again signed a contract with the sanitation workers that keeps the same deal.

Now why would I go back home to Georgia and say to hard-working citizens,

I'm going to raise your taxes on your work so we can transfer money to New York City to pay for somebody who is working 4 hours a day and going to the health spa at your expense on your money?

Why should I raise taxes on a janitor in a school in Georgia who may mop every day for \$17, \$18, \$21 in order to take money from that Georgia janitor and transfer it to a \$57,000 a year janitor who has to mop every 4 months? It is just not right.

Yet our friends in the Democrat Party are so trapped into the welfare state, they are so much beholden to their large big-city machines, that they have to find ways to raise taxes to increase the amount of money they can give away through the welfare state.

And so the choice this week is very simple. Choice No. 1, I say to my colleagues, is,

Do you believe we need a revolution to replace the welfare state? Because, if you do, you've got to vote no on the Democrat tax increase because the only way you're going to force change in the welfare state is to starve it. Giving the welfare state more money just lets it get bigger, lets it get sloppier, lets it get more inefficient, lets it do more things that make no sense to average working Americans."

No. 2:

Do you believe the future of growth, the future of getting out of the recession, the future of job creation, is largely in the private sector with business? Or do you believe socialism might work, that while it failed in Russia, and failed in Czechoslovakia and failed in Germany, we could make it work here? Now, if you believe a bigger welfare state will work, if you believe a bigger bureaucracy is good, if you believe we ought to have more power and more money in Washington so Washington can control your life more, then you ought to vote for the Democratic tax increase because that's what it finances. In the end the Democrats raise taxes so they can have a bigger version of their government, so they can have a larger welfare state, so they can have more control

over your lives, so they can decide what pork to give you because they took your money from you in the first place. Or do you believe that President Bush is right in focussing on creating real jobs that are permanent in the private sector by encouraging investment, by encouraging savings, by encouraging work?

Now I happen to believe, as the President said in his State of the Union Message, that the time has come to replace the values of the welfare state. I believe with the President that we have to go to a process, first of all, of requiring able-bodied citizens under the age of retirement to work, if they get money from the Government; second, of reforming the bureaucracy so they have efficient and effective cutting out of waste, cutting out the redundancies, cutting out the redtape; and, third, cutting taxes to encourage people to work, to save and to invest.

So, I hope every citizen who really wants us to replace the welfare state, every citizen who wants us to get out of the recession, and every citizen who wants us to create permanent jobs, jobs that take people off of welfare, jobs that take people off of unemployment, jobs that allow people to pay taxes because once again they are working for a living; I hope that every person who wants us to have that kind of a future will call their Congressman and will say,

Vote no on the Democratic tax increase. Vote yes for President Bush's tax cuts. Vote yes to create jobs. Vote yes to end the recession.

Mr. Speaker, that is the choice we are going to face in the next 48 hours.

REQUEST FOR 30-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am, of course, going to give my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], a chance to have his special order. But let me, under this reservation for just a moment, point out for those who study the House, who would like to know, that they should understand that the Democratic leadership, which is in the process of writing a one-sided rule, has not yet finished that rule and, therefore, has not filed it, and, therefore, under the rules of the House, if they fail to file the rule before we adjourn today, they could not bring up their tax increase bill tomorrow, and we could not begin debate tomorrow.

So, while I will withdraw my reservation in just a moment, I want to make sure all my colleagues understand that we are having an opportunity to watch the process at work and that the rule, which I believe is remarkably one-sided in favor of the tax increase bill, will be brought in, and I look forward to hearing the comments of my good friend,

the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. 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.

CUTTING TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, while I have been here during special orders, I have heard described the Democratic proposals and also the President's proposal, and it just is not portrayed as I have studied it, and it does not appear to me that the proposals have been characterized properly. One of the things that has not been mentioned in the debate here in the special orders, either by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the two gentlemen from Texas, Mr. DELAY and Mr. ARMEY, or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is the question of the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, under the President's proposal there are tax cuts provided that reduce revenues to the U.S. Government. There are no proposals within that proposal that I know of that replace those revenues. But now I seem to understand how the gentlemen that are supporting the President's proposal would lead us to believe, that because of all these tax cuts we are going to have all these jobs, and because we have all these jobs, we are going to have the additional revenues that will equalize it.

Mr. Speaker, while I sat in the chair and thought about this, I just wondered why the President did not propose to cut taxes even further. Maybe we should cut it down to where nobody hardly pays any taxes because then we will have all this money out there, and we would be producing all these multitudes of jobs, millions and millions of jobs within a week or two, and we would have all this revenue coming in.

My colleagues, that is smoke and mirrors. That is not reality. That is trickle-down economics. What the Democratic proposal does, and all one has to do is read it and they will see it, is, yes, we propose tax cuts. We propose tax cuts for the middle income.

□ 1820

But we also propose that we lose revenues as a result of that. We recognize that, and therefore we propose that we replace that revenue with other revenue and revenue from the wealthy, from those that have income over \$200,000, from those millionaires who would get a 10-percent surtax.

They are the same ones that got the big tax breaks in 1981 and continued on through 1986. They are the ones that

have not had their total tax increased as the middle class has in the same time period. While their taxes have been reduced, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] pointed out, from 70 to 28 percent, from 70 to 28 percent, our middle-income people, because of increases in the Social Security tax, and even though their income tax may have been reduced a little bit, but with the Social Security tax going up, have actually had an increase.

So the wealthy have had the large, over a 50-percent tax cut in this time-frame, while those in the middle income, who we wish to give some tax relief to, have got a tax increase in that same period.

So we say yes, we are willing to follow the President and stimulate the economy with some tax cuts, but on the other hand, we are not willing to increase deficits to do it. We say that if we are going to reduce revenues through tax cuts, then in order to keep the deficits, and they are already too high, in order to keep them from escalating further, that we must replace that revenue, and we do not use smoke and mirrors.

Smoke and mirrors have been around the Congress and the administration for a long period of time. The first time in my memory that they were used effectively was when the former director of the Office of Management and Budget was a former Member of this body back in 1981 and then in 1982. It was with smoke and mirrors that we did the 1981 budget and the 1981 tax bill. It was through that period of smoke and mirrors that we have got us to where we are today. Today we do not have budget deficits of less than \$60 billion.

I can well remember in the years before 1981, while I was here and there was a different person in the White House, we had budget deficits of \$28 billion, \$56 billion. We thought they were too high. I even voted against some of the budgets because that was too high a deficit.

As soon as we started the 1981 time-frame, we did not see ever again, and we have never seen again, budget deficits of less than \$75 billion or even less than \$100 billion. Now we are up over \$400 billion, and what this administration is asking us to do again is to reduce revenues, reduce revenues again, increase the deficits in order to give the wealthy big tax breaks.

If we analyze the President's proposal, there is very little in there for those of income under \$50,000. But there is a great deal in there for those over \$200,000 and more. Those of over \$200,000 or more are going to get tax breaks of thousands of dollars a year. They will get tax breaks as much or more than the middle income will earn in a year, actually earn, not pay taxes but earn in a year.

So to the middle income they say, "We will give you a small amount, but

you are really going to get your breaks when the wealthy, the trickle-down theory, when the wealthy go out and give you a new job in this country with the factories they are going to build in Mexico and Taiwan and China."

Because that is what this administration has permitted the industrialists and others of this country to do. That investment has not come into this country. We do not see those manufacturing jobs being built by the industrialists, by the investors in this country.

If I really thought that many of these people that have all this wealth would invest it in this country and would create manufacturing jobs in this country, then I would be more inclined to think the way, perhaps, that the people on the other side of the aisle do. But that is not what I have been seeing lately. I see more jobs going to Mexico than are coming to Missouri. I see a lot more jobs going to Korea and Japan and other countries than I do coming to Illinois or Indiana or anyplace else.

By the way, just during the Presidents Day break I had a field hearing out in Indiana, the central part of it. While I was there I was reading the Kokomo Tribune paper, Kokomo, IN, and I was reading where General Motors, and General Motors has been a good company for the United States in the past but I question how much now, because I was reading about the Delco operation that they had there. General Motors was moving almost all of the assembly operation, guess where: Mexico, Mexico. Now we are going to give them more money to do that with?

Are the investors really going to be using their money to play more on the stock market? The stock market is looking real good for a lot of people these days. Is that where they are going to put their money? That does not create jobs.

Maybe somebody on the other side of the aisle could educate me how, if we give somebody another \$50,000 instead of giving it to the Government for taxes for our programs, and we increase the deficit and we borrow the money from the Japanese or Germans or somebody else to pay for those bonds, but that person out there now has over millions of dollars already, he is going to take that \$50,000 and he is going to come to Hannibal, MO, and build a plant and put my people to work? I do not think so. I really do not think that is what he plans to do with that money.

You say, "Well, if you take this money away from him with the surtax, if you take that away from him, he will not be able to build those plants and the factories and have those businesses again," perhaps not, but if he has enough income of \$1 million he must have pretty many investments, or if he is like some of our athletes that make over \$1 or \$2 million, he is still

going to have quite a bit left over. He is sure going to have a lot more left over than most of the people in my district make in a year. He is going to have left over a lot more than a lot of people make in a lifetime to invest.

I do not think that is going to stop him from investing. It might slow him down a little bit in buying or thinking of buying that newer yacht. Instead of having the one that costs a half a million dollars, he will start thinking about buying one that costs three-quarters of a million dollars, and instead of going \$500,000 he will go to \$750,000. It might stop him from doing that. That is really a pity. I feel sorry for him.

Or it might be that instead of having for himself and his wife a 15-room mansion, he has to live in a 10-room mansion; a 10-bedroom mansion, not a 10 room. I do not know of many mansions with 10 rooms.

□ 1830

It might make him slow down with those types of things. I do not think it really is hurting him as far as the necessities of life.

People poke fun at a \$200 tax cut or a \$400-a-year tax cut. It is not a great deal, I will admit, and it is not going to really help a lot of people a whole lot. But, folks, there are a lot of people in my district right now that I think would even stand in line if somebody would walk up to them tomorrow and say, "If you stand in line here for all day, I will give you \$400, but you only get it a dollar and a half a day." I have got a lot of people that would take them up on that.

We do not even have to tell them to stand in line. They do not have to do anything. All it means is when they get their paycheck, they are going to get a little bit more money.

What is wrong with that? That means maybe they can pay their bills a little easier. It might mean they can maybe even take their kids to the movie. You know, they may not have that big yacht and that big mansion to worry about. They may not have to worry about whether they are going to spend the summer in the Caribbean and the winter somewhere else and part of the fall in France. They may not have to worry about whether they are going to have that money because they got a 10-percent surtax.

With that little bit of money they may be able to take their kids to the movie. They may be able to stop afterward and get an ice cream cone, because some of them right now cannot do that.

So it is not a lot of money. I do not think anybody here is going to stand here tomorrow or the next day and tell you that it is a whole lot of money and that it is going to enable anybody to go out and buy a new car. You cannot buy a new car for \$400, everybody knows that.

Nobody is kidding anybody. You cannot tell me that there are not people out there that can use it, too.

So the Democratic tax bill may not be the best in the world, but it is sure a lot better than what the President proposes. At least we do not increase the deficit. At least we do not say well, \$400 billion is not a bad deficit; let us put another \$50 billion on a year. You know, what is \$50 billion when you are up to \$400 billion? Who cares.

I care. I think most of the Democrats care. We do not go on increasing the deficits. I say to you fellow Members of the House, that I want you to realistically look not just listen to what has been said here earlier this evening, but look at the proposals realistically. You tell me where you find in the President's proposal the methodology to increase the revenues to pay for the loss of revenues that he has in his proposal. I want to see those in black and white. I do not care to see it through smoke and mirrors. I do not want to see it with all those assumptions.

I can remember, as I said earlier, when this all started when the former Member of this House was OMB Director and we had that 1981 budget. Boy, did it have smoke and mirrors in it. It had assumptions that were written invalid from the get-go, as we say back home.

It had assumptions that, boy, with this type of budget, our GNP was going to be great. Interest rates were going to go down. We were going to have a real rapid GNP growth. We were not going to have unemployment. Everybody was going to be working. There was going to be no inflation. No, we were not going to have any inflation.

Not too many economists really believed that type of philosophy, that you can have a heated-up economy, a rapid growth in the economy, and still hold down interest rates and hold down inflation, and at the same time you have got 3- or 4-percent unemployment.

Come on, people, it does not work that way. If you put those other things in there, you are going to have higher interest rates, because you are going to have greater demand on the economy. Especially now, when most of the interest rates are low right now. But when this economy gets going and you get a demand for the money, I will guarantee you the interest rates are going to go up, especially with \$400 billion a year deficits. That soaks up a whole bunch of money.

So, folks, I just want to say that I think everybody should look very well and not just listen to the oratory and descriptions of legislation, but look at the legislation itself. Just see what it says. Review it as what it is.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE].

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow on the comments of the

gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] and amplify, if I might, on my comment this morning.

While the gentleman from Missouri is still here, does the gentleman know what the President's submitted budget deficit is for this year?

Mr. VOLKMER. The best I can figure it, it is around \$380 billion. But that is with their assumptions. If you discount some of their assumptions it is going to be well over \$400 billion.

Mr. NAGLE. Am I correct, and I do want to come back to that, but am I correct that does not include the S&L bailout?

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. Mr. NAGLE. And it does not include the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. VOLKMER. That is correct. Mr. NAGLE. I had a figure when you added those two in of \$500 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes. Mr. NAGLE. What assumption is the administration making that you find particularly disquieting and difficult?

Mr. VOLKMER. The biggest one I find is in the GNP. I see us moving very slowly. I think now even most economists are saying that we are almost to a standstill. We are not going to see that growth in that GNP.

Mr. NAGLE. What was the GNP growth projections?

Mr. VOLKMER. I think it was up somewhere close to a 2.2-percent rate, which is slow anyway. But I do not see that movement at all in the economy. I do not think anyone does.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4210, TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR INCREASED ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TO PROVIDE TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-435) on the resolution (H. Res. 374) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4210) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for increased economic growth and to provide tax relief for families, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3844, HAITIAN REFUGEE PROTECTION ACT

Mr. DERRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-436) on the resolution (H. Res. 375) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3844) to assure the protection of Haitians in the United States or in United States custody pending the resumption of democratic rule in Haiti, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1992

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, February 26, 1992, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Thursday, February 27, 1992.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ENGEL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 60 minutes, on February 27.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes, on March 3.

Mr. SANTORUM, for 60 minutes, on March 4.

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

Mr. JONTZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 60 minutes each day, on March 16 and 17.

Mr. OWENS of New York, for 60 minutes each day, on March 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 60 minutes each day, on February 26 and 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. RHODES.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. CAMP in two instances.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. BAKER.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio in three instances.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in five instances.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIPINSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. BONIOR in two instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. TRAFICANT in two instances.
Mr. PICKLE in three instances.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. SKAGGS.
Mr. PANETTA.
Mr. DOWNEY.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mr. CLAY.
Mr. GUARINI.
Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
Mr. HARRIS.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mr. ERDREICH in two instances.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. TRAXLER.
Mr. MCNULTY.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. BILBRAY.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. STARK.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 355. An act to provide emergency drought relief to the reclamation States, and for other purposes;

H.R. 476. An act to designate certain rivers in the State of Michigan as components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 543. An act to establish the Manzanar National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 26, 1992, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2865. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on HUD research and development activities during fiscal year 1991, pursuant to Public Law 101-625, section 951(b) (104 Stat. 4417); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2866. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a notice of Final Priorities—Office of Indian Education: Planning, Pilot, and Demonstration Projects for Indian Children; and Educational Personnel Development, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2867. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a copy of the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook for 1992, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790d(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2868. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to add requirements concerning health insurance of children by absent parents; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2869. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Korea (Transmittal No. 8-92), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2870. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 07-92), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2871. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Greece (Transmittal No. DTC-5-92), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2872. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-monthly report on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus problem, including any relevant reports from the Secretary General of the United Nations covering the second half of October and all of November and December 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2873. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Export Administration's annual report for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2413; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2874. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2875. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts during fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2876. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts during fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2877. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period Oc-

tober 1, 1991, through December 31, 1991, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 102-194); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2878. A letter from the U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report on the official request from the Republic of El Salvador for emergency import restrictions on significant pre-Hispanic archaeological material, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2879. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistant training funds under the Trade Act of 1974 for period ending September 30, 1991, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2880. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to specify the purposes and duration of emergency assistance under part A of title IV; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2881. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1992"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2882. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "AFDC Savings Set-Aside Amendments of 1992"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2883. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Social Security Act Cross Program Recovery Amendments of 1992"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2884. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on various issues of the Safety Research Program of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2039; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

2885. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Medicare Budget Amendments of 1992"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2886. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Medicare Premium Equity Amendments of 1992"; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 374. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for increased economic growth and to provide tax relief for families (Rept. 102-435). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHEAT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 375. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3844, a bill to assure the protection of Haitians in the United States or in United States custody pending the resumption of democratic rule in Haiti (Rept. 102-436). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3844. A bill to assure the protection of Haitians in the United States or in United States custody pending the resumption of democratic rule in Haiti; with an amendment (Rept. 102-437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. DAN-NEMEYER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 4294. A bill to make applicable to the Congress certain laws relating to the terms and conditions of employment, the health and safety of employees, and the rights and responsibilities of employers and employees; and to repeal and prohibit certain privileges and gratuities for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, the Judiciary, Government Operations, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. DAN-NEMEYER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. EWING, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 4295. A bill to provide that pay for Members of Congress shall be reduced whenever total expenditures of the Federal Government exceed total receipts in any fiscal year, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Rules.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. DAN-NEMEYER, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 4296. A bill to eliminate the franking privileges for the House of Representatives, to establish a spending allowance for postage for official mail of the House of Representatives and to limit the amount and type of mail sent by Members of the House of Representatives; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. DAN-NEMEYER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. EWING, and Mr. COX of California):

H.R. 4297. A bill to provide for the adjournment of Congress by September 30 of each year; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AUCCOIN (for himself, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. LEVINE of California):

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on cyanide used in mining and mineral activities and to use the revenues from such tax for environmental cleanup and other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRUCE (for himself and Mr. JACOBS):

H.R. 4299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in order to provide an incentive for business to invest in pollution abatement property and related assets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VENTO (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SCHU-

MER, Mr. MFUME, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FROST, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WYDEN):

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act to extend programs providing urgently needed assistance for the homeless, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DE LUGO:

H.R. 4301. A bill to provide airport and airway improvements for the U.S. Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 4302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the treatment of certain higher education loans from qualified employer plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRELAND:

H.R. 4303. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to reinstate the requirement that a competitive prototype program strategy be used in the development of a major weapons system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax equity and fairness by imposing an alternative minimum tax on corporations importing products into the United States at artificially inflated prices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWERY of California:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to permit State and local agencies to adopt flexible and compressed work schedules; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHTLEY (for himself, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 4306. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt mental health services furnished to an individual who is a resident of a nursing facility from the limitation on the amount of incurred expenses for mental health services that may be taken into account in determining the amount of payment for such services under part B of the Medicare Program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY:

H.R. 4307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply the special valuation rules to grantor retained interest involving residential property other than a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PENNY:

H.R. 4308. A bill to grant employees family and medical leave under certain circumstances and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor, Post Office and Civil Service, and House Administration.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 4309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide protection for taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTEL:

H.R. 4310. A bill to reauthorize and improve the national marine sanctuaries program, and to establish the Coastal Sanctuary Foundation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 4311. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for mandatory coverage of services furnished by nurse practitioners and clinical nurse practitioners under State Medicaid plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. MINETA):

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with respect to bilingual election requirements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 4313. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to impose additional fraud detection and disclosure obligations on auditors of public companies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NUSSLE (for himself, Mr. DANNEYER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. EWING, and Mr. COX of California):

H.J. Res. 418. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the number of consecutive terms a person may serve as a Representative or Senator, which shall be known as the Citizen Representative Reform Act New Blood Provision; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAXON:

H.J. Res. 419. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the recall of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 420. Joint resolution designating February 14, 1993, through February 20, 1993, as "National Engineers Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution designating April 22, 1992 as "Earth Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. FEIGHAN):

H.J. Res. 422. Joint resolution designating May 1992 as "Neurofibromatosis Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H. Res. 373. Resolution returning to the Senate the bill S. 884; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HEFLEY:

H. Res. 376. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to limit the availability of appropriations for office salaries and expenses of the House of Representatives to 1 year and to require excess amounts appropriated for that purpose to be used for open-market purchase of outstanding inter-

est-bearing obligations of the Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WELDON:

H. Res. 377. Resolution requiring that travel awards that accrue by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives be used only with respect to official travel; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

326. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the Steamtown National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

327. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the Rural Health Care Initiative proposed by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

328. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the enactment of health care legislation; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 23: Mr. WALSH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PAXON, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. JAMES, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. KYL, and Mr. FIELDS.

H.R. 53: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WISE, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. NAGLE.

H.R. 110: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 187: Mr. SAWYER and Mr. NCNULTY

H.R. 394: Mr. SLATTERY and Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 406: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 431: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WISE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 481: Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 565: Mr. BLAZ and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 576: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 643: Mr. BOEHNER.

H.R. 722: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 723: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 880: Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 951: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1007: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1049: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 1067: Mr. WASHINGTON.

H.R. 1147: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 1259: Mr. MAVROULES.

H.R. 1330: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 1422: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. TORRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAXON, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1473: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1481: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1502: Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1516: Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1536: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 1566: Mr. FROST, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1628: Mr. GEJDBENSON, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MCDADE, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1703: Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 1704: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1733: Mr. ECKART, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.R. 1870: Mr. YATES, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. DYMALLY.

H.R. 2070: Mr. GORDON, Mrs. MINK, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. PRICE.

H.R. 2083: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 2108: Mr. GEJDBENSON.

H.R. 2202: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2214: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 2248: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2259: Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.R. 2304: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2492: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 2567: Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 2591: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 2598: Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 2632: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 2668: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2669: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2726: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2768: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 2774: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 2890: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STARK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 2966: Mr. CLAY and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3089: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 3164: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. FROST, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. ROSE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3277: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 3285: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3395: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 3486: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 3553: Mr. BLACKWELL and Mr. DOOLEY.

H.R. 3571: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 3578: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. RINALDO.

H.R. 3654: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ENG-

LISH, Mr. EWING, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LENT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. PRICE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3689: Ms. PELOSI and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3702: Mr. ANTHONY.
H.R. 3718: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. ROYBAL.
H.R. 3748: Mr. VENTO.
H.R. 3809: Mr. STARK, Mr. AUCCOIN, and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 3832: Mr. DE LUGO.
H.R. 3838: Mr. FIELDS, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 3841: Mr. HARRIS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. RAY.

H.R. 3844: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3949: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. STAGGERS.
H.R. 3978: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 4002: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. PAXON, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 4013: Mr. COOPER, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. VISLOSKEY.

H.R. 4023: Mr. STARK, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HUCKABY, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 4025: Mr. TRAXLER and Mr. ZELIFF.
H.R. 4051: Mr. FROST, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 4073: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 4083: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. YATRON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 4086: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 4100: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas,

Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 4121: Mr. ZELIFF.
H.R. 4122: Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4158: Mrs. BOXER.
H.R. 4166: Mr. HATCHER and Mr. SOLOMON.
H.R. 4169: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4178: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 4183: Mr. ANTHONY.
H.R. 4190: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 4194: Mr. EWING and Mr. MCDADE.
H.R. 4196: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. RAY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 4206: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. HUGHES.
H.R. 4220: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. ECKART.
H.R. 4224: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 4229: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4243: Mr. SYNAR, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 4271: Mr. LOWERY of California and Mr. SANGMEISTER.
H.R. 4277: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. HORN.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.J. Res. 351: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. PATTERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BELLENSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 402: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. PICKETT.
H.J. Res. 407: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MAUROUDES, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SARPALUIS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. ANDERSON.

H.J. Res. 411: Mr. WALSH, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. ROUEKEMA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.J. Res. 414: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. MURPHY.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. ECKART, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. JENKINS.

H. Con. Res. 239: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. HOYER.

H. Con. Res. 263: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H. Con. Res. 264: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. HUGHES.

H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. PASTOR.

H. Con. Res. 272: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. LEVINE of California, and Mr. MANTON.

H. Con. Res. 274: Mr. POSHARD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H. Con. Res. 277: Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 271: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. MFUME.

H. Res. 322: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, and Mr. MURPHY.

H. Res. 332: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. EWING.

H. Res. 359: Mr. LEVINE of California.

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. Res. 194: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mrs. LLOYD.