

SENATE—Wednesday, March 25, 1992

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable HARRIS WOFFORD, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray:

*I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour. * * *—I Timothy 2:1-3.*

Gracious Father, help the people of God to take seriously this exhortation of the apostle Paul to a young pastor. Help them to accept their responsibility to pray for leadership in the confidence that such labor in prayer will assure a desirable social environment: quiet, peaceable, Godly, and honest. Give them to understand that to be prayerless is to accept an undesirable social and cultural order. When they are angry with their leaders, when they decide to write an angry letter, restrain them from an impetuous act and lead them to pray for those of whom they are critical. Help them realize that leaders are human beings like themselves, that they are not infallible, that they are vulnerable to the same temptations which challenge all of us.

Forgiving Father, remind the people that they are as responsible as their leaders for good government. We pray in the name of Jesus, Lord of history and the nations. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 25, 1992.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable HARRIS WOFFORD, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the Journal of proceedings has been approved to date and the time for the two leaders is reserved for their use later in the day?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this morning the period for morning business will extend until 11:30 a.m. During that time, Senators will be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each, unless otherwise specified. A number of Senators have been specified and will be recognized to address the Senate for additional and stated time periods.

At 11:30 this morning, when the period for morning business closes, it is my intention to move to proceed to Calendar Item No. 428, S. 2399, legislation to revise the budget walls.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein.

The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes.

TWENTY YEARS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRESS

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, several years ago, it was common to hear the pundits suggest that the environmentalism of the early 1970's and 1980's was just a passing fad. It is interesting to note that we do not hear that anymore. Today we have politi-

cians at all levels of government, including Presidents and Prime Ministers, highlighting their environmental accomplishments. We have Madison Avenue executives and major American manufacturers and corporate CEO's begging us to buy their products because these products pollute less, are more recycled, are more green than their competitors.

Oddly enough, Mr. President, just as more and more people are recognizing the importance of protecting the environment, there is at the same time an increasing tendency among some people to berate, belittle, and ridicule those who are urging actions to preserve our limited natural resources.

Hardly a week goes by, Mr. President, without someone taking the floor of this Congress, in the House or in the Senate, or to take to the op-ed pages of one of our newspapers to blame environmentalists and environmental laws for our economic woes. The argument is that there are too many burdens that have been placed upon our society for little or, in some cases, modest benefits. Unfortunately, as our economy continues to struggle, this phenomenon appears to be gaining strength. I believe this trend is not only unjustified, it is literally unhealthy.

So, Mr. President, let us consider all of the evidence, rather than just a few anecdotes.

We must avoid the temptation to use environmentalism as a whipping boy.

What has happened since the explosion of environmental consciousness in the 1960's and the first Earth Day in 1970? The question we might legitimately ask ourselves is are we making any progress or are we just treading water? The answer is simple. The United States has made tremendous strides in protecting the health of its citizens and in restoring the quality of the Nation's environment over the past 20 years.

Let me cite three major accomplishments. First, the promotion of a Federal environmental ethic through the creation and use of what is known as NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. Second is the steps that have been taken to prevent the pollution of air and water. And third, the conservation of wildlife and wildlife habitat.

I will briefly touch on each. The National Environmental Policy Act: I believe, Mr. President, when historians look back to the years 1969 and 1970, they will say those were watershed years in terms of the U.S. environmental movement. Congress, concerned that the environment needed greater

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

protection, took the lead and enacted major environmental statutes.

In those 2 years alone we saw Congress approve and the President sign NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Air Act. In addition, new Federal agencies were created that paralleled the new statutes including the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Of all these and other significant actions that took place in those 2 years, few can rival in importance the creation of the National Environmental Policy Act. Signed into law by President Nixon on January 1, 1970, it is a short and simple law with dramatic purpose.

To declare a national policy which will encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment.

How I like those words, "enjoyable harmony."

NEPA was designed to instill a new environmental ethic in all Federal agencies by requiring the preparation of environmental impact statements, EIS's and the consideration of all reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of Government actions before any decisions are made.

Now, what does it mean? It means that every dam, the issuance of permits to cut trees, the construction of irrigation canals, must have an environmental impact statement. No agency is exempt, even branches of the military must prepare an EIS. And if they do not, members of the public can—and indeed, members of the public do—sue. The courts have consistently held that no further governmental action can take place until an environmental impact statement is done and done correctly.

Some agencies complain and gripe and say this is a hassle, but no one can deny that NEPA has been a tremendous success and has changed forever the way our Government makes decisions affecting the environment.

Let us look at prevention of pollution. If there ever was a case where an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, it is in these areas. In 1970, we passed the Clean Air Act. Has it been a success? It has been a tremendous success. Listen to these statistics, Mr. President. In the past 22 years, automobile emissions of the two most troublesome pollutants, hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide, have been cut by 90 percent. Nine-tenths of the pollution from hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide has been eliminated.

Under the recently enacted Clean Air Amendments of 1990, we are going to see even greater reductions. Over the next 4 to 12 years, these emissions will be cut to levels that are between 95 and 98 percent below 1970 levels.

Another example in our battle for clean air is found in the data on emissions of lead. Between 1970 and 1990,

total annual emissions of lead nationwide have declined by 96 percent—96 percent—nearly entirely due to the phaseout of leaded gasoline required by the Clean Air Act of 1970.

An interesting feature of the early 1970's environmental awareness was a focus on the effects of pollutants wherever they may be. Let us take lead for an example. Concerns about the acute effects of lead poisoning among children led Congress in 1970 to approve the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, which created a program to fund lead paint abatement programs and screening and treatment programs for children. As a result of these efforts, we have new paints coming on the market without lead content.

Since the original Clean Air Act was enacted 22 years ago, new challenges have arisen. The best examples of these are acid rain and the destruction of the ozone layer. After long and bitter disputes over the dangers of acid rain and of chlorofluorocarbons, CFC's, Congress, in the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act, dealt with both culprits in an effective manner.

What is more, using the authority provided in the Clean Air Act of 1990, President Bush recently announced that chlorofluorocarbon production, which of course is the major cause of ozone depletion, will be discontinued in the United States no later than December 31, 1995. And HCFC's, hydrochlorofluorocarbons, will be gradually phased out in the early part of the next century. I believe, Mr. President, we are going to see an even faster schedule come along in the years ahead.

United States production of CFC's is now 42 percent below 1986 levels, and we should be proud of that. Let us not forget the Clean Water Act. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 marked the beginning of the environmental era for our Nation's water resources. The law set some ambitious goals—the elimination of all discharges to surface waters by 1985. We have not attained zero pollution yet, but think of the progress that has been made as a result of the act. In the late sixties, the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland caught fire—a river caught fire—it was so contaminated. Today, some of our most polluted waters, like Lake Erie and the Potomac River, have been transformed. More than 80 percent of our lakes and rivers now meet the interim goal of the Clean Water Act. They are fishable and swimmable to a considerable extent due in part to the Clean Water Act.

Our coastal waters and oceans have benefited likewise. In the 1970's, municipal sewage and industrial contaminants were the principal sources of pollution. Pollution was literally flowing into our open waters untreated. In the Clean Water Act, Congress tackled these problems head-on and created the Construction Grants Program. Over the past 20 years, the Federal Govern-

ment, through the Clean Water Act, has provided more than \$50 billion to State and local governments for the construction of waste water treatment plants. It has been one of our most successful environmental programs.

Let me turn to the conservation of wildlife and wildlife habitat. Once again, some astonishing successes. In 1973 Congress enacted the Endangered Species Act and, because of it, we have been able to rescue a number of important species from the brink of extinction. We ought to be proud of this. The bald eagle, the peregrine falcon, brown pelican, American alligator, whooping crane, all have been saved because of what we did in the Congress, and what the U.S. citizens requested we do and demanded that we do.

We have recognized that habitat is absolutely critical to the preservation of wildlife. So we have protected, at home and likewise abroad, Mr. President, through debt swaps and other mechanisms, millions of acres of forests and open spaces.

Listen to these statistics. In the 20 years from 1970 to 1989, the National Wildlife Refuge System in the United States grew from 29 million acres to 90 million acres; tripled. Our National Park System nearly tripled, from 30 million to 80 million acres. The National Wilderness System increased from 10 million acres to 91 million acres. The National Wild and Scenic River System grew from 868 miles to 9,281 river miles. Admittedly, a sizable chunk of this was in Alaska, but we made significant strides in the lower 48 States as well.

Mr. President, all of us should note yesterday's transmittal of the 22d annual report of the Council on Environmental Quality together with the President's message on environmental quality to the Congress. The report and message detail current environmental conditions and trends. In addition, the documents reflect on the Federal Government's efforts to protect the environment in 1991 and the President's environmental priorities for 1992 and beyond. In a very real sense, the Council, established under NEPA in 1969, symbolizes how far this country has come in terms of environmental consciousness. Environmentalism is not a passing fad. What is the conclusion of all this? What can we draw from the last 20 years? Have we made any progress? We certainly have. We ought to be proud of it.

The challenges in the future are going to be different. We have been wrestling with making our air, our water, our lakes and streams, our wetlands, our forests clean and preserved, and we have done a wonderful job. But now we have to move into the international world, Mr. President. For example, this June, June 1 to 14, in Rio de Janeiro, there is going to be a mammoth Earth summit. It will bring to-

gether the heads of state from some 80 different nations, and represented will be over 100 nations. There we are going to discuss global climate protection, biological diversity, and the need to protect and preserve our oceans.

This conference can be a wonderful step forward, but it is important that the United States continue to build on the environmental successes achieved over the past 20 years and step out and lead the rest of the world. We have achieved great things since the National Environmental Policy Act was enacted in 1969. Now we have to recognize that there are new challenges on an international scale, and I am confident we can do it.

But with all we do, Mr. President, we ought to take pride in what we have achieved. Let us not knock the environment and those who attempt to make this a better world and a better country for future generations.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, certainly I want to commend my leader for his most eloquent statement on the situation with respect to the environment. I would like to amplify and perhaps repeat, to some extent, what he said.

NOT A BLEAK ENVIRONMENT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, does anyone in this body remember Cassandra? She was the mythological figure who could foretell the future and who in modern usage has come to represent people who constantly predict misfortune and disaster. Well, I think that many of our colleagues and certainly some in the environmental movement could be described as Cassandra's. The future is bleak, they say, the planet will soon be dead.

I would like to join my colleagues in saying things are not as bad as some would have us believe. Yes, there are still major environmental problems to be solved, but let us not forget the steps we have taken. The environmental movement to date has been a success, not a failure, and we should take note of our successes.

In the last 20 years, we have passed legislation to clean up our Nation's lands, waters, and air. We have addressed solid waste and safe drinking water. We have eliminated the use of many toxic chemicals and pesticides, like DDT. We have begun to cut our emissions of toxic substances. We have recognized the dangers of CFC's and have acted to phase out their use. As an environmentalist, I think it is important that we stand up and be heard: Our efforts have paid off.

I think it is safe to say that few, if any, of my colleagues will consider me a particular partisan Member of this

body. I am proud to carry on the non-partisan tradition established by my Vermont predecessors. What concerns me is that in the coming months, the environment may become a partisan issue. One side may try to paint the other as an enemy of the environment. Political debate is not bad, but it would be wrong to try to paint our current situation as bleak and representative of failed policies. I do not believe it right to focus only on where we have yet to go, without remembering how far we have come.

Most Americans consider themselves environmentalists. Could we have said this 100 years ago, or even 25 years ago? A century ago, the Sierra Club was founded. Would anyone in 1892 have believed how the Sierra Club has prospered and become a part of American life. This is cause for optimism, not pessimism.

We, as a people are becoming more in tune with our planet, which I believe is quite an accomplishment. Think about it. Man is the only animal that has never entirely adapted to the environment. Instead of adapting, we have tried to change our environment. But for the first time in our evolution as a society, we are trying to come to grips with our effect on the planet. We are trying to adapt to the planet; we are not trying to adapt the planet to us.

When my children were growing up, for example, white bread was the norm. We took what nature gave us, wheat, and took out 30 percent of the bran to make white bread. In taking out the bran, we removed over half of the calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, potassium, sodium, and the trace metals like iron, and the B and E vitamins. Then, we put some of these materials back in artificial form and called the bread enriched. This may seem like a silly example at first, but it really is symbolic of how out-of-touch with nature we had gotten. But that has changed. We are beginning to realize that natural is better. There are now even grocery stores which sell only organically grown, pesticide-free food. Could we have imagined this 20 years ago?

It was not too many years ago that rivers caught fire, and you could not eat the fish from many of our country's waters. That has changed. It was not too many years ago that we took all of our trash to the dump. That is changing. It was not too many years ago that hazardous wastes were dumped in farmer's fields. That has changed.

One hundred years ago, we nearly hunted the bison to extinction. Now we have laws to protect the animals on this earth. Many endangered species have even started making a comeback. The cessation of drift net fishing and bans on ivory are two more ways we have acted to protect the environment in just the last few years.

Wetlands preservation. Now there is a controversial subject on both sides of

the aisle. But lest some think we are totally destroying every undeveloped acre in this country, I would ask that they reflect on these facts. National parkland has nearly tripled since 1970. Acreage in national wildlife refuges has increased from 29.2 to 88.5 million acres in the past 20 years. National wilderness areas have increased in size from 10.4 to 95 million acres in 20 years. The number of wild and scenic rivers has increased 10-fold in this timeframe. Last, there are over 4.4 million acres in national estuaries. This is some accomplishment for the past 20 years.

We have begun to phase out the CFC's which threaten the ozone layer, and recently, we passed significant new clean air legislation to help correct our other air pollution problems. Particulate levels have been cut in half since 1974. Sulfur oxide emissions have been cut by a third since the early 1970's. We are making progress. This is good news. The American people should be reading about this in their papers.

Major industries have announced programs to cut back on the release of toxics. This would have been unheard of years ago. VOC emissions have been cut by a third in recent years. Again, this is good news. Yet, some would cast this as bad news.

Years ago, industrial pollution threatened our country's waters; now nonpoint pollution is the biggest threat. In a relatively few years, we have reversed the course of pollution set in motion by the industrial revolution. This is truly amazing. Industry is now a distant sixth place in sources of pollution to our waters. We should commend all those industries that have done their part to clean up our country's waters. Yet, instead some would make it seem like our waters are no better today. Is it not time we thanked business for their efforts to clean up our planet instead of acting as though business is beneath contempt in terms of the environment?

Pollutant loadings to the Great Lakes have been reduced a third or more since 1976. Pesticide residues in bird eggs have also decreased. Many major companies have undertaken voluntary internal compliance programs. This is good news for the environment. Yet, some focus only on the failures of industry. Again, the silver lining is obscured by a cloud.

Lead poisoning; this is an issue with which we have made tremendous progress. Lead emissions to the environment have been reduced from 203,800 metric tons per year to 7,000 metric tons per year in 20 years. Regulations have recently been proposed to further lower lead in drinking water. More good news for the environment and for our country's children. Yet some would make it appear as if nothing has been or is being accomplished. Yes, more does need to be done to help protect our children from lead. That is why I

cosponsored Senator REID's lead bill and have continued to do what I could to help move this bill along. We do not control the legislative agenda, however, thus the fate of this bill is not in our hands.

In the area of energy, great advances have been made in the area of renewable energy sources. We are starting to come to grips with the detriments of hydropower. Technology breakthroughs have occurred in photovoltaics, in wind power, in renewable fuels. Even fossil fuels for motor vehicles have started on that way out. This is progress toward a cleaner planet.

On the energy front, some progress is still needed with respect to nuclear energy policy. But, who is to blame for our shortcomings? Some would point to the administration. Well, Americans are tired of finger pointing.

There is an old saying that when you point one finger at someone else, there are three fingers pointing back at you. This is clearly true as the Senate recently approved these pronuclear policies. So let us not blame the administration for having the same position many of us apparently do as well.

My point is, a lot of good things have happened toward protecting the environment of the planet in the past 20 years as well as in the past 3 years. They should not be swept away in gloom and doom election year propaganda. It is wrong to tell the American people nothing has happened. No wonder many of them have developed the feeling that environmental protection has gone too far. Some in Washington are telling them nothing has happened while at the same time taking their money? Tell me, Mr. President, is this good for the environment?

Now, I am not a Cassandra, but neither am I a Pollyanna. While we have made progress in some areas, in others we have not. Allow me to give a simple example, the soft drink bottle. When I was growing up, we took our bottles back. In third world countries today, people still take their bottles back. We used to do it, and many people still do it. Have we become so rich that we cannot afford to recycle? Sometimes I wonder. Try to find a diet soft drink in these same Third World countries that recycle their bottles.

Try to explain to an impoverished resident of this country that you want to spend money on a drink that has absolutely no nutritional value. We waste millions and millions of dollars each year on throwing away precious resources and on consuming food with no calories. That should say something about our values.

Thus, there is still work to be done. We must address population growth. We must address biodiversity. We must address global warming. It is interesting to me that some point the finger at the administration as not being interested in global warming. Again, three

fingers point back here. We all know that there are Members on both sides of the aisle that would resist efforts to address global warming. Clearly, one side alone is not to blame.

I believe President Bush does care about the environment. I have heard no one complain about his appointment of Bill Reilly as EPA Administrator. Think back 10 years and tell me we have not made progress.

Without his support, there would have been no Clean Air Act. Indeed, I believe you could easily make a case that most environmental legislation has been signed by a Republican president. The Rivers and Harbors Act, for example, was signed by Republican William McKinley in 1899. Teddy Roosevelt added 150 million acres to our national forests and created 51 Federal bird reservations and 5 game preserves. EPA was created by a Republican President.

But, environmental protection is not about who is better, or who has done more. It is about people working together to protect the planet. Progress toward a cleaner environment has occurred under President Bush and for this I congratulate the President. I say this sincerely for I think my colleagues know that I am not one to speak merely in support of a party line. Partisan politics should have no place in environmental protection.

Endangered species do not care if it is a Republican or a Democrat that protects them, and I suspect the American people do not care either. I certainly do not. Let us take pride in the fact that by working together, we have an Endangered Species Act.

We have a Clean Water Act, a Clean Air Act, a Safe Drinking Water Act, and a Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, to name a few.

We have come a long long way in a very short time. We are beginning to turn around hundreds of years of culture. Let us congratulate ourselves and the President for how far we have come. Then, let us work together to set new goals for the future.

I urge all of my colleagues when they read the new CEQ report on the environment to reflect on where we were not too many years ago. We have cause to be proud. We have made our country a little cleaner.

Now, Mr. President, allow me to reflect a little on the present and on the future. We have to change the way we do business here in terms of protecting the environment. There is one table in the new CEQ report that is truly frightening. That is table 14 called risks and cost effectiveness of selected regulations, by cost per premature death averted. The trend in this table is toward vastly increasing costs for little gain. In 1967, according to this table, the Government promulgated a rule related to automotive safety that cost \$100,000 per premature death

avoided. That seems more than reasonable to me. In 1984, regulations related to seatbelts became effective, again for a cost of about \$100,000 per death avoided.

Costs have gone through the roof since then. The average cost per premature death avoided for four EPA rules in 1990 was \$1.425 trillion. That is right, trillion dollars. Now I would not be surprised to learn that the regulations cited in this table were carefully selected. But even so, one rule was cited as having a cost of \$5.7 trillion per premature death avoided. Even without this regulation, the baseline risk of premature death was less than 1 in a million.

Are we out of our minds? Is it really necessary to spend the equivalent \$5.7 trillion to avoid one premature death when the odds of anyone dying without the rule are already less than 1 in a million. A 1 in a million risk is equivalent to getting lung cancer or heart disease from smoking 1.4 cigarettes or cirrhosis of the liver from drinking a half a liter of wine.

How many people could be receiving prenatal care and counseling for this same amount of money? How many babies could be saved? How many mothers could we keep off of crack? How many scholarships could we fund to help disadvantaged students? How many AIDS cases could we prevent? How many cures for cancer could we find? Where are our priorities?

Earlier this month, my colleague from New York expressed concern in a hearing that New York was losing its ability to operate as a port because we cannot discard salt water sediments in the ocean? Does this make sense?

There is even currently a debate raging about whether or not the Safe Drinking Water Act allows EPA to even consider costs in its rulemakings. Clearly, we cannot afford a policy of protection at any cost. No wonder many Americans wonder about our fiscal responsibility.

Before long, the Senate is likely to consider a bill that basically is targeted at the Vice President's Council on Competitiveness. Many are upset that the executive branch is changing congressional mandates, myself included. But it seems to me, we are somewhat to blame for this situation. Congress and the executive branch have been on a course toward the present situation for some time. We write laws, the administration interprets them. We do not like the interpretation so we write more prescriptive laws. More prescriptive laws are more likely to be unworkable. The administration tries to make them workable, like the recent lead in drinking water rule. Some do not like it so we write even more prescriptive legislation, some of it even looking like regulations. They say for every action, there is an equal and opposite reaction. Per-

haps we should view the Vice President's council in these terms. What is it that we have done, Republicans and Democrats, that requires such a council?

It is almost, Mr. President, like we have a civil war going on between Congress and the executive branch. And like the civil war of 130 years ago, it is devastating our country.

I believe both the President and Congress want environmental protection. Our job is not to write unbalanced environmental legislation so that we can look pure while trying to make the administration look bad. This pure as the driven snow posturing is not what Americans want. Now are we best suited, regardless of which party is in the White House, to writing regulations. Our job is to set goals. Somehow, I think both branches of government have lost sight of their roles. I think the American people know this. Maybe if we had collectively spent more time thinking about the macro issues and not micromanaging, we would not be grappling with many of the problems our country faces.

It has to stop. We do not need count-down calendars, nor do we need legislation that basically is political fodder. Can anyone name one American who benefited from all the time we spent on the recent tax bill? I doubt it. I can think of about 536 Americans, however, that were hurt by this waste of time.

This civil war needs to stop. A house divided truly cannot stand.

It is time to move forward and make responsible progress so that in 20 more years from now, future Americans can be as proud of the progress we have made in environmental protection as we should be today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their statements, and I am glad to have had the opportunity to be present here to listen to them both. If I might simply continue on the wave length of both my colleague from Rhode Island and my colleague from Vermont and comment on the fact that it is a reality that there are three Republicans speaking on this subject. It is a reality that in the time I have been here the Republican Presidents have signed a lot more environmental legislation than Democratic predecessors. It is also a reality we have had more Republican Presidents in the last 20 or 30 years than Democratic Presidents.

I will also comment on the realities of the civil war. One of our more clever Republican colleagues, the Senator from Indiana, DAN COATS, the other day talked about some of the nasty

things that are happening around here, he said: "It is 90 percent giving the rest of us a bad name." And that accurately characterized the way this process works too much of the time.

The battle between executive and legislative for credit for things and also the prescriptive nature of what we do is certainly at the heart of some of our problems. One of the serious problems with that is that if we battle with the administration over the micromanagement of policy you cannot tell when the administration is being honest with us and when they are not. And one example of this occurred just last week in the regulations relating to on-board canisters to capture benzene and other vapors. The canisters which are supposed to go on board automobiles are not going to get taken off the automobiles for the umpteenth time and put in filling stations.

This happens to be not one of the micromanagement battles but one of those battles that has existed largely between the automobile industry and the environmental community, if you will, and the decision was batted back and forth in the regulatory process and the automobile companies kept winning on the administrative side until we went to the Clean Air Act and in the middle of the Clean Air Act the automobile industry won a bunch of things and one of the things they lost was the canister issue. Last week the President decided he was going to come down on the side of the automobile industry one more time which simply complicates that problem.

I agree with what our colleague from Vermont said about the fact that we ought to be sticking with the larger policy issues; we can rely on the administration to deal with the rest of them.

I would like to talk this morning principally about one of those issues. My colleagues have talked in the larger context of environmental policies. I would like to take one of those and dwell on it just to show you that it is possible for this body and in cooperation with the administration to do something right.

I look at my colleague from Rhode Island because he principally has been in the middle of this particular effort to make a Federal policy work at the State and local level. I begin with yesterday.

STATE REVOLVING LOAN FUNDS FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday the Environment and Public Works Committee held its annual hearing on the budget request of the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, which we hope to become a Cabinet department one of these days when it frees itself from the maze of riders that we keep putting on the bill. It is a fact

that each year the Administrator of the EPA and all of the assistant administrators appear before the Environment and Public Works Committee to discuss the President's proposed budget for the coming year.

Yesterday, Bill Reilly, the current EPA Administrator, had a very impressive story to relate. EPA is finally getting the resources that it needs to do the job that Congress has mandated. The EPA budget is up substantially from where it was in 1989 when President Bush came to office. In 1993, EPA will employ 17,000 people. It will spend \$7.2 billion improving the quality of our natural environment and protecting the public health.

One of the highlights in the President's budget is his request for assistance to local governments to build sewage treatment facilities. He has asked for \$2.5 billion in 1993 in combined grants and loans to aid States and local governments in the task of building and replacing wastewater treatment facilities.

This request deserves special attention. It is the largest amount requested for this purpose since 1981. It is \$100 million more than the Congress appropriated last year. And it is more than double the amount that the Congress has authorized for 1993. The authorized amount is \$1.2 billion. The President's request for assistance to build wastewater treatment facilities is \$2.5 billion.

The President's budget request for wastewater construction assistance is a fundamental departure from past policies. Republican President's since President Eisenhower have been trying to terminate this Federal grant program. The Congress has three times reauthorized these grants over Presidential vetoes. It was a veto by President Nixon of a bill authorizing wastewater treatment construction grants that gave birth to the budget process here in the Congress. In recent years, under tight budget constraints, even the Congress has appropriated less than the authorized amount for this program.

So, I suggest, it is news that a Republican President is asking that the appropriation for this program be increased to an amount that is more than double the authorized level. The reason for this request is obvious to me. The program works. It is a great success. It has improved the quality of the Nation's waters. It has made a basic public utility affordable in many communities that could not otherwise have built these facilities. It has been efficiently administered by EPA and the States.

Mr. President, Federal aid to build wastewater collection and treatment systems began in 1956 with enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. For most of its history it was a direct Federal grant to local govern-

ments. Cities and towns used the money to lay sewer pipes, to build sewage treatment plants, and to replace sewage facilities that had worn out.

In the first years the grants were relatively small, \$20 million to \$50 million per year. But in 1972, the program was dramatically expanded. That was the year that Congress completely rewrote the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to address the water pollution problems that had become a national scandal. It was about 20 years ago that rivers caught fire, the Great Lakes were dying, urban rivers like the Potomac were so polluted they were no longer suitable for recreation. And the American people demanded that our lakes and rivers and streams be cleaned up.

Although it was not officially called the Clean Water Act until 1977, it was the amendments of 1972 that signaled the big change. Authorizations for the wastewater treatment construction grants program were increased to nearly \$5 billion per year. The matching rate was increased to 75 percent Federal money. States were instructed to prepare priority lists of projects for Federal funds. A massive construction program was begun.

That level of effort was continued through much of the 1970's. At the end of that decade, the Federal Government was providing about \$5 billion per year in aid to local governments to build sewage treatment and collection facilities. More than \$26 billion had been invested at that point.

In 1981, when President Reagan came to office, he appointed David Stockman as the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. Mr. Stockman was very critical of the construction grants program. He felt that many of the communities that received Federal assistance could well afford to build their own wastewater treatment facilities.

He also argued, and with some justification, that the very low contribution made by local governments to the cost of these plants encouraged overbuilding. Cities designed plants with capacity well beyond their current needs because the cities contributed on average only 5 percent of the construction costs.

As it happened, the construction grants program was up for reauthorization in 1981 and President Reagan made it clear that he would request no funds for 1982 unless significant reforms in the program were made.

And the Congress responded with reforms. The Federal matching rate was cut from 75 percent to 55 percent requiring local governments to shoulder a larger share of the burden. Projects that were growth related were no longer eligible. Priority was given to construction that would bring cities into compliance with Federal water quality standards. And it was agreed that the program would be extended for

another 10 years at \$2.4 billion per year. But at the end of the 10-year period, the Federal role in wastewater treatment was to be terminated.

There was some logic to the commitment of \$2.4 billion per year for 10 years. Those of us in the Federal Government often hear complaints from our colleagues who serve in State and local governments that the Congress imposes mandates without paying for them. In fact, the New York Times carried a major story on this subject yesterday.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I am pleased to represent this body, along with DANNY AKAKA, had a very, very thorough report on this subject at its meeting last week.

The laws that Congress enacts can have major cost impacts for State and local government. Since they are governments that must get their tax dollars from the same people that the Congress taxes, they argue, rightfully in my view, that Congress has an obligation to consider the impacts of its action on State and local spending and taxes.

Well, that is one thing we have always done in the Clean Water Act. The purpose of the construction grants program was to help pay for a Federal mandate. Publicly owned treatment works, the sewage treatment plants owned by towns and cities and counties, must meet a level of pollution control set forth in the Clean Water Act. It is called secondary treatment. It requires that about 85 percent of the pollutants in the wastewater be removed before the water is discharged to a river or lake. In 1981, when the Congress and the administration agreed to provide another \$2.4 billion per year for 10 years for construction grants, it was expected that this amount of money would roughly pay for the cost of complying with that Federal mandate.

When these grants came up for reauthorization again in 1985, further and very significant reforms were made. At that time we were looking at the end of the Federal role. Under the very able leadership of the now ranking Republican member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, Senator JOHN CHAFEE, and with the help of the States, the construction grants program was converted into a permanent infrastructure investment program.

Rather than make outright grants to local governments for construction, the 1987 Water Quality Act authorizes grants to the States. Each State places its grant in a revolving loan fund. It matches the Federal grant with some of its own funds. The money in the fund is then loaned to local governments for wastewater treatment construction projects. Local governments pay the money back over 20 years at interest rates less than the market

would charge and money is then reloaned to build new sewage treatment facilities in other towns and communities in the State.

These State loan programs are called State revolving funds or SRF's. The first SRF's were established in 1989 and 1990. Today every 1 of the 50 States and Puerto Rico has established a revolving loan fund. They have all received grants from the Federal Government to capitalize their funds. And as of last fall, loans have been extended to over 400 local governments through State funds.

The States have done a truly extraordinary job in setting up these funds. States are required to match the Federal dollars with some funds of their own. Many States have gone well beyond the required match. And a dozen States have leveraged their funds. They have used the Federal grant to back up bonds issued by the State the revenues from which are deposited in the fund and are also used to make loans.

Let me give you an example. The State of New York has leveraged its Federal grant and State match at a 3-to-1 rate. For every dollar of Federal grants it receives it is able to loan out more than \$3 to local governments. This means that Federal dollars in States using the leverage of SRF's can reach much farther than they would as a direct Federal-local grant.

The advent of the SRF has brought about another significant reform. Because local communities are required to pay back the loans, the planning and design of the wastewater facilities that are built is likely to be much more in tune with the actual needs of the community. Cities and towns will seek efficiencies and technologies that can save costs and save on water consumption, because ultimately they will have to pay the sewerage charges that finance the facility.

But there is still a substantial benefit for local governments. The State of New York estimates that local government saves \$250,000 in interest costs for each \$1,000,000 borrowed from an SRF as opposed to the bond market. And in some States, like my State of Minnesota, no interest loans—that is, loans without interest—are offered to communities that cannot afford even the 2- to 5-percent rate that is typically charged for an SRF loan.

So, what we have here is a great success story. Since 1956, the Federal Government has invested more than \$58 billion in local sewage treatment and collection. It is an example of the Congress financing a mandate that it has imposed. Today, there are 16,000 functioning sewage treatment plants owned and operated by local governments across the country.

Plants serving more than 144 million Americans meet secondary treatment, the Federal standard for clean water.

That is up from 85 million in 1972. And the quality of the Nation's rivers, lakes, and streams have improved dramatically as a result.

State revolving funds have magnified the impact of Federal dollars. The money will be available in perpetuity as local governments repay their loans. Many States have leveraged the Federal dollars to extend the reach of the SRF's. And the dollars are applied more efficiently as the discipline of repayment is applied to the design and construction of these facilities.

But there is work yet to be done. The 1987 Water Quality Act established the State revolving funds, but it also legislated an end to the Federal role. The total amount authorized for the SRF grants was only \$8.4 billion, including \$1.2 billion in 1993 and \$600 million in 1994. After 1994 there is no authorization for Federal assistance.

The need, however, remains large. EPA's most recent estimate of the dollar amount necessary to build the sewage collection and treatment facilities now planned by local governments is approximately \$80 billion through the year 2010. And there are other substantial needs not included in the EPA estimate. The current authorization for SRF grants is nowhere near enough to meet those needs.

Recently, Senator CHAFEE recommended that the Federal grants to State revolving loan funds be continued through the year 2000 at \$2.5 billion per year. That is a suggestion we should all support. I do. It reflects the success that has been experienced in the construction grants and revolving loan fund programs. There is no better way for us to invest Federal dollars in clean water than this program.

I take the President's 1993 budget request for these programs as a sign that this administration agrees and recognizes the value and the success of this important environmental effort.

Mr. President, this year marks the 20th anniversary of the 1972 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—that point in time when our National Government became truly dedicated to protecting the quality of our Nation's waters. It would be fitting if we could recognize the 20th anniversary by extending a program that works—the State revolving funds—through at least the end of this century. I believe that the President's 1993 budget request for this program points us in the right direction.

I urge that we act on that request as quickly as possible.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. BENTSEN addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas is recognized for up to 15 minutes.

TAX RELIEF FOR MIDDLE-INCOME AMERICANS

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, there is an axiom in politics that every officeholder in Texas from the courthouse to the statehouse knows by heart, and President Bush certainly knew it when he was a Member of Congress from Texas, but he seems to have forgotten it. And that axiom is that, "You cannot beat something with nothing." That is especially true when we are talking about tax relief to middle-income Americans.

All sides agree, Mr. President, on the need for tax relief for middle-income Americans, whether we are talking about Democrats or Republicans, whether we are speaking about the President or the Congress. Over the last decade there is no question that middle-income Americans have been the ones that have been hardest hit. They are the ones that have seen their taxes go up while their incomes went down.

Congress last week finished its tax bill with a substantial cut for middle-income Americans, and they finished it within the deadline set by the President of the United States and sent it to the White House. The President had not even read it when he issued a statement that he was going to veto it. He had his veto message all ready.

Mr. President, I think it was good legislation. It said to middle-income Americans that had a family of four—two children—making \$35,000 a year, that we are going to give you a 25-percent cut in your income tax.

That is meaningful. But President Bush did not agree. He vetoed the bill and spent a good deal of time since then denouncing it, inaccurately labeling it as a \$100 billion tax increase. He knows better. That is a gross misrepresentation of that bill.

People say, Why don't you answer that; why do you leave that kind of a misrepresentation hanging out there, getting repeated over and over again? We do answer it. It is answered here on the floor of the Senate, and it is answered by a number of Senators and House Members. But I tell you, it is a tough competition with a bully pulpit; tough competition to get the word out to the elections.

I will give another example of the advantage the White House has. Let's talk about the Sunday network shows. Say half the networks called and asked a Democrat to be on the program with a Cabinet official representing the Republican Party. And then we have the Cabinet official saying: "Well, if I cannot have it just to myself, if I have to have someone on the other side representing their point of view, then I am not available." The network is trying to get their viewership up and understands that if they have a Cabinet official, that person is better known and that person is going to attract an audi-

ence. So we see the network, in many instances, saying: Well, OK, the show is yours; we will not have a Democrat on that program to represent the contrary point of view.

A good example of this problem is when the President talks about a tax increase, and does not say that there is an equivalent tax cut. For every tax increase, there is a tax cut. He does not say that the President's bill, over those 6 years, would have added \$32 billion to the deficit. When he says he turned his back on the 1990 budget agreement, and he is sorry he was ever a part of it, that exemplifies it. That is the only serious discipline we have around here on this Congress and on the administration to try to cut this deficit. And it has enabled us to begin to make some headway in cutting back on the deficit.

The congressional bill cut that deficit by \$13 billion over those 6 years, while the President's bill added \$32 billion to it over that period of time.

The President should know that you cannot beat something with nothing. He told us over and over again that he would not accept our middle-income tax cut. But where is his? Does he still support the smaller tax cut he originally proposed and then pulled back on? We know what he is against. But when it comes to cutting taxes for hard-pressed, middle-income families, what is he for? And perhaps more important in this age of \$400 billion deficits in that budget, how would he pay for whatever he proposes?

No wonder the American people are turned off by what they see going on in Washington. No wonder they are sending ominous signals to candidates up for reelection this year that they want less rhetoric and more effective action. No wonder the same poll, which shows Americans overwhelmingly for legislation to cut taxes to hard-pressed middle Americans, also shows they do not believe such legislation will ever become law.

We will never pass a middle-income tax cut until we move beyond what we do not want and start talking about what we do want; what we are willing to support and how we are willing to pay for it. The legislation that the President commented on is not, as he says, a \$100 billion tax increase. It is a tax cut for 77 million middle-income Americans. And in the interest of fairness and holding the line on the deficit, we did it by raising the taxes on approximately a million people at the very top of the income scale. They are the ones who, in the last decade, have seen their taxes go down while their incomes went up; just the opposite of middle-income Americans.

And when we talk about the tax increase, we were talking about that fourth tier, raising it by 5 percent, from 31 to 36 percent. In addition, the bill imposed a 10-percent surtax on those making over \$1 million a year.

We talked about raising it from 31 percent to 36 percent. All you have to do is remember back to 1986, when President Reagan, a Republican, was talking about raising it to 35 percent on anyone making over \$70,000 a year. We are talking about 36 percent on families making over \$140,000 a year.

Tax fairness and the ability to pay are still an important criterion in sharing the responsibilities of paying the cost of government. And for those who might think that 36 percent, or the surtax on people making over \$1 million a year is high, let us take a look around the world and look at the top marginal rate imposed by our biggest and toughest competitors: Now 36 percent; not a 10-percent surtax on people making over \$1 million—substantially more. If you are talking about Germany, if you are talking about Japan, countries that are our toughest economic competitors today, they have a 50-percent and a 53-percent top personal income tax rate.

I listened to one statement that was made by the President and was made repeatedly on this floor, claiming that 80 percent of the highest taxes in our bill would be paid by small businesses. I said, How can that be? I was a small businessman once myself. Small business often is with two or three employees. How could it be that they are making over \$140,000 net?

I went to look at how they arrived at this conclusion. I looked at the 1985 Treasury study that I understand was used to arrive at these figures. The vast bulk of those taxpayers weren't small businesses at all. They were doctors, lawyers, bankers—people that invested that year in limited partnership tax shelters. These individuals had losses because they were sheltering their income. They took those people who had lost money in those ventures and said those are small business people. It did not make any difference if their principal income was as a lawyer or doctor or banker, they considered them small business people. The study is irrelevant today, of course, since most of those tax shelters were done away with in President Reagan's tax reform initiative of 1986. In essence, his statement was a total misrepresentation of the facts.

President Bush, of course, was well within his constitutional rights and his responsibilities to veto that tax bill. But now that he has done it, and he spent several days attacking it, where do we go from here, as far as middle-income folks are concerned? What can we do to change this from an exercise in blame-placing to a serious effort to cut taxes?

I challenge the President today to send to the Congress his proposal. Send us your proposal, Mr. President, for cutting middle-income taxes. Show us what you would do. Perhaps he could do it simply by telling us how he

thinks we should change our legislation so it meets his objections. Maybe he prefers to take a totally new approach.

Both Democrats and Republicans, Congress and the President, have told the American people they strongly support middle-income tax relief. Americans have indicated they like that idea, too. Given that kind of broad agreement, people have every right to ask, "why don't you give us some relief? Why all the arguing, and the bickering, and the gamesmanship?"

If the President will send us his middle-income tax plan, then I pledge—and I am confident that I speak for the great majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—I pledge to work with him in a spirit of mutual cooperation. We did a good deal of that in the tax bill we proposed. We took six of the seven growth incentives that he had in his bill and put them in our legislation.

This is an election year, and we all know the special hazards and difficulties of dealing with tax legislation in an election year. The other side of that coin, though, is that we are also familiar with the risks of failing to perform at a time when the people are preparing to pass judgment on who lived up to their commitments and who did not.

Mr. President, you just cannot beat something with nothing, and when it comes to middle-income tax relief, I challenge the President to stop talking about what he does not like and tell us what he wants to do and how he will pay for it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBB). The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE].

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I listened with careful attention to the presentation made by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee and I will say this, Mr. President, that I do not think the argument is over tax relief for the middle class. I think the argument is over how best we use new revenue, should we choose to raise new revenue. The total revenue raised under the bill that came to the floor from the majority party was about \$52 billion, and of that \$52 billion, \$32 billion of it went for this so-called middle-class tax relief.

Mr. President, there is not a consistent view on this side as how to proceed, but speaking for myself, I am not opposed to raising new moneys through taxes. I do not mind taxing the rich whether it is a surtax or increasing the brackets to 36 percent. But the question is what to do with the money when you raise it, and the overwhelming view on this side and, indeed, I should say the overwhelming view in Congress as a whole is, do not squander it on a very, very modest tax break for

the middle class. If you are going to raise this money, use it to reduce the deficit.

The deficit is what is going to haunt this country in the days and years ahead. We felt that a very, very modest relief, and you can argue over whether 83 cents a day per child 15 or younger is any significant relief for the so-called middle class and it is a very limited group in the middle class. And indeed, Mr. President, when that bill came back from conference, it had exactly what we on this side were saying: That it did not cover that middle class.

And so when it came back, the tax applied not to those married families starting at \$175,000, but it came down to married couples, I believe, at \$140,000. It came down. The tax was applied—not that the tax came down—but the tax applied to those in lower brackets than originally estimated, and we are absolutely confident that if we are going to continue with that so-called tax break for the middle class, those higher taxes, the 36 percent rate, would have to even go down to lower and lower brackets.

Mr. President, no one ever accused the New York Times of being a pro-Republican newspaper. What does the New York Times say about that bill? This is what it said on March 21, last Saturday, "Tax Bill Veto Is No Loss." I might just quote from it:

Congress worked feverishly and successfully to pass an economic recovery plan before yesterday's deadline set by President Bush in his State of the Union address. It need not have bothered. The bill provided paltry relief for middle-class families, no relief from the recession and virtually nothing to spur long-term growth. Worse yet, it reinstated a bevy of tax shelters of the type that were demolished by the glorious 1986 tax reform.

Mr. President, it did not agree for the reasons that President Bush vetoed it, but it agreed with the result, and so do we on this side, Mr. President.

So where do we go from here? I hope that the majority party, working with the Republicans and the administration, can get together on a tax program that will do something to help the economy out of this recession; that we could take care of some of the problems that have arisen in connection with, for example, the real estate quandary we are now in. I think the passive loss changes that were recommended were good.

There were other provisions that were good, I believe. I am sorry when they came back from conference they left out one of the provisions that would be most successful in reviving the real estate situation; namely, the \$5,000 tax credit. I hope they do something about the very, very onerous so-called luxury tax which has been a total disaster in raising revenue, a disaster in creating unemployment in the industries affected.

So I think there is hope, Mr. President. I would say the ball lies in the

majority party's court and certainly those of us on this side would cooperate to achieve a good result, but I do not think raising taxes very substantially and spending the money on 83 cents a day per child under 15 is going to get us very far.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for the Senator from Rhode Island, and we often have worked together in a bipartisan way and accomplished things we thought were important for the country. But as I listened to him talking about how committed everyone was to deficit reduction, I could not help but think what the President's bill did in that regard.

He did not refer to that at all. Over 6 years, the President's bill would add \$32 billion to the deficit. The President is the one who said he was sorry he ever entered into the 1990 budget agreement that is designed to restrain how much is spent by the administration and Congress. And he sure showed that as he presented his legislation and did not pay for it.

Our legislation reduced the deficit by \$13 billion. It is not enough, but it is a dramatic change from what the President had proposed; not enough for middle income, more than \$42 billion. I have been here long enough to know that is still a lot of money.

The tax bill would have provided meaningful relief to 77 million taxpayers in each of the first 2 years. Beginning in the third year and thereafter families would be eligible for a \$300 tax credit for each child. This would be a 25-percent income tax cut for a family of four making \$35,000 a year. I know there are people inside the beltway who think that is peanuts, but that's real money to most Americans.

The bill would provide meaningful tax relief to a family that sits down and reads the supermarket ads and looks for the coupons trying to decide what to buy and where to shop. It's meaningful to the family that has a child that gets sick and the parents while trying to decide whether to go to the emergency room or to a doctor knowing that it is both a medical decision and a financial decision for them. It's meaningful to the family that is trying to send their kids to college and is forced to look first for what the student aid is before they look at the curriculum.

It is also meaningful to the family trying to figure out how to pay the orthodontist for braces for the child. If that family were to put that \$300 for a newborn child into an IRA until the child was ready to go to college, they could accumulate \$15,000—that is meaningful.

Those are the things that we put in this piece of legislation. So do not tell us what you are against; tell us what you are for. Mr. President, tell us what you will support and then tell us how

you will pay for it. We would be delighted to see if we cannot work this thing out together.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BYRD pertaining to the introduction of S. 2402, S. 2403, and S. 2404 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand that morning business is about to expire. The Senator from New Mexico is on the floor because I await the majority leader or his designee for purposes of moving that we consider the bill that would remove the defense wall.

Might I say, so that my friend, the majority leader will know, I am not in a hurry. The problem I have is that I must be off the floor at 12 o'clock for a short while. I would not want to interrupt him or cause a delay with respect to his making the motion to proceed. Some other Senators will take my place at that point.

So we will not be asking that the process be in any way restrained. On the other hand, if we could move ahead with it, it would be helpful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. DOMENICI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRRESPONSIBLE CONGRESS? HERE IS TODAY'S BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the Federal debt run up by the U.S. Congress stood at \$3,863,647,979,260.75, as of the close of business on Monday, March 23, 1992.

As anybody familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows, no President can spend a dime that has not first been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States.

During the past fiscal year, it cost the American taxpayers \$286,022,000,000 just to pay the interest on spending approved by Congress—over and above what the Federal Government collected in taxes and other income. Aver-

aged out, this amounts to \$5.5 billion every week, or \$785 million every day.

What would America be like today if there had been a Congress that had the courage and the integrity to operate on a balanced budget?

A TRIBUTE TO BERTHOLD GASTER

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine journalist and a wonderful friend, Berthold Gaster.

Bert Gaster, who passed away yesterday, was editor of the Connecticut Jewish Ledger, which is circulated every week to more than 25,000 families in my State. Under Bert's able direction over the past 30 years, the Ledger has become a real fixture in our homes, bringing us news as personal as the charitable work of our friends across Connecticut, and as profound as analyses of the Arab-Israeli peace dialog. Whether the subject was anti-Semitism in our own backyard, remembrances of the Holocaust, or current events in the Jewish community, Bert Gaster kept us informed and enlightened.

As a journalist and a public-spirited citizen, Bert Gaster won many awards, including a citation from the Freedom Foundation for an essay about the American dream. Bert Gaster's life was a fulfillment of that dream. He came to America from Vienna in 1939, where Nazis had begun to persecute the Jewish population. He had lived through the infamous Kristallnacht, watching Nazi gangs terrorize the community. His father survived the concentration camps. Those memories inspired him to lead the greater Hartford area's yearly Holocaust memorial observance, many of which I was honored to participate in.

Once in this country, liberated from fascist domination, Bert Gaster flourished in freedom, receiving bachelor's and master's degrees and embarking on his career in journalism. I believe he saw in journalism an antidote to the repression of Nazism; he knew the free and unfettered expression of ideas was the best way to combat ideologies that seek to stifle the human spirit. For more than three decades, Bert Gaster embraced the first amendment of his adopted country and used it to advance the public interest and the cause of freedom.

I am proud to have known Bert Gaster not only as a journalist, but also as a very good friend. I always enjoyed his company, his advice and his warm, easygoing manner. On this sad occasion, when memories of many happy times with Bert are recalled, I wish to offer my condolences to Adele Gaster, a wonderful woman to whom Bert was married for 40 years. Adele worked right alongside Bert at the Ledger, handling the whole range of tasks involved in producing a weekly newspaper. I also wish to express my

sympathy to his son and daughter, Jeffrey and Emeline, his sister, Rose, and to other members of Bert's family. Given his significant role in our lives, Bert's family can easily be said to include everyone who receives the Jewish Ledger each week and benefits from its insights into the Jewish community in our State and around the world.

From the darkness of the Holocaust to the bright and open skies of freedom, Bert Gaster's journey of life is a cause for celebration. As Emile Zola said at the trial of Alfred Dreyfus, "The light, the whole light—this was my sole, my passionate desire!" Bert Gaster, through the conduct of his life and career, shared that desire, to shine the light of truth over the land so that we might see our way to a better world. Those of us who knew Bert Gaster would best honor his memory by doing our part to keep that desire alive within ourselves.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, more than 3 years ago, the Ayatollah Khomeini declared Salman Rushdie a blasphemer and condemned him to death. Rushdie's crime was not murder or treason, but a thought, a word, a novel called "The Satanic Verses." Since then, Rushdie has been a prisoner, a man isolated from the rest of humanity by hatred and intolerance. And he has not been the only victim: The book's Italian translator was brutally attacked and its Japanese translator murdered.

Last night, under cover of darkness, Salman Rushdie appeared at a conference sponsored by the Freedom Forum and the American University. And earlier today, Senator MOYNIHAN and I met with Rushdie here in the Capitol. His story is compelling. In one sense, Rushdie's journey from a storyteller to a target of state-sponsored terrorism is a complex tale of personal hardship and international intrigue. In another, it is frightfully simple: Salman Rushdie has been sentenced to death for the crime of writing a book.

Rushdie's plight is an example of fanatic censorship—what he calls terrorism by remote control. It is ideological extremism and political expediency taken to new heights. But while this censorship is different in scope, its threat is the same as government censorship throughout the world.

INTERNATIONAL CENSORSHIP

Article 19 of the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Notwithstanding that declaration, censorship is an unfortunate reality in many parts of the world. An article in

the recent edition of the Freedom Review indicates that of 162 countries examined, only 42 percent have a free press—a 3-percent increase over 1990, but still far from acceptable.

The most significant increase in press freedom came in the former Soviet Union and parts of Africa. An organization named after article 19 of the U.N. Declaration, reported last year that South Africa ended the emergency rule that restricted reports of unrest in black townships. In the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as well as in Poland and Czechoslovakia, glasnost has paved the way to a fledgling free press throughout the former Soviet bloc.

The first real evidence that something was new under the Red Star in Moscow was not the destruction of statues or the celebrations in Red Square.

The Communist Party was officially dead when newspapers began to publish accounts of suppression under the Communist regime and television newscasts started beaming criticism of the old order to the new world.

Unfortunately, China did not share in this expanding freedom of the press. In the wake of the crackdown following the prodemocracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square, Chinese reporters have been repressed and foreign journalists denied access.

In a particularly egregious example of artistic suppression last year, the Chinese Government urged the United States Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences to disqualify the Chinese film "Ju Dou" from Academy Awards consideration for best foreign language film.

The press suffered at the hand of the governments in Cuba and Haiti, as well. Iraq, which strictly controls information about the nation's persecution of the Kurds, executed reporter Farzad Bazoft, an Iranian-born reporter for the London Observer, as a spy.

The year 1991 saw many threats to the personal safety of journalists. The Freedom Review reported that 62 journalists were killed last year, up from 45 the year before. Twenty journalists were kidnapped or disappeared. Thirty-six were wounded and 48 were beaten. Fifty-one journalists received death threats and 298 were arrested or detained. In Colombia, alone, six journalists died at the hands of drug traffickers.

And lest we think the United States is free from this kind of terrorism, three journalists have been killed in this country in the last 15 months. On March 11, Manuel de Dios, Cuban editor-in-chief of New York's leading Spanish-language newspaper was shot dead in a restaurant in New York City. Last year, two Haitian radio talk show hosts were killed in Miami.

Democracy and freedom of expression move in tandem, one fueling the other.

Neither survives alone. As one country after another moves toward freer, more open societies, the rights of the press and the public to speak their minds will increase. America leads the way in that process, but even in this country, we face threats to freedom of expression.

UNITED STATES

In the United States, freedom of expression includes freedom of speech, of association, of religion. In theory, we celebrate free expression and pledge our allegiance to the democratic form of government that guarantees it. In reality, the principle of free expression sometimes clashes with speech or art that we find offensive. That clash forces us to give more than lip service to the first amendment.

John Frohnmayer, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts who was fired earlier this year by President Bush, spoke this week about the danger of censorship in this country. He warned of fear, of ignorance, of lack of resolve in protecting all voices, including the voices from the edge.

Frohnmayer's comments remind us that notwithstanding the first amendment, we are not free from censorship in this country. In just the last few years, we have seen:

Restrictions on the access of the press to the gulf war;

Repeated efforts to tie the hands of the National Endowment for the Arts;

Threats to defund the Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

Zealous prosecution of rap singers in Florida;

Attempts to ban library books in public schools;

Regulations aimed at preventing poor women from getting information about abortion; and

Resistance to public access to government information under the Freedom of Information Act.

The arguments for suppressing expression in these various cases are disturbingly familiar—that the art, or the lyrics, or the book, or the actions are offensive to someone and thus should be banned for everyone. It is an improper application of the principle of majority rule to issues of free speech. It is precisely what the first amendment is intended to proscribe.

Our Constitution established a democratic framework premised on self-government. It reflects the Founders' confidence in a government by and of the people, a government that welcomes rather than fears dissenting views. That promise is carved on the walls of the Jefferson Memorial:

I have sworn upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of men.

At times in our history, we have seen examples of inexcusable attacks on free speech. From the Alien and Sedition Act to the McCarthy era, events have challenged our complacency

about the guarantee of free expression. The lesson is clear: If we do not remain vigilant—even in protecting speech we do not like—we risk losing our right to all speech.

In response to an Islamic opponent who claimed that free speech is a non-starter, Salman Rushdie responded:

No, sir, it is not. Free speech is the whole thing, the whole ball game. Free speech is life itself.

We should heed those words from one who has lost his physical freedom in the exercise of his freedom of expression.

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDER M. SANDERS, JR.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the new president-elect of the College of Charleston, Judge Alexander M. Sanders, Jr. Judge Sanders is an outstanding individual in every way, and I am confident that he will be a strong and innovative leader for this fine institution.

Judge Sanders has served our State in a variety of capacities: As a member of the house of representatives and the senate; as an attorney and professor of law; and most recently as chief judge of the court of appeals. He has distinguished himself in each of these positions by his keen intellect, commitment to excellence and devotion to hard work.

I am sure he will meet the challenges of this new position with the same energy, good humor, and dedication which have been his hallmarks.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of an editorial from the Charles Post and Courier on Judge Sanders be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the Charleston Post and Courier, Mar. 25, 1992]

COLLEGE'S NEW HEAD PROVEN WINNER

Few public officials in South Carolina have a more loyal following than the new president-elect of the College of Charleston, Alexander M. Sanders Jr., who is known for his keen mind and winning personality. We expect him to make his mark at the college as he has in every post he has filled since he entered public life 25 years ago.

First as a member of the House of Representatives and then as state senator from Richland County, Alex Sanders became known as both a thinker and a spellbinding storyteller. He was out front on environmental issues before most of his colleagues and got their attention with his engaging manner and way with words.

Judge Sanders' opinions as chief judge of the Court of Appeals for nearly 10 years reflect his wit as well as his intellect. He has the ability to make even the most complex legal issue interesting and has become a draw around the country as a speaker who not only entertains but enlightens.

In view of the esteem in which he is held in the legal community, there was some surprise that he would even consider leaving the

bench. But another respected legal mind and friend, Harry M. Lightsey, former dean of the University of South Carolina Law School, had found happiness as president of the college. When he was nominated to replace Dr. Lightsey, who will step down later this year, Judge Sanders didn't say no.

Because he is so politically well-connected, there have been charges that none of the other 219 applicants ever really had a chance. An attempt by one faculty member to obtain the names of the applicants was rejected by the chairman of the board of trustees, Joe Berry, who maintained that the applicants were promised confidentiality. The critics' fire was fueled.

That never should have happened. One of South Carolina's best-known media attorneys, Jay Bender of Columbia, contends that there is nothing in the Freedom of Information Act that justifies keeping from public scrutiny applications for public employment, be they for police chief, school superintendent or college president. "It is the fact that everyone has the opportunity to see what goes on that gives credibility to the process," he said. That's particularly important to the winner.

To his credit, Judge Sanders reportedly not only won over students who interviewed him last week but withstood well the grilling of some hostile faculty members. Clearly, he impressed the board, which gave him its unanimous vote Saturday after interviewing the other two finalists.

While he has taught law at USC for 20 years, as well as a stint at Harvard, Judge Sanders' one admitted weakness in terms of the new job is his lack of administrative experience. But Dr. Gordan B. Stine, a board member and former president of the college's Alumni Association, pointed to the judge's skill in working with people and his known ability to make hard decisions. Dr. Stine, who made the motion for Judge Sanders, noted that after his session with the faculty, a number of letters were received in praise of the judge, including one from a professor who noted that "anyone can look good when times are good. But it takes skill to perform well when times are tough."

Those who know him predict that before long, the critics will be singing the praises of the judge, whose fans include such establishment types as the current and former governors and such establishment critics as author Pat Conroy.

He will bring to the college a lively intellect and great good humor and he will charm while he's leading. His presence will be a stimulant not only to the campus, but the community.

DEATH OF BERTHOLD GASTER

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to express my sadness at the news of the death of a sincere and long-time friend, Berthold Gaster. Bert was my father's good friend and trusted adviser, so his connection to my family goes back a long way. But Bert's deeper connection to the darkest moment of the 20th century, the Holocaust—from whose impending scourge and ruin his family fled in 1939—served to remind us of what we stand to lose when we sacrifice our thoughts and conscience to the tyranny of a seductive despot.

By surviving this abomination of civilization, Berthold Gaster understood

better than anyone the essential sovereignty of every human being. Having borne witness to depraved unchecked madness under the guise of government, Bert possessed a raw sensitivity to the perils of power undisciplined by diversity and dissent. He never lost an opportunity to support the underdog, or spared a moment of his time or energy championing the civil liberties and human rights of others.

Bert's vocation as a journalist suited his keen insight and compassion. The power of his pen was mighty indeed. He never tired of stressing the importance of remaining vigilant against any erosion of human freedom. Memories of marauding Nazis' pillaging the quiet Jewish neighborhoods of Vienna—during what has come to be known as Kristallnacht—were forever emblazoned in his heart and mind. These images of chaos stood in stark contrast to the rights and liberties that most Americans take for granted. Bert always continued to remind us that moral laxity and complacency can foreshadow any nation's downfall.

Mr. President, I hope never to forget the lesson of Berthold Gaster's tenacious love of freedom, boundless compassion and ultimate faith in humanity which rose, phoenix-like, from firsthand experiences of human savagery. Knowing Bert personally was my own good fortune. But the stroke of fortune that blessed all of us was the act of a nameless Nazi official, who some half a century ago—softened by the pleas of Bert's mother—allowed them safe passage to the distant and more promising shores of America.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE P. BRADLEY MORRAH, JR.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine man and outstanding South Carolinian, former State Senator P. Bradley Morrah, Jr., who passed away last month. Senator Morrah was a man of character, courage and compassion and an outstanding public servant, and he will be greatly missed.

As a State legislator and attorney, Bradley Morrah devoted his life to serving others, and he did a splendid job of representing his constituents and clients in Greenville County. He started out as a member of the State House of Representatives in 1941. A position from which he resigned to serve in the military. His military career was distinguished by the same outstanding qualities he brought to all his endeavors, and he earned a Bronze Star and seven battle stars.

From 1953 to 1966, Senator Morrah represented Greenville County in the South Carolina Senate. He was a capable, dedicated and conscientious lawmaker, and his courteous demeanor and warm personality endeared him to his colleagues.

He practiced law in the Greenville area for many years, and was active in many civic organizations. He served on the U.S. Constitution Bicentennial Commission of South Carolina; the board of trustees of the Greenville city school system; the board of visitors of The Citadel, and the Archives Commission among others.

Senator Morrah ran against me for the U.S. Senate in 1966, and I found him to be a worthy and honorable opponent. I had a great deal of respect for him and was saddened to hear of his death. His passing represents a great loss to many; but he will live on in the memories of those who know him and through the many contributions he made to Greenville Country and our State.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my deepest condolences to Senator Morrah's daughter, Irene Morrah Ingold; son, P. Bradley Morrah III; sisters, Mrs. Hugh Z. Graham and Mrs. Joe. T. Rice; and the rest of his fine family.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of an article and an editorial from the Greenville News be included in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

[From the Greenville (SC) News, Feb. 18, 1992]

FORMER LAWMAKER MORRAH DIES

Former state Sen. P. Bradley Morrah Jr., whose stamp remains on Greenville County roads, libraries and government, died Monday. He was 76.

Morrah had a long career in Greenville County politics and also gave his time to a number of civic organizations.

Local leaders such as Greenville Mayor Bill Workman said they were inspired by Morrah's style, and colleagues such as former state Rep. B.O. "Tommy" Thomason said he was responsible for helping bring the Church Street overpass and other key road projects to Greenville.

Former Gov. Dick Riley credited Morrah's influence with getting things done in Greenville, even though he served in the Senate when each county had only one senator.

Democratic Sen. Ernest Hollings called Morrah "an articulate, skilled legislator," and Republican Sen. Strom Thurmond, who Morrah ran against in 1966, said the Greenville lawyer's passing a great loss to the state.

Morrah first served as a member of the House of Representatives for Greenville County in 1941, resigning to enter the military service. He rose to the rank of major and was awarded the Bronze Star and seven battle stars.

Between 1953 and 1966, he served the longest term of any former single county Senator. He served as chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee and on the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

In 1966, he was defeated by Thurmond for the U.S. Senate and also lost his state Senate seat to write-in candidate Thomas A. Wofford.

Born June 13, 1915, in Lancaster, he was the son of the late Patrick Bradley and Hessie Thomson Morrah. He graduated from

Greenville County schools and was a 1936 graduate of the Citadel, where he lettered in basketball and track. He graduated from Duke University Law School in 1939.

He served as chairman of the South Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Committee and the U.S. Constitution Bicentennial Commission of South Carolina. In addition, Morrah was a former member of the Board of Visitors at The Citadel, and was a member of the Clarks Hill-Russell Authority of South Carolina. He was former president of the Greenville Little Theatre, a former member of the Board of Trustees of the Greenville City School System, was a member of the Council of 13 Colonies and a former member of the state Parks, Recreation and Tourism Commission. He also received the National Daughters of the American Revolution Medal of Honor.

He also was a former member of the Archives Commission, the Palmetto and Summit clubs in Columbia, the Greenville Country Club and Cotillion Club.

He was a member of First Baptist Church.

Surviving are a daughter, Irene Morrah Ingold of Greenville; a son, P. Bradley Morrah III of Greenville; two sisters, Mrs. Hugh Z. Graham of Greenville and Mrs. Joel T. Rice of Belton; and two grandchildren.

Funeral services will be conducted Wednesday at 3 p.m. at First Baptist Church. Burial will be in Woodland Memorial Park, Section O.

The family is at the home at 206 Overbrook Road.

[From the Greenville (SC) News, Feb. 27, 1992]

BRADLEY MORRAH, JR.

Greenville attorney P. Bradley Morrah, Jr., who died last week at age 76, might well have become a South Carolina institution, except for circumstances that cut short his political career more than two decades ago.

Morrah's good qualities and potential were dealt with uncharitably by fate, it being his experience that's still referred to in political warnings against running as an incumbent for one office while also seeking election to a higher place. He lost a 1966 challenge against U.S. Sen. Strom Thurmond, and, surprisingly, he was also narrowly defeated by a Thurmond supporter who ran as a write-in candidate against him for his supposedly safe state Senate seat.

The political emotions and crosscurrents of the time punished Morrah's high standing that had discouraged ordinarily opposition, positioning him to be caricatured as inappropriately ambitious.

His place as exceptional community leader and South Carolina lawmaker, while he was still in his early 50s, provided the substance for his obituary last week. As noted, he combined admired qualities of civility, decency and leadership at a time when state senators wielded great power over their own countries as well as substantial control of state government.

Morrah had come to maturity when the temper of the times did not always favor good qualities, a point that came to light during the infamous Willie Earle lynching trial of 1947. He was a young defense attorney. And Rebecca West, the novelist and magazine writer who recorded that event most memorably, pictured him as a good man "stranded in the wrong century," amidst prevailing incivility.

Throughout the past two decades, this good man remained active in community affairs, but at a lower profile not noticed by many newcomers to the area.

VICTORS IN ALBANIAN ELECTIONS SHOULD COMMAND UNITED STATES ATTENTION AND SUPPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this past weekend, Albania took another step in breaking with its Communist, isolationist past. In parliamentary elections, the Democratic Party won a resounding 62 percent of the vote, enabling it to control Albania's new parliament. Apparently, the turnout was heavy, and the vote took place without incident. In both form and substance, the elections indicate that Albania is serious about reform.

Last year, I visited Albania during its first parliamentary elections, and during that trip, I met Dr. Sali Berisha, the talented medical doctor who heads Albania's Democratic Party. I was much impressed by this man's commitment to his fellow citizens, particularly in helping them rebuild a country devastated by years of Stalinist repression and deprivation. He will need our support in that great undertaking.

Dr. Berisha subsequently visited the United States, and I know that many of my colleagues met with him and were equally impressed by his leadership and vision. Today, I am sending Dr. Berisha a telegram to congratulate him and his Democratic Party on their victory, and to offer my support for the difficult days ahead. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my message be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, DC, March 25, 1992.

Dr. SALI BERISHA,
Chairman, Democratic Party, Tirana, Albania.

DEAR DR. BERISHA: I wish to congratulate you on the Democratic Party's overwhelming victory in Albania's parliamentary elections. In both process and results, the elections are truly an indication of the Albanian people's desire to make a final break from their isolationist, Communist past.

Now that the people of Albania have demonstrated their commitment to reform, I believe that there should be greater opportunities for Albanian-U.S. cooperation, particularly in terms of economic development. In this regard, I believe that the U.S. Administration should move to grant Most Favored Nation trade status to Albania. You may be sure that I will do what I can to encourage such a step.

As one who observed Albania's first free elections one year ago, I am particularly gratified by the most recent election results, and I wish to extend to you my personal congratulations and best wishes.

With every good wish.

Ever sincerely,

CLAIBORNE PELL.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The period for morning business is now closed.

APPROPRIATIONS CATEGORY
REFORM ACT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar Order No. 428, S. 2399.

Mr. DOMENICI. I object.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar Order No. 428, S. 2399.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I ask the majority leader, is it acceptable that I proceed first or would he like for me to wait for the chairman of the Budget Committee to discuss the other side?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to proceed to Senate bill 2399.

In the course of today and days to come, the Senator from New Mexico and others will discuss not only with the Senate but hopefully with the American people what is at issue here.

Frankly, I generally do not feel very confident in opposing a motion to proceed, albeit this bill was moved in a rather extraordinary manner. But in this case I feel very comfortable with this because I do not believe that the Senate should be considering Senate bill 2399 for a number of reasons that have very little to do with the substance which will follow shortly.

First of all, the Budget Committee of the U.S. Senate—I see the occupant of the chair, and I remember when he was a member of the Budget Committee. He used to wonder when we would have an opportunity to do something. In this case interestingly enough that committee, the Budget Committee, is supposed to consider bills that change the Budget Act or any amendments to that Budget Act. We are currently operating under the 5-year agreement and the Budget Enforcement Act.

This bill which would take the cap on defense and get rid of it in 1993, literally just get rid of it, tear down that wall, clearly should have been considered by the Budget Committee.

Since it has not been considered by the Budget Committee, it comes to the floor in a rather extraordinary manner.

First, last night, a rather extraordinary process was used to determine and declare we were in 2 days of legislative session in the same day so that it would be ripe for a motion to proceed today.

And, second, this bill, if we ever get to it, would be subject to a 60-vote point of order for the very reason that it has been appropriately considered by the committee of jurisdiction.

You see, that Budget Committee should consider and vote on a number of questions. What does this bill mean, simple as it may sound, for budget discipline? What might it mean to the deficit, and deficit reduction efforts? What might it mean to the defense of our country when we want to build down the defense in an orderly manner? What will taking that cap away do to that orderliness when this defense budget is put in total competition, in a big pool of money in the Appropriations Committee, to determine how much for defense and how much for all the rest?

In essence, believe it or not, if this bill is adopted, one committee will be determining the fate of our defense build-down, not the Senate, not the President, and not the Congress with the President. One committee, the Appropriations Committee, which is torn apart inside because there are many subcommittees spending money on domestic programs. It will be very easy in this build-down era to annually devastate defense—a billion here, a billion there—as the competition for programs in every area of domestic spending overwhelms it.

We finally arrived at a point in history, after the 5-year agreement that economic summit produced, that we took that competition between domestic spending and defense and said that is not good, it is not good for fiscal policy, and it is not good for defense. We said, let us set up a cap on defense and a cap on domestic, and you cannot use defense money or defense savings for higher domestic spending.

And, yes, we even put one in for international affairs, albeit a smaller portion, and we said if you do not want to spend it on international affairs, it goes to the deficit, but it cannot be used or intermingled for other things, including defense or domestic.

So, today, we are without hearings on that very serious budget enforcement provision. Today, we are going to, if the Senate were to agree, take that cap away and say, if the Congress wants to spend less on defense, all the savings go into a domestic pool to be spent on domestic if the Congress sees fit, and the savings resulting from deeper defense cuts do not go to the deficit.

Somebody may get up and say, oh, they can go to the deficit, because we do not have to spend it all. I see the occupant of the chair, and that brought a

grin to his face. Will anyone really believe that when we do that, that every single penny will not be spent on 1 of the 2,600-plus domestic programs, some of which are not much good, many of which have taken on a halo and are immortal, because we cannot even talk about getting rid of them? So why will we not use all that extra defense money to spend for those?

There are some running around asking us to tear down this wall so the money can be spent on programs they want. There are constituent groups that come to our offices saying it is going to be spent on education; tear down the wall. It is going to be spent on infrastructure; tear down the wall.

Well, there is no provision in this bill or in the procedures of this institution that say where it is going to go. Where it is going to go is a big pool of money to be spent wherever the appropriators recommend, unless changed by the Congress. I think everybody knows what that means.

Having said that, let me tell the Senate a couple of things that I think are very, very wrong with this. I have discussed what is going to happen to an orderly defense build-down, and in the course of this debate, we will have experts on defense talk about how much we have already cut it.

We will introduce today, rather quickly, the letter from the Armed Services Committee chairman and ranking member. They essentially say the President's defense budget number for 1993 is right. So there is not any use to tear down this wall. Just do the President's defense number, and what you save, devote to deficit reduction and go about your business. We do not need to tear the wall down.

So I see it this way, in its simplest terms: A deal is a deal. We worked hard putting together this budget restraint package that set limits on spending. Frankly, less than 2 years have passed, and we want to renege on the deal. Nobody should think that that 1990 budget agreement mandates a high level of defense spending. The cap merely says you cannot mix the funds. For those who want to cut defense more, have at it. If you win, the savings go to the deficit. That is very simple to understand.

Second, I cannot understand how we can expect the American people to believe that we are serious about Federal spending being out of control when, 5 days ago, we put a big tax on a certain part of America—78 billion dollars' worth—and we did not apply that to the deficit. Now we are going to tear down the defense wall, so we will not put any of the defense savings on the deficit. I ask, even if we had not used the phrase in the past "tax and spend," what is it, if it is not tax and spend?

I alluded to that in arguing against the tax increase bill. But I did not have exact living proof that the spend part was all spending because most of the

tax increase was used for tax credits, special interest provisions, and other revenue losses. Some call these tax expenditures. So I called it tax and spend.

Today much is being said about change, about America's new kinds of needs, about fiscal restraint and the deficits, and the need to save something for our children. Yet, we see the culmination of tax—\$78 billion in new taxes, and spend—take down the only thing that protects defense spending, and spend the savings instead of apply the savings to the deficit.

So we can spend a lot longer debating this issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters of the chairman and ranking member of the authorizing committee for defense be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1992.

Hon. JIM SASSER,

Chairman,

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,

Ranking Minority Member,

Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM AND PETE: In accordance with the provisions of Section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act, I am forwarding my recommendations for the National Defense function for FY1993. I appreciate the additional time you permitted me, based on your schedule, to present my views. I cannot recommend significant reductions in the President's FY1993 budget level. I do believe, however, that significant savings can be made in the following years of the future-years defense plan.

As you know, President Bush has requested \$281.0 billion in budget authority and \$291.4 billion in outlays for the National Defense function for FY1993. The President's request is \$7.5 billion in budget authority and \$4.9 billion outlays below the level for defense permitted in the Budget Enforcement Act. As the Director of the Congressional Budget Office testified to the Armed Services Committee in February, even before the additional defense reductions proposed by the President in this year's budget, defense spending for fiscal years 1993-1997 would be \$350 billion below the 1990 level used as the Budget Summit baseline.

In order to make the reductions in defense already included in the President's FY1993 budget, by 1996 one million jobs will be lost in the Defense Department, and an additional one million jobs in the defense industry. This is the case even if no additional reductions are made to the President's proposals. By 1995 we will have reduced the Army by 10 divisions, the Navy by 95 ships, and the Air Force by 10 fighter wings. In addition, dozens of major weapons systems have been canceled and many others slowed down.

The Committee has received a great deal of testimony about the turmoil and concern among the military members, Defense Department civilians, and defense industry employees that make up the defense establishment. The senior leaders of the military services, for example, have pointed out that the pace of personnel reductions currently underway cannot be accelerated without sig-

nificant hardships to military members and their families. Over the next eight months, the Army alone will release 85,000 people from active duty.

I hope that members of Congress will keep in mind one fundamental difference between this drawdown and previous ones. After most of our wars, those being released were draftees who wanted to get out. In today's military the men and women who serve are volunteers, many of whom were counting on a military career. If we are serious about maintaining a top quality volunteer force this distinction must be kept in mind. This is why I do not believe it is possible or desirable to reduce the military or civilian personnel levels in the Defense Department at a faster rate than that proposed in the Administration's FY1993 budget.

We have many pressing needs in this country that must be addressed over the next five years. In particular, we need to invest more in the skills and training of our people. A strong defense conversion and economic adjustment program is essential if we are going to take advantage of the skills and talents of the dedicated people being forced to leave the defense sector. This will help us avoid causing additional hardship to these people and worsening the unemployment situation in the short term, while at the same time paving the way for higher economic growth in the long term.

I anticipate that there will be initiatives in other areas that have traditionally been of concern to Congress, such as the industrial base and the National Guard and Reserve. These initiatives are not part of the President's budget. Unless the Congress decides it will no longer address these concerns, our Committee will have to make reductions from the President's budget to fund these initiatives.

The defense outlay level in the Budget Resolution must also take into consideration the \$7.7 billion in rescissions of previously appropriated funds proposed by the President. If the Congress does not approve all of these rescissions, many of which involve programs strongly supported by the Congress, then additional cuts must be made just to get back to the FY1993 outlay level proposed by the Administration.

There is no doubt that some reductions can be made in the President's request. I know that some members of your Committee have identified potential reductions of \$8-10 billion in the President's amended FY1993 defense budget request. But in my view these proposals do not take into account Congressional increases to the President's programs. I want to emphasize that if we do not approve the level of rescissions proposed by the Administration, and if we want to enact a package of economic conversion and transition initiatives for communities and individuals affected by base closings and defense industry drawdowns, it will require substantial reductions to the President's proposed program just to stay within the Administration's level.

Given the practical limits on the pace of personnel reductions, the extensive defense program reductions already underway, the need to assist military, civilian and industry personnel leaving the defense sector, growing environmental cleanup requirements, and the uncertainty over whether Congress will accept the President's rescission proposals, I do not believe that significant reductions below the aggregate funding level proposed by the President can be made in defense in FY1993. The Committee will continue to look for savings and efficiencies in DoD programs,

but I believe savings identified in FY1993 will be offset by the above and other considerations.

I do however believe if present world trends continue it will be possible to achieve savings beyond those proposed by the Administration in the outyears of the President's FY1993 budget. For example, we must take a fresh look at the proposed Base Force. There is redundancy and duplication among the military services in roles and missions. By eliminating these redundancies and streamlining the support and overhead structure of the Defense Department, it will be possible to maintain the combat capability of the Base Force at lower budget levels.

I also believe that we can maintain our forward presence on land and at sea at more realistic levels. The level of U.S. troops stationed in Europe can be reduced well below the 150,000 proposed by the Administration, although these additional reductions will have to be achieved in the years after FY1993. The old Cold War operating tempos of our forward deployed forces can also be reduced, saving operating costs and extending the life of weapons systems.

At this time, it is my judgment that the defense budget can be reduced by \$80-85 billion, including the FY1992 rescissions, below the Budget Summit Baseline over the next five years, or \$30-\$35 billion below the Administration's FY1993 request for the next five years.

I believe our nation has many great needs. One of the most important of these needs is deficit reduction. I believe it is essential that the Congress demonstrate a willingness to make cuts in federal spending and apply them to deficit reduction. Without question, defense has been the most significant source of deficit reduction in the Budget Summit Agreement, and will continue to provide significant savings throughout the 1990s.

I look forward to working with you on the Budget Resolution in the weeks ahead.

Sincerely,

SAM NUNN,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 24, 1992.

Hon. JIM SASSER,

Chairman,

Hon. PETE V. DOMENICI,

Ranking Minority Member,

Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM AND PETE: It is my understanding that today Chairman Nunn submitted to you his recommendations for the National Defense budget function for FY 1993. Until today, we were endeavoring to reach agreement on a joint letter, but the revised out-year reductions recommended by Senator Nunn preclude my concurrence. I, too, cannot recommend any substantial reduction in the level of defense spending proposed by the President for Fiscal Year 1993.

I generally concur in Senator Nunn's comments regarding the very significant reductions already made in defense spending under the budget summit agreement, as well as his assessment of the issues Congress must address during the debate on the defense budget this year. In particular, I fully endorse his cautionary statement that, if Congress fails to approve the President's rescission proposals and at the same time wishes to add to this year's defense budget a package of economic conversion and transition assistance initiatives for communities and individuals affected by base closings and defense indus-

try drawdowns, then significant and perhaps unwise cuts to the President's FY 1993 defense program would be required. This would be the case even if Congress were to approve the President's requested level of defense spending.

However, I cannot join in the view that \$30-35 billion in defense cuts beyond those recommended by the President can be made in the next five years. In my view, the appropriate funding level for defense for FY 1994 and beyond will be a top priority for the President and the new Congress following the November elections, and our recommendations today will have little standing in that debate.

In view of the continuing rapid pace of change in the world and the growing uncertainty about the course of future events, particularly in the former Soviet Union, I must reserve judgment at this time on the level of defense spending which is necessary to ensure our national security in the future. A precipitous decline in defense spending would irreparably degrade the superb capabilities of our Armed Forces today, and we must ensure that any reductions permit an orderly build-down of our military forces. In the words of General Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "... we are reducing as fast as we can, we cannot go any faster or we will break the force."

Over the next several months, the Committee will conduct a complete and careful review of the President's recommendations, including an overall assessment of service roles and missions, alternative plans for both domestic and overseas basing, and operating tempos and training requirements. We will study the complex questions associated with the issue of defense industrial base policy and the economic effects of reducing defense spending. And we will continue to work closely with the Administration to reduce the nuclear threat which still exists in the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Should events in the world continue to unfold in a positive direction, this review may identify additional areas where reductions can be made in future years. However, I do not believe that Congress should at this time take action to promise the American people specific additional peace dividends in the future when we are not sure we can safely deliver on that promise. In this connection, I believe that Congress should adhere to its commitments under the Budget Enforcement Act and devote any reductions in defense spending to deficit reduction.

In any case, the Armed Services Committee will continue to work to ensure a level of defense spending and military capability which is adequate to ensure the future security of our nation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. WARNER,
Ranking Minority Member.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, even though some of the media accounts say that they are recommending deeper cuts than the President's, I think it is fair to read it the way I suggest, and that is, for 1993, they do not recommend anything different than the President in terms of the cap or dollars to be saved or dollars to be spent for defense. They might, in the third or fourth year out, say that we could cut more. We can take that up another day.

But, essentially, the committee that knows the most about what is going to

happen says we should not take down the wall, unless we make sure that we spend at least what the President has recommended. That will not happen if the wall gets torn down and nothing is put in its place.

So I think Senators can understand that when a motion to proceed is objected to, more than in the usual debate, this is an appropriate place to raise the issue whether we should be considering taking down the defense cap and wall for 1993 at all. We do not need to change it, because if we want to save money by cutting defense more, we all have a blueprint for that.

Cut it if you want; put the savings where they belong under the agreement we made—that is on the deficit. We should leave the wall alone to protect defense from an inordinate competition created by domestic programs that want to divert defense savings from the deficit and devote them to additional domestic spending.

So with this, I might indicate that a number of Senators want to be heard on how much we have already reduced defense spending, what the 5-year program means that we put in almost 2 years ago, and the President's proposed additional defense cuts. And many want to talk about the need to restrain expenditure growth rather than the need to spend defense savings on other domestic programs.

Frankly, Mr. President, I will use some of the debate to discuss the issues I just described, and then I will begin to talk with the Senate seriously about the other part of the budget deficit, which are the entitlement or mandatory programs. I have a proposal that I will make in general terms during this debate that I hope Senators might support. This proposal would make a permanent change in the Budget Act, which obviously would have to go to hearings. The proposal would cap the growth in mandatory expenditures, and do it in an orderly way so that the authorizing committees that oversee this myriad of entitlement mandatory programs, except Social Security, would have time to look and see what has to be changed so that the expenditures would be somewhat restrained and yet live up to our commitments in those particular programs. And that can be done.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I rise to ask for consideration of the Appropriations Category Reform Act of 1992. I first introduced this measure on February 25 as S. 2250.

We now have 49 Members of the U.S. Senate who have stepped forward to become original cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add today the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as an original cosponsor to this bill.

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

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I will call to the attention of my colleagues that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Intelligence, Senator BOREN of Oklahoma, became a cosponsor of this legislation yesterday.

There is a lot of interest in this bill that has a very technical name, the Appropriations Category Reform Act of 1992.

Some of my colleagues might consider the fact that there are 49 original sponsors or cosponsors as unusual for a proposal that is essentially a technical budget matter.

But I think every Senator who has signed his or her name to this bill knows its effect on the future and the prosperity of this country. At a time when we are struggling to emerge from the longest recession since the Great Depression, they know that the influence of this bill will be anything but technical on the economy and the lives of the people of this country. It is a fundamental measure that is a condition precedent to allow us to begin investing in America once again.

As the distinguished occupant of the chair knows, it was his deceased father-in-law who, as President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, embarked this country on a period of great investment, investment in infrastructure, investment in the human needs of our people. That was almost a quarter of a century ago.

Since that time and since the time of Lyndon Baines Johnson, we have allowed our country to fall into neglect, not because we wished to, but because we had conflicting pressures on us. One of those pressures was the great economic burden of carrying the weight of the world on our shoulders. Essentially it was the weight of the free world on our shoulders in defending our way of life in the cold war and our way of life against a corrupt and totalitarian regime. That battle is won.

It is time, I think, now to go back to the policy of investing in America, in investing in our own people, of scaling back military expenditures. And, yes, some of those military expenditures ought to go to deficit reduction, but certainly a substantial proportion of them ought to go to meet the long neglected needs of the people of this country.

Just look around us and see. Look at what is happening to the infrastructure of this country. Go to New York City, the great proud city that has been the intellectual leader of this world and this country in many ways, a city that has produced great things in the past. It is sad to go there now. It looks like a city in the old Soviet Union, or perhaps even a city in the Third World, as you see potholes everywhere and you see bridges rusting and decaying. You see graffiti everywhere and people

afraid to walk the streets in certain areas. And this is duplicated in city after city after city across this great land of ours.

As we look at the educational scores that come in from around the world and how our students in this country compare with the students in other countries, we find that we are falling short. So the needs are great. The neglect has been long. But now the day of meeting these needs is coming.

What we are offering today is simply the opportunity for our colleagues here in this body to make a judgment, to make a judgment about whether they wish to use some of the cuts in military spending to meet long neglected domestic needs. We are not saying that is going to happen. What we are saying is simply allow this legislative body, the U.S. Senate, 100 individuals who represent the more than 260 million people in this country, to make a judgment, to reflect the views of their constituents.

It will simply change the budget agreement to allow transfers between defense spending and domestic spending. That is all it does.

Mr. President, there is no disguising the fact that this bill is principally at odds with the approach of the administration. The administration cannot seem to fully comprehend that the cold war is over, that the evil empire is dead, that it is no longer something that we have to confront. The President told the American people that the peace dividend is simply that, only peace.

Well, of course, that is a large part of the dividend—peace. But what he is also saying is there is no tangible proof for the toll and the struggle of the last half century, and no real restitution for the sacrifice that the American people have made.

This legislation takes the clear and necessary step. It poses a single fundamental question: Are we going to move decisively to invest a portion of the peace dividend in our domestic needs? Or are we going to maintain cold war policy and cold war sacrifices after the cold war is over?

Essentially what the legislation does is to allow our colleagues here in this body to make that choice. We are not saying what choice they should make. If the Members of this body wish to reduce domestic spending and increase defense spending under this proposal that we are advancing today, they are free to do that. We are simply saying, let us take down the wall that separates domestic spending from defense spending. Let us keep the overall cap so that we will keep the discipline of the Budget Enforcement Act. But let us make some judgments here, as we are elected to do, about what is to be done about the future of the country and certainly what is to be done about defense spending versus domestic spending.

The truth is that the measure I have introduced, along with 49 of our colleagues, allows for both investment and deficit reduction. We need both. We must have both.

I think it is useful that we have a fresh sense now of what this bill does and what it does not do. The bill that is before the Senate today does not unravel or rewrite our budget agreement, as some would have us believe. It merely accelerates by 1 year the possibility of transferring funds from defense to domestic accounts if the U.S. Senate votes by a majority to do that.

Now, if having a wall between defense and domestic is such a fine idea, why do we not just extend it out into perpetuity? Why do we not just say the U.S. Senate cannot be trusted to make the decision as to whether or not the tax dollars of the American people ought to be spent for defense or for domestic spending, for military hardware or for roads and bridges, and education and hospitals? The U.S. Senate cannot be trusted to make that decision, so let us just take this wall between defense and domestic spending and extend it out into perpetuity. In essence, that is the argument that is being made by the opponents of this legislation today.

All we are saying is, let us accelerate by 1 year the taking down of the walls between domestic and discretionary spending. That is not a change in the architecture of the original budget agreement. We are not remaking the agreement. We are not renegeing on the agreement. We are not allowing in any way for deficit increases.

Mr. President, why would we come before the Senate at this particular time and talk about changing the agreement to some extent, or altering, modifying it even slightly? The reason for the change is self-evident. It will allow us to marshal the resources we need to fight a recession that is longer than any of us anticipated back in 1990 when this budget summit agreement was signed.

Remember, this summit agreement became law back in the fall of 1990. That is over a year and a half ago. At that time, we were just on the verge of a recession, just sliding into the recession. We did not know it. The administration did not know it. The participants in the budget summit agreement did not know it. Those who voted here for the budget summit agreement or those who voted against it, they did not know that we were on the edge of a recession. But we were. And we now know it is the longest, as I said earlier, the longest recession that this country has had since the Great Depression of the 1930's. This recession has gone on for 19 months.

So we are talking here about the ability to make the judgment about whether we ought to use some of these military expenditures, ought to curtail these military expenditures, and make

some investments in our economy to sustain economic growth. And some of these investments that could be made will not be made unless these walls can come down.

I am talking about investments in infrastructure, investments in health, education, job training, and in research and development, and in technology. There are many Members of this body who have a great interest in a superconducting super collider. It is going to be extraordinarily difficult to finance that project unless the walls come down. No question about it.

There are many Members of this body who have an interest in seeing the United States put a space station in space. Just yesterday, the chairperson of the appropriations subcommittee that has the responsibility for funding NASA said here on the floor of the U.S. Senate—it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that unless these walls come down, there probably will not be any space station funding. That is the way I understood what she had to say.

We can make these investments now. We can make them because the cold war is over. And these are the kinds of investments that we must make in technology, research and development, education, job training, infrastructure. These are the kinds of investments that this country must make if we are to compete with Japan and Germany and the other rapidly developing industrial powers of the world.

That is the driving logic behind the change. By original design, our budget agreement will deliver this opportunity to us in 12 months' time. In 12 months, the wall comes down between defense and domestic. We are simply saying it would be foolish not to seize this opportunity as it now arises.

Some say, "Well, you know, you made that agreement over there to keep these walls up for 3 years." That was not part of the agreement that I favored, but I went along with the total agreement. "Why do you come now and want to take them down?"

Well, circumstances have changed. Let us talk about an imponderable as large as a defense budget that approaches \$300 billion.

(Mr. SHELBY assumed the chair.)

Mr. SASSER. When you are looking at a military budget that approaches \$300 billion, there is a tendency to try to put it in perspective by comparing it to something else; to make it have a sense relative to the economy as a whole or to compare it in the context of other Federal programs.

Those who scamper to find relative merit in a military budget approaching \$300 billion miss the only point, I think, that really matters, and that is whether the American people need that level of defense spending for their protection from external threats. Ultimately you have to measure any expenditure against the need for it and

what the expenditure contributes to the Nation's economic well-being. Everything else is an illusion.

We have all seen the fun house mirrors at the amusement park that distort the object in view. At the right angle, these mirrors can make a sumo wrestler look like Slim Pickens, and I suggest to my colleagues that our defense debate at the moment is trapped in a house of mirrors.

The purveyors of the perspective, and they have appeared before the Senate Budget Committee, put on chart shows that last 3 or 4 hours in an effort, I suppose, to wear out Senators so they will not be able to propound relevant questions. They will not have time to do that. But the purveyors of perspective justify a cold war budget by telling us that military spending is declining as a percentage of gross national product. And they also tell us that defense spending is declining relative to other areas in the budget. Those who make this case over a period of time can be quite persuasive, and by the time they get through they have us believing that an elephant is really a mouse.

The fact is, if you want to put the defense budget next to the entirety of the gross national product, of course it looks small. But if you want to place it next to what we spend for domestic programs to meet the needs of the people of this country—to build roads and bridges and hospitals, to educate our people, to run the general government, to conduct research and development—we find that the defense budget looks very large indeed.

It is really a question of perspective. Congress is charged with doing more than simply making comparisons within our budget. We are here in this body to make choices about priorities and we have to try to assess the relative merit of what the expenditures of taxpayers' money contribute to the national good. Military spending has only one purpose and that is to defend the United States of America from external threats. That is all it is for. It is not a jobs program, it is not a WPA project, it is not an educational effort. Military spending purely and simply is to defend this country from external threats.

Domestic investments, on the other hand, investments in our domestic economy, are there to promote durable economic growth and to improve the standard of living of the American people. Those are the terms that we must consider if we are going to bring military spending out of the fun house, if we are going to clearly see what we are buying with our military budget and clearly see what we are not.

Let us make some of the very comparisons that those who minimize our military spending are apt to make. Let us consider those results relative to the military spending of our economic competitors and, most importantly,

relative to the security threats that this country now faces.

I might say these threats are determined by our Nation's top military and intelligence officers. I am going to quote them here. First, let us consider military spending as a share of Federal outlays. It is true that we are experiencing a modest decline. At the peak of the military buildup during the Reagan years—which was unprecedented in the peacetime history of the United States of America, a military buildup that exceeded the military buildup that occurred during the war in Vietnam—in 1986, military outlays comprised 27 percent of all Federal outlays. Under the President's 1993 budget, military spending would still consume 18 percent of all Federal outlays.

Let us look at the budgets of the world's industrial democracies that we compete against. It is quickly apparent that military spending as a percentage of their total outlays is dramatically less, on average about one-half of the outlays of ours, one-half to one-third of our spending levels.

In 1988, at the height of the cold war, France was spending 8.8 percent of its budget on defense. And West Germany, which was on the front lines—just across in East Germany there were almost a half a million Soviet troops, perhaps more—West Germany, which would have been the battleground and had the most to lose if the cold war exploded into a hot one, West Germany was spending only slightly over 9 percent of its budget on military expenditures.

Compare that with the 18 percent that the Bush administration wants to continue to have the American people fork over after the cold war is over and the evil empire has collapsed.

What about Italy, what were they spending at the height of the cold war? When we were spending 27 percent, in 1986, they were spending slightly over 4 percent; Japan, 6 percent; Norway, 6.9 percent; Netherlands, 5.4 percent.

Again, by comparison, we will be spending 18 percent of our budget outlays in 1993 in the absence of any cold war threat.

Another argument that the proponents of military spending like to make is they say military spending is not a large percent of gross national product. Defense spending measured 6.3 percent of our gross domestic product in 1985. True, it is coming down some. The President is sloping it down to 4.5 percent of gross domestic product in 1993. But, again, that far exceeds the ratio of defense spending to gross domestic product in other industrial democracies.

In 1991, defense spending measured 3.5 percent of France's gross domestic product; 3 percent of Norway's 2.7 percent of the Netherlands; and 1 percent of Japan's gross domestic product. So in terms of the very comparisons often

made by those who point to our declining defense expenditures, in terms of total budget outlays of gross domestic product, yes, we have seen some modest decline, but we are still spending at many times the levels of our economic competitors.

The simple question is why? Why are we doing this? Why do we continue to do it? What threat is there on the face of this Earth that would cause us to spend \$1.4 trillion over the next 5 years when those who are charged with ferreting out the threats cannot seem to find them.

The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Robert Gates, a veteran of the cold war, recently told the Senate, "The world of the 1990's * * * is an arena in which promise will often outweigh menace, and in which opportunities for constructive action will outnumber the threats to our security." So says the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. But the administration presents us with a proposal in the face of that to spend \$1.4 trillion on the military over the next 5 years.

Mr. President, recall that the foundation of our current military plan, a so-called base-force concept of 1.6 million active duty personnel by 1997, that base-force concept was developed in 1990. Let us contrast for a moment the world as it was in 1990 and the world as it is now in March 1992.

When the Pentagon gave the base force 18 Army divisions, the former Soviet Union fielded 190 ground bases. Today, the Central Intelligence Agency predicts that the Commonwealth, the successor to the old Soviet Union, will field no more than 50 to 60 divisions by the end of the decade. And frankly, most analysts would be surprised to find a force even close to that level.

In 1990, when this budget agreement was entered into, the Pentagon plan at that time included 12 carrier battle groups and 448 combatant ships for the so-called base force. The Soviet Navy was arguably at that time the world's largest. Quality was questionable, but they were arguably the world's largest. In 1990, the Soviet Navy has 240 surface warships operating daily in every international body of water, not to mention nearly 1,400 combat craft in reserve.

Where is the Navy of the old Soviet Union today compared to 1990? The old Soviet Navy is in port or it is in dry dock. There is no fuel. There is no morale. They do not know who owns the ships. Ukraine and Russia are fighting over the Black Sea fleet. Each of them is trying to get the captains and the admirals to pledge loyalty to them. The Navy of the old Soviet Union has ceased to exist. In the words of a senior Pentagon official who tracks the former Soviet Navy, he said, "There are no surface combatants deployed anywhere in the world. None, zero." So

the Soviet Navy has ceased to exist for all practical purposes.

And finally, when the Pentagon came up with this current base force structure in 1990, the same time that we negotiated this budget agreement, Soviet missile factories were running full bore. I well remember some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle getting up at that time and saying we cannot reduce defense spending because they are continuing to build strategically, they are continuing to broaden and increase their strategic nuclear offensive force, and the Soviet missile factories were running full bore. They were turning out the largest, most destructive missiles in the world, missiles like the SS-18.

What is happening at the old SS-18 missile factory in the Ukraine today? It is making machines that make sausage. It is hammering rocket booster shells into trolley buses. Now that is the state of our former enemy, the old Soviet Union.

Those are the changes that have occurred since this budget summit agreement was negotiated in the fall of 1990. Yet, the unreconstructed old cold warriors strap on their rusty armor, come over here on the floor and tell us, no, we cannot reduce this military spending; no, we cannot reduce that; we do not have a problem domestically; we do not have a problem with our economy, we do not have a problem with our education system; and even if we do, we do not want to use this military spending to deal with that.

What does the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency say about the state of the threat? Gen. James Clapper, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, said in recent testimony, "I would sum up the residual military posture of the former Soviet Union as follows: It will have no capability to directly threaten the United States and NATO with large-scale conventional military operations."

That is what the man charged with directing the intelligence of the Defense Intelligence Agency said in recent testimony. Yet, despite the assessment from our Nation's highest intelligence officers, the administration stakes out a defense number that is really still at cold war levels and the President appears before a joint session of the Congress and says, "This deep and no deeper."

Meanwhile, across the Potomac in the Pentagon, the planners search the globe for plausible threats, and they come up with a list that would stretch the imagination by any calculations. The risk includes an Iraqi invasion of both Saudi Arabia and of Kuwait; a North Korean invasion of South Korea; or get this, a Russian attack on Lithuania coming through Poland; and then, of course, a coup in Panama and one in the Philippines.

Even if all of this required a U.S. military response unilaterally with no

help from anyone, and that is a broad, long leap, the most demanding of these would require only a fraction of the 1.6 million personnel base force.

Mr. President, I think we should recognize the consequences of going to any length to justify an inflexible military budget.

If indeed we have gone as low as we can go, as the President seemed to tell the American people when he appeared before a joint session of Congress, then we are putting a very low ceiling on the kind of investment that we can make here in America.

If the peace dividend is really as negligible as that suggests, what the administration is telling us is that we are not going to have the kind of new roads and new schools that we need in this country to compete in the competition of the decade of the nineties; that we are not going to be able to repair and rebuild the infrastructure; that we are not going to realize the things that peace promises.

We have a historic opportunity to convert peace to domestic gain. It will be a loss of historic provisions if we miss it.

I think the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Gates, sounded an appropriately ominous note. He was speaking of our former adversary, the old Soviet Union, and he told the Senate this and I quote, "they"—talking about the old Soviet Union—"cannot continue with the programs at anything like the levels they had before and make any headway at all on their economic reform."

And he continued by saying, "I think that creates the conditions in which further reductions in the numbers of these weapons become very possible."

That is what the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency said. He said that if our old adversary, the old Soviet Union continues to spend for the military at the levels that they were spending, they could not make any headway at all on developing their economy or economic reform.

We ought to look at that ourselves and take a lesson from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency for our own domestic purposes. He went ahead to say that their situation allowed us to cut back on the number of weapons that we were buying, producing, and reducing military spending.

But what does this legislation we have before the Senate today do? It will allow a transfer from defense spending to domestic spending if the Senate wants to do that. It is not going to expand the size of the appropriated spending in the budget. It is not going to create more spending. The legislation simply opens a pathway between defense and domestic spending, defense and domestic categories, and in doing so will allow this body to have a debate. We will have a debate and vote on how to invest our scarce fiscal re-

sources. We will talk about it, debate it here on the floor and vote on it: Do we want to put more money into B-2's? Or some will say, no, we want to put more money in schools and health care, in education. Then we will vote on it, and we will be bound by the majority vote. That is the way we do things in a democracy.

It does not mean that automatically military money is going to be spent for domestic purposes. The money can flow both ways if the body wishes to do it. We do not have to spend it at all. All of the defense reductions can be allocated to reducing the deficit if we wish to do so. We are simply opening a pathway of taking it out fairly.

Second, this proposal does not alter defense spending at all. It merely allows us to maximize the use of defense savings—whether we are talking about \$5 billion that the President himself proposes to slice off of military spending or the \$10 billion that the House has proposed or a level that we in the Senate would deem appropriate for military spending. The measure is not a substitute for a military spending debate in this body. It carries with it no specific policy requirements for our military budget.

Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], has arrived on the floor. The Senator from Illinois has been a leader in this whole effort to try to take down the arbitrary barrier that segregates military spending from domestic discretionary spending. He, as I recall, was the first to rise on this floor to state that this arbitrary barrier should be taken down. I should like to pay tribute at this time to his efforts in this endeavor in times past and to yield the floor to him if he would wish to speak at this particular time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for his generous words, and I applaud his leadership in this debate.

I applaud the leadership of Senator SASSER not only on this but on other matters. At one point back some months ago, when I was on a radio program and they asked me who might be the candidates for President on the Democratic side, I said if Senator GORE did not become a candidate, someone who would make a superb President of the United States is Senator SASSER of Tennessee. I believe that to this day. That is not likely to happen in the year 1992, but I have great respect for him.

Mr. President, this is not a new thing, and I am amazed that there is opposition to the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee. The night of the budget agreement—the Presiding Officer probably was here, along with a majority of Members. It was about

11:30 or midnight. I offered an amendment to do away with the 60-percent wall, and I remember Senator BRADLEY and Senator BIDEN said they wanted to join as cosponsors. By voice vote this body unanimously said we should not have a 60-percent wall. Then in conference we got the message from the White House that if the elimination of the 60-percent wall stayed, the President was going to veto the proposal, and it went out.

I hope my colleagues will not reverse themselves now and say we have to have a firewall.

What does it mean in practical terms to not have this firewall? First of all, does it add anything to the deficit? It adds not one penny to the deficit if we adopt the Sasser proposal, not one penny. What does it do? It permits us to deal with a little greater flexibility with the problems we face.

Mr. President, when we are talking about the problems we face, let me point out that the President has called for a \$50 billion cut in defense spending. Now, a \$50 billion cut ordinarily to most of us means you spend less money. What does it mean? This is the proposal by the administration for budget authority for defense in fiscal year 1993, \$281 billion. Five years later, when we are at the end of this \$50 billion cut, what is the spending? \$291 billion.

To me, that sounds like a \$10 billion increase, not a \$50 billion cut. In outlays, \$286 billion, fiscal year 1993; fiscal year 1997, \$289 billion in outlays. That is not a cut. That is an increase.

What the President does is he assumes the inflation rate and cuts back from what would be the inflation rate. We are playing games with the public.

The reality is we could have a substantial cut in defense spending and not impair the defense of this country one iota.

Bill Colby, who headed the CIA under Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford—and my recollection is they were not Democrats—said we could cut defense spending a real 50 percent in the next 5 years and still have the strongest defense of any country on the face of the Earth.

I want a strong defense. I served overseas in the Army. I am proud to have served overseas in the Army. But we have to use a little common sense. We are spending this year, depending on whose figures you use, somewhere between \$120 billion and \$160 billion to protect Western Europe from an invasion by the Soviet Union. There is only one problem. There is not a Soviet Union anymore.

We have to use a little common sense. We have a million Americans overseas right now, either in the Armed Forces or their dependents, or 60,000 civilian employees and their dependents. What great threat would it be to the United States if we were to cut that in half, even if we kept every-

one in the Armed Forces or working for the Government and their dependents, and they spent this money in the United States rather than in Japan or in Germany? We add to the employment. We would help the economy of this country.

Right now in Eastern Europe there are some dramatic things happening. We ought to be responding more. And the administration, apparently, is finally inching in the right direction, thanks to the courage of Senator SAM NUNN, our colleague, who has stood up, and has been joined by a few others who were just over there recently. And thanks also to the statement by former President Richard Nixon. I do not agree with Richard Nixon on quite a few things. But he said we cannot simply stand by and let Eastern Europe just disintegrate and pretend it does not affect the economy of this country.

We have needs at home. We know that the Head Start Program does great things for young people. Only 40 percent of the young people who are eligible for Head Start are getting help by Head Start. What if, instead of following the President's recommendation and getting four more B-1 bombers, for example, we were to shift that over to Head Start? Would the United States be richer or poorer as a Nation? I think the answer is clearly we would be richer.

This next year, the budget calls for spending half a billion dollars, \$500 million, for testing nuclear warheads. There is not another nation on the face of the Earth testing nuclear warheads. Why do we have to have more powerful, more accurate, nuclear warheads, when other nations are not moving in this direction?

What if we took that \$500 million and reduced half of that and used that to apply to the deficit, and used the other half to help American Indians on reservations where the schools are so miserable? Would be a better Nation or a poorer Nation? We know the answer.

We ought to be meeting needs in this country and abroad and stop playing these military games.

Germany: Here is what is happening in Germany today. We have a large number of American troops stationed there. Why? To protect the western part of Germany and the rest of Western Europe from the Soviet Union. In what was eastern Germany, Germany is now paying the Russian governments for having Russian troops there. We are paying to have our troops there to protect them, to protect Western Europe, from those Russian troops.

If anybody can make any sense out of that, you know, you have a great imagination. This budget calls for a 30-percent increase in star wars. Take a look at Newsweek magazine—I think it was last week—and it shows how there is just a massive waste of money on this. Can we not take a little bit of

that money and apply it to education needs, health needs, housing needs in this country that will make this country a better place?

We ought to be reducing the deficit. I am joining the distinguished Presiding Officer, Senator SHELBY, in favoring a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget unless there is a 60-percent vote of Congress to the contrary. I am pleased to tell you, Mr. President, we are going to vote on that sometime between now and the middle of June, and I believe we have for the first time the votes to pass that. It is going to be a great influence for this country.

We can start getting interest rates down. The fastest growing item in the budget by far is interest. The gross interest expenditure in this country has grown from \$74 billion in fiscal year 1980 to, in the next fiscal year, according to the President's figures, \$316 billion. This next year, for the first time in the Nation's history, interest will be the No. 1 expenditure of the Federal Government. Nobody can tell me that makes any sense.

We should not be devoting our resources to paying interest; not to buying weapons that are not needed anymore; not to keeping people overseas who are not needed against a Soviet threat when there is not a Soviet threat anymore; but to doing constructive things.

We have these pages down here who are going to be going to college pretty soon. If they were going to college under the old GI bill that the Presiding Officer and I can still remember, if you were to add the inflation factor of that GI bill, do you know what it would mean today? It would mean \$8,100, on an average. Today, under the Pell grant, if you are poor enough—and the GI bill was there for anyone, no matter what your income was—but if you are impoverished enough, you may be able to get \$2,400. Can we do better? Of course we can. We have to invest in our people. And that is what we are not doing.

And the Sasser amendment would say if you have a majority in the House and the Senate, and it is not easy to get a majority in the House and the Senate, then you can shift from some of these things that just do not make sense at all anymore in today's world—we are stuck in a rut on our defense spending—shift it over, using some of it to reduce the deficit which we have to do, and using some of it to invest in our human resources. That just makes sense.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Sasser legislation. I hope when it comes to a cloture vote, I think it is ridiculous that we have to have a cloture vote on it. But I hope when it comes to a cloture vote, we will have the votes for it.

Let me just remind my colleagues again that on the night when we passed

the budget agreement this body unanimously voted for my amendment to get rid of that 60-percent wall. I cannot tell you whether the Senator from Mississippi was here on the floor when that happened. I do not know whether the Senator from Iowa was here when it happened. But let me tell you, the large majority of people on both sides of the aisle voted for that, and I hope we do not reverse ourselves. I hope we use common sense and vote for its counterpart now, the Sasser legislation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to speak on this bill, S. 2399, as introduced last night by Senator MITCHELL. I understand it is identical to S. 2250, which was introduced by Senator SASSER on February 25.

Mr. President, what we have here is very interesting. It seems to me, that while perhaps the rules allow this, this is a subversion of the rules of procedure, of the committee process, of the budget agreement, and of the way we ought to conduct business around here.

A couple of years ago, I was pleased to become a member of the Budget Committee. Now I think that the best thing we could do, perhaps, is to abolish the Budget Committee. The Budget Committee has not been meeting. Yet, we have this budget issue pending before the full Senate. It is very interesting to me how this whole thing has been worked. I have been expecting each week that the committee will meet and we will talk about the budget for the next year and about this firewalls issue. However, there have been no meetings. No meetings this week, last week, or the week before that. Why? I can tell you why. Because the distinguished chairman could not get the votes. So, if you do not have the votes in the committee, you just go around the committee. You just make a U-turn and come at it another way.

So now, not only has the Budget Committee been avoided or run over; the rules of the Senate have been used in such a way that we had, yesterday, 2 legislative days. I still do not understand how you have 2 legislative days in 1 day. Maybe it is a Senate procedural technicality. If you want to go home and explain that to your constituents, go right ahead.

And now we bring up here a proposal to knock down the firewalls between defense and domestic discretionary spending and avoid the budget agreement. In order to get to this debate, first, we had to just ignore the Budget Committee. Second, we had to have 2 legislative days in 1. So, the committee process has been ignored, the rules are being abused, and the budget agreement is going to be abrogated.

I want to say right up front that I thought the budget agreement of 1990

was a bad idea. I said it in the committee and here on the floor. I spoke against it, because it cut too much in defense, raised too many taxes, and allowed the deficit to continue to go right up. I never figured out how you do that. You get more money by reducing defense, get more money by raising taxes on the working people, and yet the deficit still goes up. That was a beautiful agreement.

Actually, I thought it was a sorry agreement. But since it became law—without my vote—I have tried to honor it. I have not liked it. I am sure at times the President would have liked to change the priorities between the different categories, but he has submitted budgets within the walls that were agreed to.

I admit publicly now that, without that agreement, the deficit would probably be much higher. The Congress—the House and the Senate—all of us would have found a way to spend even more. We could have, perhaps, come up with a budget agreement this year that would have been, instead of \$400 billion in the red, maybe \$500 or \$600 billion in the red. So, these firewalls are a little, bitty deterrent on the insatiable appetite of the Congress to spend more money.

Now I want to go back to the Budget Committee a moment before I actually get to what is being attempted here. Why do we have committees if we are not going to use them? I expect to see members of the Budget Committee, Democrats and Republicans, rise on the floor to trash this process, because the Members clearly would not have agreed to this. I think it is a terrible subversion. I would not vote for this on the procedural question alone, let alone the substance. If there has ever been an indication or proof that we need to reform the way the Senate runs, and also the Budget Act, this is the best one I have seen in a long time.

As to what is being suggested here, this is another effort to use defense as a piggy bank to pay for all of our other spending programs. Even the distinguished Senator who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], in a letter to the chairman of the Budget Committee, said that while perhaps we could cut defense as much as \$85 billion over 5 years, we should not cut it further this year. Basically, we ought to go with the plan as it now exists. If we cut defense more this year, it is going to affect National Guard armories, Reserve numbers, the numbers of troops we have, building programs, and the economy. So the very respected chairman of the Armed Services Committee warned against doing just what this would allow to happen: Dipping into the piggy bank.

I keep hearing that we do not need defense anymore. Utopia is here. It does not matter that the Soviets still

have their very dangerous long-range missile warheads aimed at us. These warheads have not been taken down. If you do not think there are other dangerous characters around the world, you better check it out.

This bill disrupts a very well-thought-out plan that the President submitted on the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Colin Powell. General Powell came before the Armed Services Committee last week, and he said emphatically: "Don't cut it any more. It will affect our end strength. It will affect the ability that we need to preserve peace." He also warned about the human damage we are doing, the tech sergeants we are kicking out. I tell you, we should not go launching off into drastic defense cuts for budgetary reasons without considering what we are doing to the national security, the economy, and our men and women who have committed their lives to serving in the military.

I have a chart here that I think points out exactly what we are launching off into. After every major conflict we have had this century, Congress has gone crazy and devastated defense. See the drop in defense spending after World War II? Then what happens? Then we have this dramatic, sharp increase to try to fix the mess we have made, and it costs us even more in real dollars. Then it comes down and kind of levels out. And then again, after Vietnam, we cut it down, and to fix it in the 1980's, we had to build up to a peak. And now, look what is happening again. This dark line is the actual line of spending, and the dotted line is the President's budget request. The President's budget request is a planned, cautious, but systematic coming down of our defense spending.

We are going to get defense spending down to the level we had in 1979. It was one of the major issues in 1979. It was one of the two major issues, in my opinion, that elected Ronald Reagan President of the United States. We tend to forget that the American people felt we had disarmed, we were at risk. Yet, here we go again, cutting defense. Will we ever learn from history?

We want to have more money to spend on our domestic discretionary problems. We all like them. I admit it, I am guilty. We all have projects in our State, whether it is Ohio, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Wyoming—all of us. But there has to be some restraint. As bad as it was, the budget agreement was an agreement. It is a restraint to more spending on the domestic discretionary side and more cuts on the defense side.

I want to make another point. Talking about sleight of hand and cute actions in the Senate—we went through it last week. In the previous 2 weeks, everybody knew there would be no tax

increase bill that would get through the process. Yet, we went through the motions. The House went through the motions; the President vetoed it, and it is going to be sustained, and then what? Everybody has gone on about their merry way.

What are we going to do now? We are going to do one of these acts again. The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee and the majority leader may get the votes here in the Senate.

Maybe they can find the way to force the votes. Maybe they can get 51 votes or 60. They may have to have 60. Maybe that would have an impact on the House and maybe they would pass it. Then what? Do you think the President is going to buy this deal? No; he is going to veto it and we are going to sustain the veto. This bill will not be passed. This is just not going to happen.

If I have my way, we are never going to get a vote on the actual bill because this is such a subversion of the process. We ought to be ashamed that we are even doing this without going through the normal process and through the committee.

Some may think this is good politics. Let me tell them, it is bad politics. I will tell them why. First of all, the American people are smarter than we are. They have it figured out. Every time we raise taxes or cut defense, that money disappears in the deep dark hole of Federal spending never to be seen or heard from again. They have got that figured out.

Also, they are frustrated and mad with all of us. They know what we are doing here, just fun and games. This is not going to happen. So why are we doing it? Boy, I hope my mother is not watching this. She would be saying, "What is it with you guys? You mean this is not going to happen, this is not going to become law? There is no way this is going to become law? No? Then why are you doing it? You are the Senate, the world's greatest deliberative body." I say that with my tongue in cheek, let me tell you.

We are going through this exercise, all this chitchat and all the votes, and there is no way it can happen. Meanwhile crime is running rampant in this country, education needs help, and some of the same people advocating we go through this charade are saying we better do something about health care. Why are we not debating those issues and doing something more constructive instead of this? This is garbage. It is an embarrassment to the institution.

Let me also take this opportunity to say that at some point this year I am going to offer another effort to make this budget process work with the Budget Process Reform Act which I recently introduced. The budget process does not work. The Budget Committee does not work. And, unfortunately, the Senate is not working because we are playing games.

We had the original Budget Impoundment Act in 1974. I voted for it because I thought there should be some discipline. Then we had the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act in 1985. It helped a little bit, and provided some discipline, but that is falling apart. Our budget process is a musclebound, toothless giant. I say fix it or abolish it, because it is an embarrassing joke.

How should we fix it? We have a number of Senators that have joined with me in cosponsoring these budget reform proposals. There are, I believe, 122 House Members that have joined in cosponsoring this bill. I would like to encourage my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle to seriously consider this bill. This is not intended to be partisan. This is not fun and games. This is an honest effort to find a way to make the budget process really work.

Here is how it would work. First of all, we would budget first, and then spend second. No authorizations or appropriations would be considered until the budget is in place. But, the Budget Committee would have to act within a timeframe that would allow the authorization and the Appropriations Committee to go forward. That was the original intent, I thought.

But what do we do when we miss deadlines? We just waive them, dismiss them, forget about them and go on about our business.

Second, it would implement very direct one page, 19 function budget resolution. It would be joint rather than concurrent, and it would bring the President into the process before the last minute. We would deal with the macronumbers and not get into the line-item process.

I think the President ought to be brought into the process earlier.

Look, if we are going to embarrass ourselves and sink into the swamp, we ought to take the President with us, do not you agree, Republican and Democrat?

However, I would hope that by bringing the President into the process earlier, maybe we could avoid going through the charade of a President sending up a budget resolution, which we similarly kick out in the street, kick it around a little bit more, and walk off and leave it. Then we come up with a budget resolution, usually late, that is quite often ignored by the appropriations process. We need to fix this, and we need to get the President working with us sooner.

Third, it would give the President enhanced rescission authority—which would give him the authority to send rescissions to the Congress, if the approved spending caps were exceeded. We need to give the President more authority to cut out unnecessary, unjustified spending projects, through enhanced rescission, through normal rescission, or through a line-item veto.

I heard the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee talking

about how the Congress has passed some rescissions. However, I remember that over the years most of the time when Presidents sent rescissions to the Congress, they were just ignored.

I also think that we should have pay-as-you-go supplementals. We go through this every year. Presidents make mistakes, then they come up here and say gee whiz, we have underfunded FEMA, CCC, food stamps; we need supplemental. Congress says what do we need? We need a train to pull the other stuff through. We come up with a supplemental that adds more money to any justifiable program then you can possibly think of. And then we get a few other goodies on the train, and then next thing you know it is a multistar train. At the very least we ought to have to pay for those supplementals by cutting unnecessary spending elsewhere.

So again, I would urge my colleagues to take a good look at this budget process reform proposal. Maybe you have other ideas that we could include. Let's make it work; put real teeth in the process. What we are seeing here today is clear evidence that the budget process does not work. We ought to fix it.

We should also ignore this proposal that is pending before us now. We should not take down the fire walls. You can say the world has changed now, so we can cut defense a lot more, but as a member of the Armed Services Committee I am here to tell you that it is not so.

I am also worried about where that money would go. If we cut more out of defense, the real freedom dividend belongs to the people—not to our spending programs. We ought to use it to cut the deficit. Leave that money in the people's pockets, and they will figure out how to spend it wisely and a lot better than us. We should not take it and spend it somewhere else when the people will probably never see the results.

I thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). Who yields time?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, what we are seeking to do here, as I said earlier, is simply, in view of changed circumstances over the past 18 months, to allow the Senate of the United States to exercise its own judgment as to the allocation of resources, as to the allocation of various appropriations. Let the Senate of the United States, through its various committees and through debate here on the floor and through a majority vote, determine whether or not we wished to take military funds, reduce military spending and use those funds for domestic purposes.

Do we wish to reject the construction of additional B-2 bombers and use

those funds to build roads or highways? Do we want to reject the construction of another aircraft carrier? We are the only power in the world that has a significant and meaningful aircraft carrier force. Do we want to reject the construction of a new aircraft carrier and say that 12 or 14 aircraft carriers are enough, and use the funds, the billions of dollars that will go into the construction of that aircraft carrier to provide for additional funding for education, perhaps additional funding for cancer research, perhaps additional funding for health care, perhaps additional funding for child immunization?

That is the only question that we are asking.

Or perhaps we want to use the funds that are going to be used to build a new D-5 missile, a nuclear warhead missile with hard kill capability that can hit within just a very few feet of a target thousands of miles away. Do we want to take the money that would be spent for that missile, when we already have a missile of almost identical capability constructed? Do we want to take the money for the D-5 and perhaps use that for mass transit in some area?

Those are the questions to be asked. Or do we take the funds from the D-5 missile and use it for deficit reduction? I mean those are simply the options that we allow the U.S. Senate to exercise under the bill that I have advanced today.

We are not saying that military spending is going to automatically be used for domestic spending. If the U.S. Senate wishes to do it, if my bill passes today, and some on the other side wish to do so, and if they have the votes to do it, and if they are convincing in debate with their colleagues, why they can take money away from domestic discretionary. They can take money out of the Women, Infants, and Children's Feeding Program if they want to and buy another D-5 missile under the legislation that I am advancing today. We simply take the wall down. That is all.

Why, they can take money out of domestic discretionary spending. They can probably find they can cut education enough, they could cut health research enough, they could cut the highway program, and they could use those funds to build another aircraft carrier if they want to. If they do not think 12 or 14 aircraft carriers are enough, if they have the eloquence to convince the majority of our colleagues in debate that we ought to reduce domestic spending and build another aircraft carrier, under the legislation I am advancing today, they can do it.

I am simply saying, let the U.S. Senate exercise the judgment in this particular area and alter the agreement, a minor modification, take down the wall between defense and domestic spending 1 day in advance, or 1 year in

advance, so that we can exercise our discretion here. That is all I am saying.

I am not saying that we are going to increase domestic discretionary spending. I am not saying we are going to reduce military spending. I am just saying take down the wall and let us make a decision. Let the elected representatives of the U.S. citizens here in the U.S. Senate make the decision about what is to be done with funds that fall in the so-called discretionary accounts that go to military spending and to domestic discretionary spending.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] on the floor. I know he has long been a proponent of taking down these arbitrary walls, and has long been a proponent of trying to meet some of the long neglected needs of our citizens that have accrued during the long years of the cold war. I would like to take this opportunity to yield the floor to him now, Mr. President, and see what he might add to this debate, which I suspect will be considerable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I thank my good friend and colleague from Tennessee, not only for his kind comments but for his distinguished leadership in this effort to bring down the wall so that more money can be made available for needed programs here in this country.

I had an interesting experience before I came over to the Senate floor. I had lunch with a long-time friend of mine. This friend of mine does not have a college education but he has given much of himself in the area of education. He has been president of the Cleveland School Board over a long period of years, a very difficult, challenging responsibility. Subsequently, he was chairman of the board of regents for the State of Ohio for a number of years and I believe still is the vice chairman of that body. He has been on the board of trustees of Brandeis University. He looked across the luncheon table at me and said, "Why can't you do something about education in this country? Why can't you use more of the dollars that are available for our children? Because we are falling behind."

And that brought back to my mind the TV program that I saw early this morning indicating that in math and science, in one we are 14th among 15 countries throughout the world, and in the other one we are 13th. We are not doing the job. And he wanted to know why we cannot do the job.

I am a Member of the U.S. Senate. Why can I not do something about it? And when you try to explain to him: Well, there is a wall, a wall that was put up and we cannot get into those defense funds, notwithstanding the fact that the military risks in the world are totally changed since the Soviet Union is no longer the Soviet Union.

Senator SASSER's bill to modify the 1990 budget agreement to permit the shifting of defense savings to domestic programs is a must.

And I must say to you that I am so disturbed that apparently in a political vote I am advised that the overwhelming majority of Members on the other side of the aisle are going to vote no. Why? Why? Politics? Some allegiance to the President? They do not believe that we can cut back on our defense spending to help needed programs in this country; that we can shift some of our resources? They are not aware of what is happening out there in the country, when people cannot find jobs, when people do not know where to look, when people who have been employed over a period of a lifetime cannot find a job now, where people cannot get adequate health care and do not know what to do in order to pay the medical bill; people cannot send their children to programs that are available to some but not available to all?

It is time that we recognize the need, the necessity, the obligation to shift some of these funds that we have been spending around the world for defense programs to the needs of this country.

There is an understandable reason that the people of this country do not think much of their Congress, and maybe even a little bit less of their President, although I am not sure which one stands in lower esteem. They wonder what we are doing down here.

We are playing games arguing whether to take down the wall. What are you worrying about the wall for? Why do you not provide more money for education? Why do you not provide more money for health care? Why do you not do something about the homeless of this country? Why do you not do something about the many other needed problems of this country? Oh, because there is a wall. And because some people on the other side of the aisle somehow think that this is a political issue, or maybe it is for the President, maybe this is something about the thousand points of darkness which the President called his thousand points of light.

This bill is the first step in addressing the new world environment. The world has changed dramatically since we enacted the 1990 budget agreement. The cold war has ended and the Soviet Union is no longer and never will be a military threat.

The United States now stands alone as the world's military superpower and we do not have to spend \$300 billion a year to defend our country. We can spend substantially less and do the job totally.

What we need to do is restructure and revitalize our economy. While we stand strong as a military power, we are standing weaker and weaker as a domestic force.

We must turn our attention to the needs of our citizens at home. We must

bring this country out of the ongoing recession, get America back on the road toward long-term economic growth, spend some of those dollars to rebuild the infrastructure of this country that has been permitted to deteriorate.

Oh, I know there has been a slight upturn in the economy—very slight. It is mild. And new jobs are not being created, and more and more people are becoming unemployed.

The President has not done a thing to pull this country out of the recession. The President has no economic blueprint for this country. The President's 1993 budget is full of the same tired, old ideas that Congress has rejected year after year, and rightfully so.

The President's proposed defense cuts are but a trickle. They do not go far enough. The President proposes to cut defense spending an additional \$6 billion out of a \$300 billion expenditure—\$6 billion in 1992, and only \$44 billion over the following 5 years, from 1993 to 1997.

Mr. President, there is a new world we are living in. Mr. President, there is a new America that is suffering.

Numerous Members of Congress and defense experts have called for cuts of \$100 to \$150 billion over the next several years. Senator NUNN, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has recommended defense cuts of \$85 billion. Congressman ASPIN, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, has recommended defense cuts of \$100 billion to \$120 billion, more than double the amount the President proposed. And two defense experts with whom I side and identify, Bill Colby, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency under President Nixon, and Paul Warnke, former head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as part of a report for the Coalition for Democratic Values recommended that we cut our defense budget by half, meaning down to \$150 billion in the fifth year, to bring it down so that by the fifth year the defense budget would be half the present amount. I support that position.

It is clear we must adopt broader defense cuts than those proposed by the President. We need across-the-board cuts. The President has not gone far enough to cut the total number of our troops. The President's budget relies primarily on cuts in procurement and construction and barely touches personnel levels.

But we still have 1,886,000 active troops which the President only proposes to cut to 1,650,000 by 1995—hardly scratching the surface, a couple of hundred thousand out of the total of almost 1,900,000. And we still have another 2,138,000 reserves and civilian personnel. And let us not underestimate the costs associated with those Reserves and civilian personnel.

I doff my hat to those men and women who have served and are serv-

ing in our military forces and our Reserve forces. But their service is not the issue. The issue is whether or not we need as many men and women in the services as we have at the present time.

We can and must reduce these numbers substantially. Reducing our troop strength by 100,000 a year will save \$140 billion over 5 years.

We still have 280,000 troops defending Europe.

Mr. SASSER. Will the distinguished Senator from Ohio yield for a moment?

Mr. METZENBAUM. I certainly do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields.

Mr. SASSER. I notice the distinguished Senator from Ohio is indicating that at the present time we still are maintaining somewhere in the neighborhood of 280,000 U.S. troops in Europe.

Mr. METZENBAUM. That is my understanding.

Mr. SASSER. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Ohio was aware of the fact that the Canadian Government is withdrawing all of their military forces from the Continent of Europe? Our friends to the north, the Canadians, have said, in view of the vastly changed world circumstances that have occurred with the collapse of the old Soviet Union and the evaporation of the old Soviet threat, they are going to withdraw all of their military forces from the NATO organization, bring them home from Europe, and bring them back to Canada. I was not sure my friend from Ohio was aware of that fact.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I thank the Senator from Tennessee, my good friend, for pointing that out to me. Indeed, I was not aware of that. But it only strengthens the reason for this country to bring back more and more troops, whether or not we go down to zero, whether we leave a token force there. With the means of transporting troops and material in these times, we certainly do not need to maintain anywhere near the force levels that we have there, and there is no secret about it.

Not alone do we expend dollars from our Treasury when we do that, but also those dollars then go into the hands of the military, and their paychecks are expended in the European economy where they could much better be expended in the American economy.

Mr. SASSER. If the Senator will yield for just another moment, let me just say the Senator from Ohio is quite right about that. These United States tax dollars that are spent in Germany and in the United Kingdom, for example, are being used to purchase items from foreigners in those countries. These tax dollars could be spent right here in the United States to help lift our own people out of a recession.

With regard to the case that the distinguished Senator from Ohio makes

about the expense of maintaining U.S. forces abroad, I might just add one of the concerns that I hear is that perhaps a reduction in the military budget would endanger local National Guard operations, for example. As the distinguished Senator from Ohio has, I think obliquely, pointed out about the expense of maintaining these troops abroad, if you brought them home and demobilized them, you could reduce the defense budget and still maintain the National Guard units at a very robust level.

So actually you are helping the National Guard and Reserve units when you bring the Active Forces home from abroad and the cost of maintaining them is cheaper and some of those funds can be then funneled to the local Reserve and Guard units, as the Senator from Ohio was touching upon a moment ago.

Mr. METZENBAUM. While the author of the bill is on the floor, I wonder if he would be good enough to inform the Senator from Ohio, if he knows, what we expend in order to protect Korea each year? And what we spend in order to protect Southeast Asia?

Mr. SASSER. I cannot provide those precise numbers off the top of my head. But, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio knows, we were expending well over—in the neighborhood of over \$100 billion to equip and sustain our military forces in Europe. At one time I think we were spending as much as \$170 billion out of our overall defense budget to maintain and equip our forces in Europe.

As my friend from Ohio knows, we still have 40,000 United States troops in Korea, at a time when South Korea has a gross national product that is many, many times that of North Korea, the threat to them to the north, and at a time when the South Korean population is considerably larger than that of North Korea.

I do not understand why the substantial burden of defending South Korea is carried by the taxpayers of the United States. Why can it not be carried by the taxpayers and citizens of the Republic of South Korea?

But I will shortly have the numbers and the answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I very much appreciate the response of my friend from Tennessee.

It helps to make the point that there are two aspects of this military spending that we must address ourselves to, neither of which help the American people.

We do not need to spend as much as we do on the military. That can be cut substantially. But the reality also is, in the second part of the equation, that too many of those dollars are being spent in Europe, in Korea, and in Japan defending Southeast Asia.

If we did not cut the military budget \$1, which no one would suggest and cer-

tainly I would not, but if we did not cut it \$1 and we expended the funds, used the same number of dollars and they were paid to American military personnel and they were in this country, it would be an unbelievable boom to the American economy because you would be taking—I think the number is somewhere around \$40 billion in Korea and \$50 billion in Japan, but I am not certain to the number, but whatever the number and as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said, something like \$170 billion in Europe, whatever the number—if those same dollars were spent in the American economy, think how many more loaves of bread, think how many more of everything—would be sold and those dollars would be turned over and over again in the American economy.

How anybody, regardless of political point of view, can disagree with the obligation to concern ourselves with the American economy at the present time, and there is something that can be done not 6 months from now, not 6 years from now, not in some long plane, bringing the troops home from Southeast Asia and from Europe, whether we leave a token force in both places or not, but what a boom it would do for the American economy.

If we cut the total amount of spending, it certainly would make more money available, once the wall is down, in order to do so many needed things in America. I see my distinguished colleague from Tennessee on the floor.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I know of the longstanding interest and concern of the Senator from Ohio in the area of health care in this country and his concern about the cost of health care and the need to deliver quality, affordable health care to every citizen in this country.

The figure of \$170 billion to maintain the American military establishment in Europe is a ballpark figure. It is coming down some now. But if we had just half of that money, if we had \$100 billion to be spent to provide health care on a yearly basis for the people of this country, I say to my friend from Ohio that the American people, each and every one of them, would have the quality health care that I know he is so concerned about.

I say that as a means of putting in perspective the cost of these military establishments. Just the cost of maintaining the military establishment in Europe in all likelihood would pay for well over half of the cost of a health care system for the people of this country. We are dealing with extraordinary sums of money, and I simply wanted to make that illustration because I knew of my friend's long-term interest in the health care needs of this Nation.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I very much appreciate the comments of my good friend from Tennessee. We are talking about megabucks. We are talking

about truly doing something about the economy. We are talking about doing something to make this Nation the kind of Nation it used to be. We have the power to do it, but for some political reason that I do not quite understand, we are having a battle as to whether we can even get this resolution to the floor for a vote. That is what this whole debate is about: Should we bring debate to a close so a majority of the Senate can express its will?

Last year, the Congress did pass a sense-of-the-Senate resolution urging the President to get the number of troops down to 100,000 by 1995. That did not go far enough. That was not nearly enough. But the President only plans to reduce our troop strength in Europe to 150,000 by 1995. Is it not understandable that the American people cannot comprehend their own Government? Is it not understandable that the American people think they ought to throw the President and the Congress out as well?

There just is no need to spend \$150 billion a year defending Europe. We spend over half our defense budget on our forces in Europe while the European Community is girding itself together, to become stronger and stronger and stronger so that they can take on the American domestic economy in confrontation. What an absurdity, and we are spending a far greater percentage of our national expenditures, that is our expenditures at the Government level, for defense spending and for defending Europe than are the European countries expending themselves.

Why do we not spend those funds here? What understandable argument can be made to leave so many men and women in the military in Europe and in Southeast Asia and in Korea? How can we possibly justify it? How can we explain it to our children? Every dollar we spend overseas is a dollar less than we have to spend on America, and if ever there were a time when this economy needs a good push, a good extra jump, a jump-start, this is the way to do it. Instead, the President would cut a lot of programs that are needed by the American people.

We must use defense cuts to invest in America, in American jobs, in American children, in American families. We must start with the basics. We have an obligation to our children and to our grandchildren to invest in education. We must make sure that our children can read and write, and we must improve their math and science skills.

The President's budget just does not pass muster in this area. The President proposes minimal increases in a few education programs and major reductions in dozens of programs. The President proposes to cut vocational education, adult education, and student loans, work study, and library assistance programs. Education programs

are an investment in our future. We should be increasing education, not cutting it.

We must also provide adequate job training and jobs to our workers. The President's budget provides almost no additional funds to retain displaced workers.

In 1990, Congress appropriated \$150 million to retain displaced defense workers and \$50 million to help communities affected by defense cuts.

Listen to this. Of the \$150 million and the \$50 million so far, the administration has only spent \$10 million of that money. Does not the President and the administration recognize the problem of displaced defense workers and the communities affected by shutdowns in defense industries? Why does the President not use the funds to help Americans who have lost their jobs?

The President's budget also falls short in the area of job creation and job training. The President proposes a minuscule 2.6-percent increase in job training programs. That is almost as if it is nothing, 2.6 percent. At the same time, the President eliminates job training block grants and funds for summer youth employment. You cannot turn the TV on without hearing about the problems of our young people in the cities of this country, and does somebody think at the White House that that problem is going to be ameliorated, helped in some way by eliminating funds for summer youth employment? Will not it be counterproductive? The President cuts the highly effective Job Corps by \$50 million and the older workers employment program by another \$50 million.

The President is moving us in exactly the wrong direction, and there are those on the opposite side of the aisle who are going to refuse to make it possible to bring this entire debate to a close so that we can vote on whether or not we want to take down this wall between defense spending and domestic spending.

We need so much in the domestic area. We need job training. We need to create jobs by rebuilding our roads and bridges. We need to clean up our environment. We need to restructure our health care system. We need to build affordable housing. We must keep our streets safe.

There is no shortage of things that we need in our country. But as long as we are spending as much as we are in the defense area, it is not going to be possible. As long as that arbitrary wall is there being protected by the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle so that we cannot bring this issue to a vote, we are not going to be able to do the job we are obligated to do.

The task before us is clear. We must use this unique moment in history to restructure our country. Our economy is in trouble, deep trouble. We had neg-

ative economic growth in 1991. Unemployment remains unacceptably high at 7 percent. American workers are earning less now than a decade ago. Families are working harder but earning less. We need long-term investments to get America back on track. We need more of those defense dollars being spent in the American economy. If we can lead the world in missile production, we can lead the world in economic production.

I strongly support the Sasser bill. I strongly urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with us in cutting off debate so that we can vote up or down on the Sasser bill. That is the only way we can modify the 1990 budget agreement to reflect the changed world environment. This bill enables us to redirect our spending. I hope that we will not be precluded from bringing debate to a close so that 51 Members of this body may vote to bring down the wall.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, a moment ago our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] asked me a question as to the cost of maintaining the United States troop level in South Korea and also questions about the costs of projecting naval power in the Pacific region, and we have some preliminary figures. They are not conclusive, but this is what we concluded on fairly brief research.

According to the publication of the Brookings Institution entitled "Decisions for Defense 1991," for the defense of South Korea, to maintain our troop level and some air cover capability, we were expending \$19 billion a year. Interesting that we would be spending almost \$20 billion a year to defend South Korea when South Korean shipyards have literally driven United States shipbuilding out of business and when we are competing vigorously across the world with Korea for various international markets and at a time when South Korea's economy is booming, South Korea's economy is expanding by almost a geometric ratio. It is a country with a population considerably larger than that of North Korea, its principal adversary; yet somehow the taxpayers of this country are still called upon to spend \$19 billion a year to defend the people of South Korea.

I sometimes wonder how it would be if the shoe were on the other foot. If our neighbors to the north or the

south, the Canadians or the Mexicans, were threatening us, I wonder if we could call upon the South Koreans to expand \$19 billion in defense of the security interests of the United States. An interesting question. I do not know the answer.

In addition, we expend, according to the same Brookings publication, \$15 billion a year to keep open the Pacific sealanes to South Korea, to supply our troops in that area, and generally to project American naval power into the Pacific area and specifically into the country of Korea. So we are spending about 34 billion in 1991 dollars of the United States taxpayers to maintain a military establishment in Korea, and to maintain a naval presence that will keep the sealanes open to Korea.

Mr. President, I think the bill that is before the Senate today is vital if we are to pursue a rational, well-conceived economic conversion program. There is no question that there are going to be some communities hard hit by the closure of military bases and by military cutbacks. The Office of Technology Assessment has done a very thorough and, I might say, very authoritative study of what will occur across this country as we move into an era of decreased military spending, what effect this will have on local communities.

We find, in reading the report of the Office of Technology Assessment, that approximately 3 percent of the counties in the United States are to some extent significantly dependent on military spending, and this 3 percent of the counties will suffer some economic dislocation and economic distress.

In view of that, I think it is absolutely essential that we engage in some mode of converting, in productive way, these facilities for military production into peaceful and productive economic strength. I think we need to have funds to finance ways to ease that transition.

One of the ways some of these military funds could be used, if the wall between military spending and domestic spending were taken down, is that we could use some of these funds for the very difficult process of conversion from military spending to economic civil production.

For example, the funds could be used for assistance in economic development in those areas where military bases are closing or where a military weapons facility is being phased out or phased down. The funds could be used to convert people by way of job training, to be used for veterans benefits for those who are being discharged from the military, could be used to aid schools and for educational purposes, particularly in those areas that would be hardest hit.

But with this wall up separating military spending and domestic spending, there is going to be little or no Federal funds available to cushion the impact of these military cuts as they

come crashing down on the 3 percent of the counties in the country that would be most adversely affected.

Finally, as I mentioned earlier, dismantling the wall between military spending and domestic spending 12 months ahead of schedule—bear in mind that is all we are asking here—within 12 months this wall comes down by operation of law because the budget enforcement agreement said the walls between military and domestic spending expired at the end of 3 years. But by taking down that wall 12 months earlier, we will free resources that I think are badly needed as we are fighting this recession. We are struggling mightily to come out of the worst and longest recession—I will not say the worst, I think that would be a mistake, but the longest recession—in duration that we have seen since the 1930's. It has stretched out to now 19 months.

Bear in mind that this long 19-month recession was preceded by 12 months of virtually flat economic growth, no significant economic growth now for almost 3 years in this economy, and it is stretching on out.

Well, if the wall comes down some of these resources that are now going into military spending could be used to combat the recession right here at home.

Let me just offer an example of the kind of job creation we could expect when the wall comes down that seals off and safeguards the military spending. Whether you are talking about the President's number for military spending that he advanced, the proposal advanced in the House budget, or some level in between the House number, which I think cut outlays at about \$10 billion, and that advanced by the President, which cuts outlays for fiscal year 1993 at about a level of \$5.5 billion, but the funds, if you take the wall down, can be used whether it is the \$5 billion or the \$10 billion, or anti-recessionary investments if the U.S. Senate chooses to do that.

Let us say that the Senate chose to use the funds out of military spending to keep all of the programs in the domestic spending category fully funded at the 1992 current services level. That will take \$6.4 billion to bring the 1993 domestic discretionary spending up to the 1992 level.

Why is that the case? Because the act of inflation, just as Social Security beneficiaries get a cost-of-living adjustment every year so that their purchasing power will remain stable, if these domestic programs are increased to what the budgeteers call baseline, if they are not given a cost-of-living increase, they will lose \$6.4 billion in real purchasing power.

Let us say we took the military spending and just keep the programs level at purchasing power. What would that do? According to the Congressional Budget Office, this carries the

potential to create 400,000 more jobs than the President's budget would produce. Specifically, 100,000 more jobs could be created through additional highway spending, 100,000 more people could be put to work in the highway program, and that money would diffuse out throughout almost every community in this country.

The distinguished Presiding Officer, who was a very able and effective Governor of the State of Florida—I think that is widely noted and has been noted in many journals of the period when he was presiding over the executive branch as the Governor of Florida—has called to my attention the ability of highway spending to increase jobs. And, more specifically, he called my attention to the fact that rebuilding and repairing highway infrastructure generally creates more jobs than new capital investment, something that I was not aware of. But we could put these funds back to State highway maintenance, rebuilding of the roads and bridges, and create literally tens of thousands of jobs.

Twenty-four thousand five hundred more jobs would result if we kept mass transit spending at current services level. How could that be? The mass transit systems could be purchasing more buses, more vehicles to move people, and that creates more jobs in those areas. They would not have to lay off bus drivers and motormen and that sort of thing which, undoubtedly, is going to occur if there is a reduction in the purchasing power of the mass transit systems all across the country.

Six thousand more jobs could be created with airport improvements if funding for airports were kept at a current services level. I do not need to tell air travelers of the necessity of at least keeping airport funding at a current services level. Airports are congested now. They are overworked, overutilized, overcrowded and people need to be working in the rehabilitation, in the maintenance of those airports, and also in assisting that they be used in a more efficient and expeditious way.

In the field of low-income HUD housing, if there is not a need there, I do not know where in the world we will find it. You cannot go into a major city in this country without being confronted by the homeless all around you.

Mr. President, every evening when I drive home, I pass by the State Department building. And right across the street from the State Department in a little city park, there are about 10 to 12 homeless men who have made this their home. You see them there through winter and summer. They have been living there so long that they have tramped down the grass in the park.

It is just a little dusty area; some of the little ornamental shrubs that have been planted there are dying out. If

you go by there late at night in the winter, you see homeless men huddled in blankets, here in the Nation's capital, right across from the State Department, right across from the building to which ambassadors of other nations arrive to present their credentials as ambassadors from their nation to the United States; right across from the building where foreign ministers of other nations come to visit; right across from the State Department building where foreign dignitaries from all across the world come. What must they think about the priorities of the United States of America when they see just before pulling in to the State Department, this public area, filled with desperate, homeless men?

Well, we could create 86,000 more jobs in the area of low-income housing, in rural housing, in community development block grants, if we just kept the funding in these particular budget areas at current services level, just safeguarding their purchasing power. That could be done by simply taking some of the cuts the President himself makes in military spending and transferring it over to domestic discretionary spending, if this body chose to do that.

In short, taking down this wall means more jobs. It means more jobs in this recessionary economy.

(Mr. SANFORD assumed the chair.)

Mr. SASSER. We hear a lot of talk from the President, the administration, and even some of my good friends from the other side of the aisle—jobs, jobs, jobs. The President said his trip to Japan was all about jobs, creating jobs for the American people. Well, I do not know of any jobs that were created from that trip, but he can create jobs now by assisting us in hiring in our effort to lower these walls to take down this barrier between defense spending, military spending, and domestic spending.

Taking down this wall would mean sustaining other critical investments, most notably in the area of health care. Here are some of the possible effects of allowing transfer from military spending in order to maintain a 1992 current services level in the health care area. Bear in mind that I am not saying if we take down these walls, these funds will be transferred.

If this body chooses to do so, all of the funds can be allocated to deficit reduction. If this body chooses to do so, and if they choose to take a cut in military spending similar to what the House of Representatives has advocated, we could fund all of these domestic discretionary programs at the current services level and still use 4 or 5 billion dollars and allocate that to deficit reduction.

But if we fund it, the health care areas, just at current services levels, just to keep them level with inflation, we find that 850,000 more low-income

women can receive primary and prenatal care. The statistics tell us, and the experts in the field tell us, that for every dollar spent in primary and prenatal care, it comes back a hundredfold in medical care that must be advanced, if you have a premature baby, or a malnourished child that is born with defective intelligence.

If these programs were funded at current services levels in the veterans health care area, more than 110,000 inpatient hospital stays could be facilitated and handled; 2.4 million more outpatient visits could be facilitated by the veterans hospitals, if they were just funded at current services level.

What about women and infants and children? I see my distinguished friend from South Carolina on the floor, and I know that the Senators from South Carolina are concerned about the WIC Program. If we could just fund the WIC Program at current services levels, we would not have to cut 200,000 recipients off of the WIC Program, which I am told will occur if that program sustains a cut below current services.

What about health research, cancer research, diabetes research? That is something I am very concerned about. I have a little niece, 9 years old, who was diagnosed as a diabetic, and that beautiful little girl, every morning, has to get up and give herself a shot. What about diabetes research? We are on the verge of curing that.

What about AIDS research? If we could fund the National Institutes of Health biomedical research just at current services level, \$391 million dollars would be made available for these programs. Perhaps with 5, or 10, or 20 million dollars more in diabetes research—we are right on the edge of finding a cure or a way to deal with that—that cure could be found in the next year or two.

We are a society plagued by drug abuse, alcohol abuse, a society that has a serious problem with the mental health administration. If we could fund the mental health administration at a current services level, \$166 million dollars more would be available for the treatment of drug abuse and for alcohol abuse among our citizenry.

In other areas, 37,000 additional Head Start slots—who among us does not think Head Start is a worthwhile program—where we take these children from disadvantaged areas, get them into a kindergarten or an educational system a year or two early. Who among us does not believe that is a worthwhile program? And 37,000 additional Head Start slots could be created, if Head Start could be funded just at a current services level.

And \$459 million more could be provided for law enforcement, for criminal justice, for judicial activities; \$250 million more for the National Science Foundation programs; \$417 million more for energy programs.

I know of the concern of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and his interest in energy production, energy conservation, in developing a meaningful energy program for the United States of America, and I applaud his efforts in that regard. But the distinguished chairman of the Energy Committee, if we could simply fund the energy function at current services levels, it would have a significant amount more to deal with the energy problems of this country; \$417 million is serious money, even by Washington standards.

Yes, if we adhere to the caps of the budget summit agreement, the Budget Enforcement Act, we will have a shortfall of \$6.7 billion in the funding for the domestic priorities of the American people in 1993.

That single budgetary fact above all others should make it clear to every Member of this body under the present arrangement, the \$6.7 billion shortfall ought to be addressed.

It could be made up partially through cuts or savings in military spending. We could even use the modest \$5 billion in military savings that the President himself proposes just to fund these badly needed domestic programs in a time of great economic distress as we try to pull ourselves up by our bootstraps out of this recession.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is on the floor. My friend from Louisiana has many responsibilities in this body. He is one of the senior Senators by way of service and by way of experience and knowledge in this body.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is a chairman of a very important Senate Committee on Energy, a committee that has responsibility for developing the energy resources of this country, that has the responsibility of trying to fashion a program to make the United States energy independent while at the same time using its energy in an environmentally safe way.

But equally as important, he is the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water and many very important and critical projects fall within the purview of that Appropriations Subcommittee for funding.

So I would like now to yield to my friend from Louisiana, Senator JOHNSTON, for any comments he might wish to make about this effort to eliminate this arbitrary wall between military spending and domestic discretionary spending.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, the chairman of the Budget Committee. I especially thank him for his kind comments.

Mr. President, I wonder if Senators really understand what this tearing down the firewall legislation is. If they understand it, they will be for it, at

least in overwhelming numbers, I am convinced of that. I think really it is misunderstood, and the reason I say it is misunderstood is that I heard the arguments, pro and con, in the Democratic caucus yesterday and I think they did not understand what we are facing.

What we are facing, Mr. President, is a budget agreement put together a couple years ago when the cold war was still going on, when dollars were scarce, and we were still meeting the challenge of a military arrayed against the Warsaw Pact where the danger of an attack from the Soviet Union, the Warsaw Pact was still very real indeed.

At that time, Mr. President, the part of the budget called discretionary domestic spending, that is, that discretionary part into which the life of America is put—everything from food for children to, indeed, energy programs, to historic preservation, to highways, to education, to all of those fundamental things are in this pot called domestic discretionary, called domestic discretionary because the Congress can, in fact, control them.

But because of scarce dollars, Mr. President, the first year domestic discretionary was taken care of, but in the 2 outyears, the spending on domestic discretionary went down so that in the coming budget year we face not a standstill, not a freeze, but a cut back of some \$6.7 billion from today's spending levels in real dollars, an actual cutback, a retrenchment in those budgets which we now have.

Mr. President, I have a steady stream, as other Senators do, of visiting firemen who come into my office. Yesterday, there was a group from New Orleans that were pointing out the importance of historical preservation and pointing out that they wanted it increased. I said "Don't you understand? Nobody can be increased unless we get the firewalls taken down because everybody has to be decreased." The present budget agreement calls for a decrease, some \$6.7 billion, or if you use the President's budget, the President would cut some \$8.4 billion in budget authority.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a decrease of from \$6.7 billion using the CBO figures or \$8.4 billion using the President's figures.

That is the central point of this debate, that the domestic discretionary pot, that pot of spending to which all Senators rally at budget time, you know help this program, help that. Will you not help us get flood control in the case of my Energy Committee on energy and water? Will you not help us get the superconducting super collider?

And I am for that, and my Texas friends are especially strong for the superconducting super collider.

But, Mr. President, if we are going to have a budget cut, how do you fund anything? You do not.

What Senator SASSER and what I and the other coauthors of breaking down the firewalls are trying to do is not increase domestic spending but at least bring it up to where it is now, at least put it where it is now, Mr. President. We are not talking about some new educational initiative. We are not talking about some new highway proposal or some new set of nutrition programs for kids or for nursing mothers. We are talking about not cutting back on those programs. It is just as simple as that Mr. President.

Now, Mr. President, since that budget agreement was put together, the Soviet Union is no more, the Warsaw Pact is no more. I was in East Germany in December and the former East German soldiers who were one of the mainstays of the Warsaw Pact have now joined the bundesstaat and their general tells me they are some of the best soldiers in the old German tradition—they saluted and for their country. You know our country is dead. God save our country even though it has changed and they are good solid members of the West now. They want to join NATO. I have been to Czechoslovakia recently and Hungary and these other Eastern bloc countries which were the Warsaw Pact.

Mr. President, they are on our side now. Boris Yeltsin in the United Nations referred to the United States as our allies, and yet this budget agreement which is so sacred that nobody wants to break was put together when the Soviet Union was the Soviet Union plus the Warsaw Pact arrayed against us, and we had to have 10 divisions in 10 days to be able to fight them.

To say that circumstances have changed is to put it mildly. There has never been a period in history of a shorter time in which things have changed so fundamentally, so diametrically, so overwhelmingly with just breathtaking speed.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will, indeed.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I find the Senator from Louisiana's logic as always very persuasive and he was stating a moment ago quite accurately that this budget agreement was put together at a time when the Soviet military capability was intact and at a time when the Soviet Union did represent—although a diminished threat—they had considerable military capability which has now evaporated.

I, for one, was not aware that the soldiers of the old East German army, part of the Warsaw Pact, are now joining the army of the old West Germany. These soldiers are now being integrated into NATO and want to fight with us.

But my question is this: I wonder if my friend from Louisiana was aware of the fact that this budget summit agreement was negotiated in the fall of

1990 when the United States of America was deploying very large forces in the Middle East, in Saudi Arabia, in preparation for doing battle and going to war with a nation which at that time had one of the largest and was thought to have one of the most competent and effective military establishments in the world?

If memory serves me correctly, they had at that time the world's fourth largest Army and Air Force. I was just wondering if my friend from Louisiana was aware of the fact that that also was an element in setting out the numbers for military spending in this budget summit agreement.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am aware. That is another point. It is history that has taken place with such breathtaking speed. The question is no longer whether we should cut defense. The question is whether we should cut defense as much as the President says, which as I recall is about \$5 billion this year, or whether we should cut a greater amount.

But, Mr. President, if we could just take the President's cut in defense and keep that from eroding domestic spending, domestic discretionary—in other words, keep domestic discretionary level—then we would be much closer to serve the needs of the people of this country.

Mr. President, on Sunday, on "This Week" with David Brinkley, I heard one of the best discourses on the economy I have heard in a long time by Felix Rohatyn, the distinguished financier. He had three or four points; the other three or four I could go into, but they are not particularly relevant at this point.

But he said, point No. 1, what he thought this country ought to do is to have \$1 trillion committed to restoring the infrastructure in this country over the next 10 years—\$1 trillion. This is \$100 billion a year. Now, what the break-the-firewall legislation says is do not spend \$1 trillion dollars, but let us not take away this year \$6 to \$8 billion of what we have.

I mean, here we are, Mr. President, in a recession, a deep recession, and yet we would be taking away from those job-creating activities of Government like highways or like building navigation or flood control projects—I come back to navigation and flood control because they happen to be in my subcommittee—or great science projects like the superconducting super collider, or everything from the WIC Program, nutrition programs, to education initiatives; all of these things, Mr. President, which are central.

And here we are; we have a recession, and the economists say if you are going to spend for a recession, then try to do it for something nonrecurring. In other words, do not put some tax program on that is going to be a permanent drag on the economy if what you want is an

immediate flush for the economy. They say do something that will give you a permanent good that comes from that spending. That fits the kind of spending we are talking about to maintain domestic discretionary programs. But if we do not breach the firewalls, we are going to have to fire people on existing domestic discretionary programs.

If we can just get that point across to Senators. I wonder if my friend from South Carolina understands that. Does the Senator from South Carolina understand that if we do not breach the firewalls, that we are going to have a fire people and cut existing programs? Will my friend from South Carolina agree with me on that?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is no question, I think there probably will have to be some discharged. The Government is too big and some should be discharged.

Right now, we plan to cut defense, but I think we have to do it orderly. And I think the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN, takes the same position I do, which is we ought to carry out the plan and start next year with cutting defense according to the plans agreed on by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wonder if my friend from South Carolina would have any objection if we accepted the recommendation of the President, which I think is a \$5-billion cut in defense.

Mr. SASSER. I say to my friend from Louisiana, I think it is \$5.5 billion, the President's cuts, using OMB calculations.

Mr. JOHNSTON. If we say we took that \$5.5 billion and used it just to keep domestic discretionary programs at their present levels, I wonder if my friend from South Carolina would have any objection.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I could not agree with that. I think the plan that is worked out by the Budget Committee and has been agreed to should be adhered to, and I think we make a great mistake in changing that. And you are going to turn a lot of men and women in uniform out on the streets.

This thing has got to be done gradually and properly, and that is the way the Armed Services Committee is trying to work it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I tell my friend from South Carolina, the firewall legislation is not about cutting defense more; rather, it is whether you can take that spending for defense and move it to anything else, or whether those cuts, in the case of the President's recommendation, \$5.5 billion, whether you have to use that to either cut taxes or to reduce the deficit. That is really what this is about.

That resolution says that that \$5.5 billion in the case of the President's

recommendation, or a greater amount, whatever the will is of the Senate—and the Senate is going to work its will on cuts in defense without respect to firewalls. I mean, if we cannot breach the firewalls, Senators are not going to vote willy-nilly for additional defense expenditures just because the agreement is there. The agreement we are trying to breach the firewall of does not require us to spend anything on defense. It simply puts a limit on defense and says we cannot use any of that savings, whatever it may be, for any other purpose.

Now, that is what this is about, Mr. President. We are trying to save jobs and we are trying to save programs—existing jobs and existing programs—by preventing what would be a reduction in those programs under the present budget agreement. Now, that is the fundamental fact which Senators do not seem to understand.

I wonder if my friend from South Carolina understands that this budget resolution requires a cut in domestic spending.

I see my friend, the distinguished former chairman and ranking minority member of the Budget Committee. Am I correct on that?

Mr. DOMENICI. Well, Mr. President, I really do not want to take much time because my friend from South Carolina has been trying to get the floor, and I want him to speak. But let me suggest to my good friend—and I serve with him on Appropriations—that in the first 2 years of this agreement domestic discretionary spending went up, and I will give you the percentages; very, very, big increases, in percentage terms.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In real dollars?
Mr. DOMENICI. They just floated away into who knows where.

Mr. JOHNSTON. In real dollars?
Mr. DOMENICI. In real dollars, percentage increases, year over year; very large increases. In fact, that was the price to pay for getting agreement, I say to my friend from Louisiana. The discretionary appropriations in 1991 and 1992 had to go up, and go up substantially.

Now, the real issue today has to do with whether or not, about a year and a half after you make an agreement, that you all of a sudden have this new giant need for domestic spending. It is not that defense had anything to do with this agreement. This agreement was made on all the discretionary accounts with full knowledge of what each account was going to get in order to get some real savings and real discipline into the budget. There was the new line for domestic discretionary spending.

Some say we should use defense cuts to fund domestic spending. That argument has nothing to do with what happened in the Soviet Union. It so happens that we might be able to cut de-

fense more than we thought. The agreement says you can cut all you want from defense. If you all want to cut much more than the President, cut it. But the agreement says you have already agreed on domestic spending. You agreed a year and a half ago on that. And that new savings should go in defense. New savings should go to the deficit. That is really the issue.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, of course, we agreed 2 years ago, when circumstances were different, we agreed 2 years ago to cut domestic spending in real terms by \$6 to \$8 billion.

Mr. DOMENICI. When?

Mr. JOHNSTON. As part of this budget agreement.

Mr. DOMENICI. Over what years?

Mr. JOHNSTON. From last year to this year.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator want to forget the previous 2 years in terms of how much we increased it?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Let us talk about the previous 10 years, Mr. President.

I wonder if my colleagues can see this chart, which shows that, in the previous 10 years, entitlements went up some \$776 billion; defense went up some \$624 billion in real terms, whereas domestic discretionary went down \$395 billion. That is the real trend. I cannot give you the chapter and verse on the first year of this budget agreement.

I wonder if my friend from Tennessee has that figure handy, in real terms?

Mr. SASSER. I do not have that figure handy, but I would like to ask my friend from Louisiana if he would yield for just one question.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, of course.

Mr. SASSER. Of course, as I indicated earlier, the Senator from Louisiana is the chairman of the Energy Committee and chairman of the Energy-Water Appropriations Subcommittee, which has the responsibility for funding a whole host of different projects, including, as I understand it, the superconducting super collider. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SASSER. I ask my friend from Louisiana this question: The President's budget for fiscal year 1993 includes \$650 million in budget authority for the superconducting super collider. That is a 34-percent increase compared to last year.

I just ask my friend from Louisiana, is there any way of funding this superconducting super collider that has a 34-percent increase in the President's budget at the President's levels if his subcommittee is going to sustain a cut in the funding coming to them in real terms?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am a strong supporter, as I stated earlier, of the superconducting super collider. I think it is the most important science project in America. And I think it is a

very good illustration of why we need at least to maintain our current levels.

But, yes, for the superconducting super collider, the President's budget asks for that big increase. If we are going to build it, we have to have a substantial increase in the superconducting super collider. But I am frank to say right now I do not know where the money is coming from. I can tell my friend from Tennessee I hope he and I can find some accounts in the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee from which we can find the money. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will help me find that money. I do not know whether any of those national labs in New Mexico can sustain a little bit of a cut so we can build the superconducting super collider.

Mr. SASSER. Just on that point, if the Senator will yield, I note the President's request for the Department of Energy's high energy and nuclear physics programs will increase by 1 percent in budget authority from 1992 to 1993; that is 1 percent in real terms.

Given the fact that the superconducting super collider is going to increase, according to the President's budget, about 34 percent in real terms and the physics and nuclear physics programs are going to increase by 1 percent, how in the world is the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Energy-Water Appropriations Subcommittee, going to fund both of those areas?

In other words, am I going to have to take a cut at the Oak Ridge National Laboratories? Or is my friend in New Mexico going to have to take a cut at Los Alamos to fund the superconducting super collider? Or can you make cuts large enough there to go ahead and fund the superconducting super collider? I do not see how we are going to do it, and I will be frank to say I do not want to take those cuts at Oak Ridge. We need to be funding these national labs at a higher level because that is where some of the best basic research in this country is done. If we are going to be competitive in this international environment, I want to be giving those national laboratories the resources they need for research and development to develop the high tech to make this country once again number one.

So, how can we fund them and fund the superconducting super collider?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I can tell you it is a terrible challenge.

This political year is so replete with polemic politics that sometimes the truth hardly lurks on this floor, at least in unadulterated unexpurgated form. It is hard to find sometimes, and that is probably true on both sides of the aisle. Everybody is trying to make a political advantage. I understand that. I probably participated in it myself.

But, Mr. President, we are not kidding on this firewall business. We are

just not kidding. These are not idle threats. I can tell you, we are engaged, my staff and I, right now in trying to figure out where we are going to fund those things that are highest priority.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. First, I want to ask again, if the Senator will indulge me, could we in the not too distant future permit the Senator from South Carolina to speak? I asked him to come down here to help me out, and he has been waiting.

But let me suggest to my friend before he answers that, these are the numbers: Discretionary appropriations went up, from 1990 to 1991, 12.3 percent in budget authority, 8.4 percent in outlays.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is in nominal terms?

Mr. DOMENICI. That is nominal.

Mr. JOHNSTON. What did that amount to in real terms?

Mr. DOMENICI. I do not have the real terms. Take about 3.5 percent off, so you have real terms, it is over 9 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON. 8.4 percent, you take off 3 percent, it does not equal 9.

Mr. DOMENICI. What governs expenditures is budget authority, and it is 12.3 percent. That is what it went up in budget authority, and it went up 10.8 percent in budget authority in 1991 over 1992.

Let me just suggest to the Senator that he is giving us the best example, as I understand it. I agree with him on most items of discretionary expenditure, and I agree with him that increases in discretionary appropriations do not come anywhere close to entitlement increases for the devastation we are causing to our next generation because of the ensuing deficits. The spending superstars are found in the mandatory programs, the entitlements.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. DOMENICI. But, "but" if we do not have a cap on defense, and a wall that says you cannot spend any savings below this cap on anything but defense, then what will happen is the very arguments being made here about the laboratories and about the superconducting super collider. Think with me and with others in the Appropriations Committee about how defense is going to be ravaged. The war is over. The Soviets have given up. How about another billion for—forget the labs—how about another billion into Health and Human Services programs where everybody is saying we do not have enough? We never have enough.

Essentially, without a wall during this buildup period, this Congress has to answer a question about the appropriations process. I serve on the Appropriations Committee with the Senator and I truly believe it does one of the best jobs around and that is prob-

ably because we have to produce spending bills every year. The question is, are we satisfied to throw the entire appropriations process into one pool and play grab bag for domestic appropriations and what is left over will be the defense number? I do not believe so. I think we ought to set the defense number through acts of Congress with the President. And that is what the defense cap is.

If you suggest another cap that is firm, then maybe we can start talking, when this bill has been defeated, about how should we set the caps. But do not tear it down and let us play, literally, "How much can we get out of defense in the appropriation process?" It will not work and it is not fair.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wonder if it would be possible to tear down the caps in a certain amount, let us say—what does the President propose as his cut? Just take that much and tear down the wall for that much. Could that be agreed to?

Mr. DOMENICI. Why do we not dispose of this bill, which, as I understand it, is just an arbitrary removal of the discretionary categories and their associated caps, and leave it there, and let us let the principals in this place talk about reaffirming the caps at some level and maybe—maybe—adjusting to some of the problems you see and maybe setting another defense cap next year that is realistic with the downfall of the Soviet Union? But not now.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Is my friend from New Mexico saying we could readjust the cap for this year or wait until next year to do it?

Mr. DOMENICI. I said right now we ought to defeat a bill that arbitrarily pulls it down and sets no defense level whatsoever leaving it exclusively to the inner workings of the appropriations process. I say, forget about that kind of bill. But when that is done, maybe we could start talking, with the President, about what the wall might be and what they should be for 1993 and what they might be for 1994. That might be the subject matter of discussion.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I am glad at least that my friend from New Mexico, who is a serious budgeteer and I must say, if I may have the attention of my friend from New Mexico—Mr. President, I was getting ready to make a compliment of the Senator from New Mexico. He does not often get compliments, so gracious is that which I was going to give. I was going to say he is really a serious budgeteer who tries to do the right thing within limits. There are partisan limits with all of us.

I think what I am hearing is he recognizes this problem I have talked about this year which means if we do not take down or change the firewalls this year, we have to cut back on existing levels of spending this year and

that if we do not adjust those firewalls, either by doing what this bill says, which is removing them, or at least changing those limits, we are going to have to cut back from last year's real appropriated levels.

The Senator does not agree with that.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me say to my friend from Louisiana, first I thank him for the compliment. I truly appreciate it. I thought he was going to say within limits and then say limits that are his, but he did not. He said political limits.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is a very extravagant compliment from me. My friend from New Mexico occupies the highest level in the Senate, in my estimation.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me thank him for that. Last year when we were debating the appropriations bills as they relate to this increase—1991 to 1992, 10.8 percent in budget authority, nominal, and 7.3 percent outlays for labor, health, and human services—I asked why are we providing a huge sum of money for the last day of the year? It was done anyway, right?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I opposed that along with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. The point the Senator is making is now he has allowed an increase under his domestic cap of 4.7 percent in outlays, but see, there is not very much money really available because it has been used up by that late funding that got by up here and predetermined the disposition of the appropriations assets, to wit, the allocable money. That happened and some people think it was great that it happened. Two of those who wanted it are here and they are gleeful about it because they received their education money in advance. It is not going to be available twice. So they are going to get it because it is appropriated, unless we choose to cut something in that subcommittee, which might be a surprise. You can do that if you would like, just say you already received your money, so you do not get the full load. That could be done and it would give you some additional money in your subcommittee.

So I do not think I want to agree that things would be terrible if we had to live up to the agreement. I do not think I agree yet. But I do say you surely should not arbitrarily throw away the agreed-upon cap for defense under the circumstances encapsulated in this bill, which is the subject of the motion.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I appreciate that history which goes into a lot of those numbers, and I suspect as we talk about some of that history on the floor, it will pass by many Members of the Senate who are not experts on these arcane rules of budgeting and the Appropriations Committee.

On that particular instance, I happen to agree with the Senator from New

Mexico about that last day funding phenomenon. However, Mr. President, the essential point, and I come back to it, is that under this agreement, we are going to have to cut in real terms from last year by about \$7 billion at a time when there is a demand for huge increases for things like the superconducting super collider, which I am for.

We can talk about all this history. We can talk about all the things that have been wrong in the past, and I will agree with some and I will disagree with some, but mark my words, if we do not bring down these firewalls, there will not be any increases in domestic discretionary spending; there will be decreases. There will be no room for these initiatives that we want to take, and I believe a majority of Senators are going to be disappointed and surprised at the result.

Let me repeat that simple little phenomenon, which is we are going to have to cut domestic discretionary in the midst of this recession by about \$7 billion unless we breach the firewalls. If we breach the firewalls, then we can get together because the President can veto any spending bill, Mr. President. If it is too big a cut, he can veto it, and I do not believe there is a single spending bill under the George Bush Presidency which does not bear his signature. I ask my friend from Tennessee; is that correct?

Mr. SASSER. I am not aware of one. I do recall the vetoes of the two unemployment insurance extensions. I do not know if that would qualify as a spending bill or not. These are the only two vetoes of spending bills I recall.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The point is I believe every single spending bill under this President, and he vetoed a number, has been sustained.

Mr. SASSER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON. He has the atom bomb. If we do not agree with him, we can take down firewalls—

Mr. SASSER. I misunderstood the Senator's question. Congress has not overridden this President's veto on any item since he has been President of the United States. He is batting a thousand.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right. The Congress is not going to force anything on the President in this political year which he must take and cannot veto. But all I am saying is we have to take down these firewalls if we are just going to maintain the status quo. I hope my friends will let us do that.

Mr. President, I would like to apologize to my distinguished friend from South Carolina who has listened to too many of these comments. I know he is anxious to make his speech, and I will yield to him at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion to pro-

ceed to S. 2399, the so-called firewalls legislation. I do so for the following reasons:

Legislation similar to this is currently bogged down in the Budget Committee, and this legislation represents an attempt to bypass the committee process.

Removing the firewalls would give free reign to those who want to decimate the Nation's defense programs and further fuel deficit spending.

Mr. President, just yesterday, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator NUNN, wrote to the chairman of the Budget Committee that he could not recommend significant reductions in the President's fiscal year 1993 budget levels. This sentiment was echoed by the distinguished ranking member of the committee, Senator WARNER. S. 2399, which was not considered by the Budget Committee and is not supported by a majority of that committee, completely ignores the advice of the leadership of the Armed Services Committee. Of equal importance is the fact that removing the firewalls will devastate the orderly drawdown of the Nation's defense structure that the Congress and the administration worked out just 2 years ago.

Last Friday, General Powell testified before the Armed Services Committee that the Department of Defense is bringing down the force as quickly as is practical. Additional cuts to the defense budget would "tear the heart out of the force." This legislation would permit further cuts and force additional men and women out on the street. It would mean that Congress not only is breaking the budget agreement, but is also breaking faith with the men and women in uniform who have served this Nation so well, and who have committed themselves to a career in the service of their country.

Mr. President, this legislation will not be a quick fix for the Nation's economic problems. It will not reduce the deficit, in fact it will increase the deficit. If we are going to reduce defense, which in the out years may be possible, the savings should be used to reduce the deficit which will benefit the Nation in the long term.

Mr. President, the goal of those who advocate this legislation is to cut defense and therefore accelerate the draw down of our forces. In my judgment, that is a grave mistake—a mistake that is best described in the words of General Powell—and for the record, of course, General Powell is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These are his words. I quote:

It takes a long time to build a force of the quality that we have today, unmatched in our nation's history—one that we can be proud of and depend on to answer any challenge we throw at it. To develop strong leaders, produce the best equipment, and train the forces to the peak of readiness takes decades—but the force can be broken overnight.

That is one of my greatest concerns today. If you go too fast, if you stray too far from the carefully crafted plan we have put together to draw down the force, you will break it. And if you break the force, we may not be able to fix it in time, the next time it is needed.

Mr. President, if the Senate approved S. 2399 we may break the force. I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to proceed.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.
Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in very strong support of the motion to proceed to consider this legislation, S. 2399, that is before us.

If there is any arbitrariness present in the situation, it is the arbitrariness of trying to hold to a defense figure that was agreed upon 18 months ago when the international situation was entirely different from the international situation with which we find ourselves confronted today.

I am pleased to join the very able chairman of the Budget Committee as a sponsor of this legislation. It does one simple thing. It takes down what is now an arbitrary wall between defense spending and domestic spending, making it possible, to shift money from the defense budget into the domestic arena.

Taking down this arbitrary wall of separation will not guarantee that result. Far from it. That is an action which will have to be considered and debated within the committees and within the body.

But the current situation arbitrarily precludes what I think is a desperately needed debate on national priorities. Are we going to stay stuck with the same figures indefinitely into the future as circumstances change all around us?

When this budget agreement was reached, it was not then clear that the economy was in a recession, although later it was shown that the recession began in the summer of 1990. But at that point, no one had any appreciation that we would be facing the longest recession in the post-World War II period, and that we would be confronting a very serious situation in which the budget deficit is being added to significantly by the downturn in the economy. The recessionary downturn in the economy has itself contributed markedly to the increase in the budget deficit which we are now confronting.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield for a question.

Mr. SASSER. I know that the distinguished Senator from Maryland is the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in Congress, which has the responsibility for studying the economy and making various predictions and also prescribing various remedies to

the Congress for problems in the economy, but is the Senator aware that because of the decline in economic growth and the attendant loss of revenue coming into the Federal Government as a result of that, this in and of itself has increased the deficit by some calculations as much as anywhere from \$70 to \$100 billion?

Mr. SARBANES. That is my understanding. As much as \$100 billion can be attributed to the economic downturn.

Mr. SASSER. So when we talk about a \$350 to \$400 billion deficit, we attribute as much as \$100 billion of that to the recession that we are presently in?

Mr. SARBANES. That is correct. And you can attribute another large portion of it to the savings and loan problem.

Mr. SASSER. Does the distinguished Senator have a ballpark figure as to the amount of the deficit, the degree to which the deficit has been increased by the savings and loan problem this year?

Mr. SARBANES. I know it is in excess of \$100 billion, and I know that of the deficit we are confronting, more than half of it is the consequence of the savings and loan situation and the downturn in the economy.

Mr. SASSER. Let me ask the distinguished Senator this as a result of his work in the Joint Economic Committee and also taking notice of the fact that the Senator from Maryland is an economist in his own right prior to coming to the Senate.

Mr. SARBANES. I am not going to plead guilty to that.

Mr. SASSER. I am going to assign that achievement to the Senator from Maryland because I think it is accurate. He is an economist of some note.

But historically, in a time of economic recession—and we have now been in a recession for some 20 months—preceded by a period of flat economic growth, no economic growth, so we have either been in a period of no growth or recession now for almost 3 years—historically, what has been the fiscal or legislative policy of prior administrations in trying to deal with these economic turndowns, and what has been the recommendation or reputable economists with regard to increasing or decreasing domestic spending during these periods?

Mr. SARBANES. What we have done consistently in an economic downturn is use some Federal fiscal stimulus to move the economy upward to get out of the recession, recognizing that if we stay in a downturn the deficit is automatically going to grow. We have been constrained in trying to follow that policy in the recession because the deficit had been enlarged to very high figures in the 1980's.

What happened to the 1980's is you had a very large increase in defense

spending. You made erosions in the revenue base, you ran a deficit, and then you ran a debt to finance that deficit, which then in turn becomes a charge on the Federal budget.

So that we are now committing a large share of the budget to cover the cost of this debt which resulted from running these deficits through the 1980's. We ran large deficits. They added to the debt. You then had to service the debt, and that became a component in each succeeding budget.

We have had some economists who have recommended that despite the existing deficit, we use some stimulus in order to try to move out of this economic situation. Others have counseled against it on the theory, that the economy is going to come out of this situation in any event. They are worried that the Fed will tighten its monetary policy. Although I must observe that only with a cut last December did the Fed's monetary policy in this recession even begin to compare with the easing of monetary policy in previous recessions, and those were recessions in which fiscal policy had been stimulative, which it has not been in this downturn.

The President himself in his proposals added to the deficit. The President's proposal on the withholding provisions added \$16 billion to the deficit. So even the administration recognizes this problem and is trying to search for some ways to provide some stimulus to the economy.

It has been suggested that if you take down the wall, you are going to add to the deficit. That is not the case. This proposal does not affect the overall figures.

(Mr. LIEBERMAN assumed the chair.)

Mr. SARBANES. All this proposal says is that if the wall comes down, you can then consider shifting some of the defense money into the domestic programs. There is not going to be an increase in total spending. That still is going to be constrained.

I will ask the chairman of the committee: Is it not correct that under this proposal, if adopted, we are still constrained by the overall limitations of the budget agreement? Is that not correct?

Mr. SASSER. Yes; the Senator from Maryland is quite correct. If you take down this wall between military spending and domestic discretionary spending, you will still have a cap at which overall spending cannot go beyond.

If I might give an illustration, let us say that you have a container filled with water. And in the center of that container you have a divider, and the water is at one level on one side of the divider and at another level on the other side of the divider. If you take the divider out of the container and the water seeks the same level, you have not increased the total amount of

water. You simply have adjusted the levels between the two small bodies of water there.

That is essentially what we are doing here. We take down the wall. Then, if the Congress or if the U.S. Senate through the operation of the committees, if after debate on the floor, if after a majority vote is cast as we do in all other other legislative matters, and if the U.S. Senate arrives at a judgment after all of this that they wish to decrease military spending and/or use that military spending for domestic discretionary purposes, or it is conservable—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield? Is it not possible that under this proposal you could take the wall down and the Senate could reach the decision that they did not want to shift any money from the military to the domestic side? Is that not correct?

Mr. SASSER. That is quite correct. Mr. SARBANES. The fact of the wall coming down does not in and of itself lead to any substantive decision. That is another decision that has to be made. At that point we could decide we want to shift some, we might decide we do not want to shift any or we might decide we will shift some to domestic investment, shift some to domestic and leave the balance in the military budget. Is that not correct?

Mr. SASSER. Conversely, this is highly unlikely. But if the wall comes down, it could be possible to take some of the funding from domestic investment, for example, take some funding from the highway program, or take some money from education, or take some money from health services and use those funds to build another aircraft carrier if somebody wanted to do that once this wall is down.

Those are all decisions that will have to be made in the future in using due process that we use here in the Senate. We are simply saying that the wall ought to come down 12 months earlier than it would come down anyway as a condition precedent to allowing the Senate to exercise its judgment and its discretion on these particular matters.

Mr. SARBANES. In effect, what the Senator's proposal would do is allow us to have what I would regard as a proper debate on what our national priorities ought to be. It is my view, that we have shortchanged important investments in our Nation's infrastructure which is affecting our productivity. It compares very badly with the investment made by our international economic competitors.

Japan and Germany are investing a significant higher amount of gross product in domestic infrastructure, in physical infrastructure, in education, and in training—than is the United States.

It is my contention that our performance with respect to productivity is affected by this shortage of investment

that is taking place in this country. Clearly, our national priorities have shifted dramatically.

Does anyone seriously contend when they analyze our security situation and our defense requirements that they can make the same case today for a defense spending level that could be made 18 months ago before the implosion of the Soviet Union?

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly. Mr. SASSER. The able Senator from Maryland just a few moments ago referred to the difference between the infrastructure investment in the United States and infrastructure investment in Japan. As we all know, infrastructure investment is investment in roads, bridges, highways, airports, waterlines, sewerlines, wastewater treatment plants, airports, the whole constellation of things that allow a large industrial country to grow and expand and produce wealth.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the 1980's Japan invested nearly 6 percent of its gross domestic product in infrastructure; Germany invested 4 percent of its gross domestic product in infrastructure while at the same time the United State of America invested three-tenths of 1 percent of our gross domestic product in our infrastructure? In other words, the Japanese invested a 19 times larger share of their national income over the decade of the 1980's in improving their country by way of infrastructure. Is the Senator from Maryland aware of that?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes; the consequences of that is the shortfall in our productivity performance compared with Japan and with Germany. Productivity is closely tied to public and private investment.

There is a tendency on the part of some to think of investment only as private investment. It is very important to recognize that investment in the public sector upon which the private sector relies and depends in order to carry out its economic performance is also significant.

If you run a trucking company and your truck sits in a traffic jam for 4 hours because of an inadequate highway system, that comes directly out of your productivity and out of the efficiency of your enterprise.

So there is an interconnection between the performance of the private sector and the environment in those aspects of the public sector that constitute the infrastructure both in physical and human capital on which the private sector depends.

Let us not kid ourselves. These other countries recognize that there is an interconnection between these two things, and they have been making much more significant investments in their public infrastructure. They are performing much better in terms of

their productivity because they are getting a steady improvement in the skills of their work force and the physical infrastructure with which they work.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for just a question here?

The Senator from Maryland makes a point that there is a direct relationship between infrastructure investment and worker productivity.

I have two questions to frame for my friend from Maryland.

One, is it not true that Japanese and German workers, for that matter, are increasing their rate of productivity faster than American workers? That is No. 1. No. 2: Is not productivity the crucial factor in increasing standards of living and enhancing the quality of life of the workers themselves? Is it not all attendant to the rate of increase of productivity and the creation of wealth?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, the path to a higher standard of living is through an improved performance in productivity. The Senator is absolutely correct, and our productivity performance, compared with Japan and Europe, has lagged over the last decade and a half. Their productivity performance has been better than ours.

One of the reasons for it is that they have recognized the necessity to make these investments in their domestic infrastructure and the necessity to make the investments in education and in worker training and retraining. Some of those countries have very highly advanced worker training and retraining programs, which enable them to adjust to the changes in economic circumstances.

You have to adjust to changing circumstances. The dinosaur eventually went extinct because it was unable to adjust to changing circumstances. What we are being told today is that judgments that were made 18 months ago about what the defense budget should be are still valid, even though the Soviet Union has imploded in the meantime.

It is one thing to face the defense requirements at a time when you were still facing a Soviet Union and all of the threats that were attendant thereto. We had arguments even then about whether the level of spending was not enough, adequate, or too much. But those were all debates that took place up at a high range of defense spending.

Then you get the collapse of the Soviet Union. You get a fundamental alteration in the threat that we confront internationally. It is not eliminated; I am not asserting that for a moment. There are still important security concerns that we have to address. But I do not think anybody can reasonably argue that the security threat has not been markedly changed in a direction that is favorable to us.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator mean to suggest that if the Congress of the United States wants to cut defense substantially below what was agreed upon a year and a half ago, 18 months ago, that Congress is prohibited from doing that unless this amendment is passed? Does the Senator mean that?

Mr. SARBANES. No. The Congress can cut it to any level it wants. The question is what use will be made of the resources.

Mr. DOMENICI. Precisely.

Mr. SARBANES. We are now in a recession. If you cut the defense budget and do not have an economic strategy for trying to redirect that economic effort, you will contribute to the economic downturn. The consequence of that will be to make the deficit larger in the guise of reducing the deficit.

Mr. DOMENICI. Is the Senator suggesting we have such a plan?

Mr. SARBANES. We have a defense budget that was set in a different time to different circumstances.

Mr. DOMENICI. I was not asking about that.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I would assert that we do not need that high a figure for defense spending anymore. People can challenge that, and I gather some do in the Defense Department. In fact, they are busily developing different scenarios of what the threat might be which would warrant or justify this budget.

Does the Senator from New Mexico recall the scenario where Russia would invade Lithuania through Poland, and Iraq would invade Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, and there would be a coup in Panama, and a coup in the Philippines, and there would be an invasion by North Korea of South Korea? Then they laid out some other possibilities as well.

Mr. SASSER. Would all this occur simultaneously?

Mr. SARBANES. That is an interesting point. As I understand the way they did the exercise, they posited that at least one of these would occur, and maybe two could occur at the same time. I am not quite sure why they were so cautious, because if you had posited that all of them occurred at the same time, you might even have been able to construct a case for a larger defense budget than existed at the time when we faced the threat of the Soviet Union.

I do not mean to be light with this issue or with this question. Obviously, it is a serious matter, and you need to think through carefully what your defense requirements are under changed circumstances. But, very clearly, there have been changed circumstances.

The question then becomes what can you do, and how can you address this defense budget. If you take that budget down at a time when we are in a recession and do not have an alternative

economic strategy for the use of the resources, you are going to help to drive the economy deeper into a depression.

Many of us feel that if you had a choice as to the use of some of this money, what you ought to do with this peace dividend is to try to address two very basic needs of the economy. One is an investment strategy, a domestic investment strategy, in order to enhance American productivity. The other is a deficit reducing component. You could do both of these things as a way of trying to get at some of the fundamental problems associated with the economy.

In fact, we are running three deficits that need to be addressed. We are running a budget deficit, a trade deficit, which has made us a debtor country on the international scene; and we are running an investment deficit. At some point, we have to face this shortfall in investment.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SARBANES. Certainly.

Mr. SASSER. On the overall question of investment, we do know that an extraordinary amount of the most talented scientists and engineers in this country have been involved now for over 40 years in the production of weapons. That is one reason that American weaponry is the best in the world.

We saw American weapons perform in the Persian Gulf, and they performed extraordinarily well, better than anyone else's. Other products made in the United States do not stack up as well against products made in other countries, because we do not devote the same proportion of our engineering and scientific capability to producing many consumer products and other products as we do to military weapons.

The Office of Technology Assessment, as my friend from Maryland, I am sure, is aware, issued a very excellent report on the consequences of a defense or military buildup and what impact that would have on the civilian economic community. That report indicated that well over a quarter of a million engineers alone are involved in the direct design or production of weapons.

As we phase down these various weapons production facilities and these weapons research facilities, the question comes what is to become of these clusters of excellence that, in decades past, have produced this state-of-the-art technology and weaponry. Under the straitjacket of this budget legislation that we now labor under, as I understand it, we would be prohibited from using military savings to devise programs to convert these scientists and engineers who are now engaged in the design and manufacture of weaponry. We would be prohibited from using funds out of the military side to devise programs to bring them into the civilian economic mainstream, and the

distinguished Senator is talking about an investment deficit. Would this not contribute to the investment deficit in our civilian economy productivity?

Mr. SARBANES. Absolutely. What happened is as we approached the end of World War II, the Nation had an economic conversion program. It consciously formulated an economic conversion program. The most important parts of that were reconversion of industry to civilian production. The renewal of the physical infrastructure of the Nation and the development of people's personal capacities, the clearest example of which was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, what we know as the GI bill of rights. On the basis of this act millions of people got an education, they elevated their skills and talents, and then were able to contribute to the rapid expansion of the American economy that took place in the post-World War II period. We did not do either of these things after the Korean war and the Vietnam war, and in both of these latter instances, the cutbacks in defense were accompanied by recessions far more serious than the brief downturn which did take place in 1945 but was very brief and very shallow.

Mr. SASSER. Conversely, if I may say to my friend from Maryland, because there were no conversion programs following the Korean war and the war in Vietnam, there were recessions as we cut back on defense spending.

Mr. SARBANES. That is exactly correct.

Mr. SASSER. I had the great good fortune as a boy to grow to young manhood in the years following the Second World War, in the 1950's. I recall the explosion in productivity that took place in this country and the enhancement of the quality of life of our citizenry. People in the past who lived in a house with one bathroom moved into a house with two bathrooms. People in the past who struggled to buy one new car every 10 years, suddenly were a two-car family. We remember that from the decade of the 1950's and 1960's. I say this to my friend.

Could a measure of that prosperity and expansion of prosperity be attributable to the wise leaders of that time, such as President Truman and others, who put into place an economic conversion program to take young men and women out of the military, educate them, and put them into civilian life where they could produce and to move industries that had been producing weaponry into the mainstream of civilian economic activity?

Mr. SARBANES. Absolutely. There has to be an economic strategy plan in order to accomplish this conversion.

Here is the question: Is there anyone who asserts that we should continue to spend money in the defense sector that does not need to be spent? I hope we

can get agreement on that. We may argue about what the level of defense should be, and we have had those arguments frequently here on the floor of the Senate. But anyone who insists on holding to the defense figure that was reached 18 months ago has to take the position that all of these developments and change in circumstances which have occurred internationally in the intervening period of time have not sufficiently altered the nature of the threat that we confront and that we cannot make adjustments in the defense budget. It seems clear that the nature of the threat has been sufficiently reduced and that we can make adjustments in the military budget.

The question then becomes: What do you do with those resources that are freed up? There are a number of possibilities. The budget agreement would require that all of them be used to reduce the deficit. In a recession, following that line of approach will only make the recession worse because you have people no longer producing and not provided with an alternative way to produce.

One way to address that question is to have an investment strategy for America. We need that strategy. Three years ago, before the collapse of the Soviet Union, over 300 economists issued an open letter to the President and Congress calling for a renewed commitment to public investment. That letter was sent before the collapse of the Soviet Union and the historic transformation of the international security environment. Even then, these distinguished economic experts believed there was a considerable potential shift of funds from military needs to domestic investment. Clearly, the potential for such a shift is even greater today. And let me quote just briefly from that letter:

In addition to our trade and fiscal deficits, America faces a third deficit, the deficiency of public investment in our people and our economic infrastructure. This deficit will have a crippling effect on America's future competitiveness. Just as business must continually reinvest in order to prosper, so must the Nation. Higher productivity, the key to higher living standards, is a function of public as well as private investment.

Higher productivity is a function of public as well as private investment. If America is to succeed in an increasingly competitive world, we must expand efforts to equip our children with better education and our workers with more advanced skills. We must fix our bridges and expand our airports. We must accelerate the diffusion of technology to small- and medium-sized business.

Yet, these needs have been neglected throughout the past decade. In real dollar terms, Federal spending in the 1980's on science and civilian technology has been significantly below the levels of 1960's and 1970's. We actually are spending a smaller percentage of

our gross national product on civilian research and development than either Japan or Germany by a significant amount.

I want to emphasize that. This is civilian research and development, the very thing that goes into developing high-technology performance in the civilian sector, and the United States is spending a smaller percentage of its gross national product on civilian research and development than either Germany or Japan. We invest 1.9 percent of our gross domestic product in civilian research. Germany invests 2.8 percent, and Japan invests 3 percent.

Taking down this artificial wall would then lead to another debate on these very issues. You would then be debating if you should shift some money, and if so what should you use it for? But that is what setting priorities is all about. We are in an artificial situation, on an automatic pilot that was set 18 months ago. Two very fundamental things have changed since that agreement was reached.

We have been in this recession now for 21 months. That is one fundamental change. The other fundamental change is what has transpired on the international scene which has eroded the rationale for the defense figure that was set in the fall of 1990.

Now are we going to be absolutely blind to these developments? What kind of policymaking is that? I am prepared to have the debate on the priorities. I understand that others have a different set of priorities. Either they would not shift any defense money, they would want to hold to the old figure, or if that money became available, they would use it in other ways, either entirely or in some combination.

That is what the debate should be about here on the floor of the Senate. We ought to pass this legislation and then move on to the critical national debate which is now called for in terms of what our national priorities should be. But we ought not to adhere to an artificial wall which is clearly no longer pertinent and relevant to the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield just a moment?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator was speaking just a moment ago about investment in the country and the need for investment and the investment deficit. Now clearly one of the investment deficits, as I understood the Senator from Maryland, one of the deficits surrounded education. We simply had a deficit in investment in education.

I would like to bring to the attention of my friend from Maryland and to the attention of all of my colleagues, the almost universal support that this bill has from the education community. Yesterday, every Senator received a huge variety of letters from a variety of education groups, all of them urging

passage of this legislation to take down the wall between military spending and domestic spending. And did my friend from Maryland know, for example, that these individuals support this legislation:

Robin Vink, representing the New York State Education Department; Becky H. Timmons from the American Council on Education; Alfred D. Sumberg, American Association of University Professors; Gerald Morris, American Federation of Teachers; Ken McInerney, National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators; Marcia Knutson, American Educational Research Association; Carnie C. Hayes of the Council of Chief State School Officers; Patricia M. Hawkins, National Association of College Admission Counselors; John B. Forkenbrock, National Association of Federally Impacted Schools; Edward M. Elmendorf of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities; Mary R. Costabile, American Library Association; Edward Kealy, National School Boards Association; David Baime, National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities; Moses Holmes, CEF treasurer, National Education Association; Richard A. Kruse, CEF vice president, National Association of Secondary School Principals; and Arnold L. Mitchem, CEF president, National Council of Educational Opportunity Associations.

So I say to my friend that leaders in education have recognized that there is an investment deficit in education and they realize that the removal of this arbitrary wall between domestic spending and military spending is necessary if we are to start meeting some of the needs in the investment deficit in education. Was my friend aware that all these various groups of distinguished educators had formed together as a coalition to try to urge the lifting of this wall between military spending and domestic spending?

Mr. SARBANES. I say to my colleague, I think what that reflects is an understanding that if we are to realize a peace dividend and then confront the question of what to do with the peace dividend, it seems to me that there are two fundamental objectives we need to work at in terms of strengthening our national economy in the use of the peace dividend.

One objective is to reduce the deficit. I accept that as an important objective in strengthening the American economy, although I point out that in a time of recession you are restrained on how much you can address that objective because you run the risk of contributing to the economic downturn.

The other is an investment strategy. There are lots of candidates for an investment strategy, and education is obviously one of them, but there are others as well. You need an economic strategy plan and you need to relate it

to the reductions that are taking place on the defense side.

The distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee is absolutely correct. You have enormously talented and gifted people who have been working in the defense industries and have been serving in the Armed Forces.

We ought to regard this change internationally as an opportunity. It is being treated as though it is a negative development. It is a positive development. It opens up opportunities.

The question then becomes, what opportunities? Let me give you an example. Virtually every airport in America needs an upgraded air traffic control system. We are behind. We are paying for it in public safety. We are paying for it in airport delays. You circle and circle and circle and circle. The people working on the ground say we need an upgrade.

Some very sophisticated technology has come along. We have some very able people who have been working in those technologies on the military side. What is going to happen to these people? Why does it not make sense that there should be a program that would begin to address the deficit that exists in air traffic control systems and that some of the people who have been working on the military side of that technology are going to move over into the civilian side of that technology?

That is just one example of what may contribute an economic strategy plan. We developed such a plan at the end of World War II and it worked exceedingly well. We had unprecedented growth in the post-World War II period. We cannot get to these kinds of questions as long as we are arbitrarily constrained by this artificial budget wall.

This is not touching the larger question of the overall limits. That is accepted by this legislation.

It is incorrect to say that if the wall comes down and you shift from defense spending to domestic spending you will increase the deficit. That is just not correct. The spending is now committed on the defense side. If you take the wall down and shift it, the defense spending will be less, the domestic spending will be more. The deficit will not be increased.

We have pressing needs, not only in human terms, but also in social terms as they affect the American economy's ability to be productive and therefore to compete.

I want to have that debate on the floor of the Senate. I want colleagues who deny that necessity to make their case, if they have one.

I am talking about the kinds of investments that go to the future strength of the economy. There are a whole range of domestic programs, and I am not talking about the ones that represent current consumption. I am talking about the ones that represent investment in the future.

In fact, we do not have an investment budget at the national level. That is one of the problems. We do not have a budget that separates out the investments in the future strength of the economy.

I am talking about the kind of investments that our international competitors are making. Is it only coincidence that Europe and Japan have a better productivity record than we do, and have a better investment record than we do? I do not think so.

I think we have to face the fact that we need an investment strategy that encompasses both the public and the private sector. But we have neglected investment in the public sector over these last 10 years. Unless we start making that investment we are not going to be able to strengthen the sinews of our economy in such a way that we will have a vital, effective, competitive economy in the future. We ought to have that debate. The way we get that debate is to eliminate the artificial wall and then have a discussion about what our priorities ought to be.

I am prepared to have that debate. I may win or I may lose. I do not know where I will come out on the specifics of the issue. But we clearly ought to have the debate and not be frozen in a set of priorities that was set 18 months ago when we did not recognize how deeply we were into a recession, and we did not have the developments on the international scene, and in particular the collapse of the Soviet Union, that have fundamentally altered the international security position and therefore fundamentally changed the necessity or the requirements imposed upon us in the defense field.

So, Mr. President, I very strongly urge the adoption of S. 2399, and I very strongly commend the chairman of the committee for coming forward with it, and for the very strong leadership which he has exercised on the issue.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield on this issue?

Mr. SARBANES. Surely.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I want to be clear here, as I direct this question to the Senator from Maryland. What we are debating, now, is just the question of can we proceed to debate the bill to take down the walls between military spending and domestic discretionary spending. In other words, there are those on the other side who do not even want to debate this issue. They refuse to give agreement to let us go forward and take up the bill and debate it. That is what we are talking about here today.

We are simply asking to move forward to take up the bill and debate it and let it be voted up or down.

The Senator from Maryland, as I understand it, says he is willing to abide by majority rule here. But he thinks it is an issue, as I understand him—and I hope he will correct me if I am wrong

about what he is saying is—he thinks it is an issue of sufficient magnitude to the country that it ought to be debated here on the floor of the U.S. Senate. And the procedural problem that we find ourselves confronted with at the present time is that some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to agree to go forward and debate the bill on its merits. I ask my friend from Maryland, is that not the parliamentary situation we find ourselves in at the present time?

Mr. SARBANES. The Senator is correct. We are dealing with an issue of prime importance, in terms of setting our national priorities. We cannot even get to the bill to debate the question of taking down the wall.

Even if the wall comes down we still face the debate of what the priorities ought to be. But at least we open up the opportunity to have a proper discussion of what our national priorities are.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, let me ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who I think has on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, with his customarily eloquent and perceptive address, discussed some of the issues that face this country as we go through the decade of the 1990's and approach the year 2000; crucial issues which must be addressed. I welcome the observations of the Senator from Maryland and his views as we move along the road and try to address these issues.

But, as I understand it—and I ask the Senator from Maryland this question—we have to cross two bridges before any of the military money could be used for domestic purposes. The first bridge that has to be crossed is to debate and pass the bill to take down the wall that separates military spending and domestic spending. Am I correct in that?

Mr. SARBANES. That is correct. Otherwise the military figure is frozen on the basis of a decision that was made 18 months ago when the military threat we were confronting was entirely different from the military threat which we confront today. I cannot understand how anyone can rationally argue that we ought to stay with that set of priorities given the developments that have occurred internationally. So that is the first hurdle.

If you take down the wall you still have the debate over what should be done, and maybe some Members would assert at that point, that we ought to keep the military figure right where it is. I do not agree with that, obviously. But they may take that position. They may prevail, although I would rather doubt it.

The question then becomes, if you take down the military figure what do you do? But that is the very debate that ought to be taking place on the floor of the Senate. What should our priorities be in the light of the develop-

ments internationally and in the light of an economy that has gone soft.

Mr. SASSER. So my friend from Maryland, if I understand him, is telling us the first thing we have to do is pass the bill to take down the walls, and then the second hurdle that has to be crossed is to have the debate and the vote on whether or not any of the military money will be used for domestic spending.

Mr. SARBANES. Yes; the second bridge is a very complicated one. The second bridge involves how much of the money can be shifted, and how should the money be used.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from Maryland and, in view of what he said here today, it is simply incomprehensible to this Senator why we cannot, by unanimous consent, move forward to debate the question of whether or not the walls between military spending and domestic spending should come down.

Because once those walls are down, if we should prevail by a majority vote on that and I do not know whether we would or not, but once those walls have come down, then you have to move forward and make a determination about what is to be done: Are we going to use military spending to enhance domestic spending; are we going to use domestic spending to perhaps enhance military spending; or are we going to make a judgment we are going to keep military spending where it is and domestic spending where it is?

All of those are judgments that have to be made in the future, but before we can get to those judgments and we can exercise our discretion in view of these changed circumstances, we need to move forward and have permission to debate this so-called walls legislation and see whether or not the walls, indeed, can be changed by a majority vote in this body.

Mr. SARBANES. Actually, the questions we face at that point are even more complex because you would also have to ask yourself, is the condition of the economy with respect to the recession such that some portion of this military spending could be used for deficit reduction or if you did that would you put a downward push on a soft or weak economy which would make the recession even worse? If you make the recession even worse, you increase the deficit automatically.

It is my view that the programs that ought to have a priority are the investment programs that build the strength of the economy for the future. This is an area where we have been badly lagging and where we have a real problem in terms of our ability to compete with our international competitors.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CONRAD). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I waited 2 hours to get an opportunity to speak, and I will begin by saying I would like to clear up the confusion. I do not think people are confused after listening to that debate. They may be befuddled, they may be bored, but they are not confused.

Let me begin by going back to 1990 and the agreement we entered into that set out priorities and a procedure, the agreement that the Democrats are trying to renege on today. Underneath all this rhetoric, underneath all this repetition, the bottom line is that the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House entered into an agreement to control spending, and on the floor of the U.S. Senate today, there is an effort to renege on that agreement.

Let me remind my colleagues about the genesis of that agreement. The President entered into summit budget negotiations with Congress with the objective to lower the deficit by controlling spending. The Democrats entered into the agreement with the objective of cutting defense and raising taxes.

The Democrats got what they wanted out of the budget agreement. They have a majority in both Houses of Congress, and the President had the choice between allowing the budget process to be destroyed or to negotiate and compromise. He negotiated and he compromised, and the Democrats got both \$160 billion of new taxes and \$170 billion of defense cuts. Those cuts were locked into the budget. So the Democrats got their part of the package up front: \$160 billion of taxes and \$170 billion of cuts in defense. Neither of those things did the President want to do.

What did the President get out of the process? What the President got out of the process was 5 years where we cap spending and 3 years where we set out individual caps on discretionary spending in defense, international affairs, and domestic spending. For 3 years we have spending caps in each area followed by 2 years where we have an overall cap. The President wanted caps for 5 years. We could not get it.

So basically the budget summit agreement consisted of three parts: Raising taxes by \$160 billion which the Democrats got; cutting defense by \$170 billion, which the Democrats got; and caps on spending which the President got. We are here on the floor of the U.S. Senate today trying to renege on that part of the deal that capped spending.

Mr. President, I am opposed to taking the caps off. I am opposed to allowing spending to skyrocket. I am opposed to raiding defense beyond what we have done. Even in a world where the lion and the lamb are about to lie down together, it is imperative that the United States of America be the lion, and if we let these budget caps be taken off, that will not be the case.

Mr. President, we heard our dear colleague from Louisiana get up and talk about how in the world are we going to fund all these programs under this budget cap? Let me remind my colleagues that under this onerous budget cap we are talking about, defense is cut by \$12.5 billion. Nobody here is talking about raising the amount to defense.

We have a limit that international expenditures can grow by only \$800 million under this spending cap. Nobody is talking about raising that amount. Domestic spending under this agreement can grow by \$10.2 billion. That is a 4.7-percent increase in domestic spending. To say that that is somehow a cut, that a 4.7-percent increase in domestic spending somehow is cruel and unusual punishment to impose on the Federal Government is outrageous. There are a lot of American families today that wish they had the problem of spending only 4.7 percent more than they spent last year.

The idea that with only \$10.2 billion of additional spending we are absolutely incapable of running the Nation's business and making the tough decisions is really insulting, I think, to the people who do the work and pay the taxes and pull the wagon in this country.

We had discussions about how we are going to fund science; how we are going to fund the superconducting super collider. Let me remind my colleagues that the President sent to the Congress the strongest science budget in the history of the country under these spending caps. Our colleagues talk about how we invest in the future. Every year for the last 10 years, Congress has cut the President's science budget. Every year for the last 10 years, the President has sent proposals to invest in science and technology and the future and space, and every year the Democrats have cut those programs to fund social programs to buy votes.

We are not talking about investing in the future. We are talking about investing in a partisan future, and that partisan future is basically to create programs that have beneficiaries.

While I am on the subject, for us to stand here and bemoan the fact that expenditure on infrastructure is declining, let me remind my colleagues—and I have a little chart that tells a story—Government has not been on a great diet. This chart plots defense spending since 1968 and its growth; family income since 1968 and its growth; and nondefense spending since 1968 and its growth.

In real terms, the growth rate of defense since 1968 is down 36 percent. Family income has stagnated at about a 3-percent growth rate, and what has happened is that family income has grown by about 3 percent, but what has happened to nondefense spending? It is up by 97 percent.

If we have not spent on infrastructure, whose fault is it? Whose fault is

it? I can tell you whose fault it is. It is the fault of the Congress because Congress has been so busy buying votes with giveaway programs that we have not invested in infrastructure. The facts are that in 1965, we were spending 4.7 percent of the Federal budget on infrastructure but today we are spending just 2 percent.

Why is that so? Not only is Congress running big deficits and spending lots of money, but Congress is spending the money on everything but infrastructure, highways, bridges, sewer systems, water systems, and airports. Instead Congress is taking money out of the pockets of working people, and giving it to people who are not working. Congress is taking money from people who are out pulling the wagon and giving the money to people who are riding in the wagon. It is not surprising to me that there are literally thousands of different groups that have all converged on Washington and said: Take those spending caps off; give us more money.

My point, Mr. President, is this: If we took the spending caps off, the money would not be spent on infrastructure. We have not spent the money on infrastructure in the past. We have cut the percentage of the budget going into infrastructure by 50 percent since 1965, and we have done it because Congress is interested in spending and not in investing.

And as for the subject of America's productivity, as if somehow we can promote productivity by more government, surely the world laughs in our face. We stand here on the floor of the Senate, knowing that the whole world has rejected government as an allocator of resources and a producer of wealth, and argue that we can make America wealthier by having a bigger Government that spends more and more money.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAMM. I will not yield at this point.

If more government was the solution to economic problems, we would have torn the Berlin Wall down to get into Eastern Europe. That did not happen, I am sorry to tell my Democratic colleagues, because I know it concerns them and breaks their hearts, but it did not happen. The Berlin Wall was torn down by people on the other side wanting to get out. They wanted to escape government as the solution to all economic problems.

The idea that somehow we are going to make America richer by making government bigger flies in the face of everything we know about what is going on in the world.

What is happening in the world is that there is a tidal wave of freedom and there is a rejection of government as an economic problem solver. Only in two places on the face of the Earth is

there strong argument on behalf of more government as a solution to every problem. One of them is in Havana, Cuba, and it is not going to last very much longer. The other one is right here in the Congress. Why that is the case, I do not know, Mr. President, but it clearly is.

Now, Mr. President, let me talk about a peace dividend. Our colleagues have talked about a peace dividend, and they have talked about what they would do with it. They would spend it on housing, and they would spend it on nutrition, and they would spend it on education. I agree with all those priorities. I think we need more spending on all those things and more. But the debate today is not about whether there ought to be more spending on those things. The debate is about who ought to do the spending.

The President says that the peace dividend ought to go back to American families by taking the first \$50 billion of defense savings and by raising the personal exemption for children by \$500 so that families can make the investment.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question on that particular point?

Mr. GRAMM. I do not yield.

The President has proposed that a \$500 increase in personal exemption go to every American child as a way of giving the peace dividend back to the long-suffering American taxpayers who won the cold war by being willing to let us use their money. Now that the cold war is over, the President says give it back to families. Our colleagues say no, let Government spend it; let Government spend it.

Mr. President, I know Congress, and I know the American family, and I know the difference. I do not believe the American people are confused. I know what Congress will do with that money. It will squander it the way it has squandered other money in the past.

I know families. I know what they will do with it. I want to give money back to American families to let the economy grow. I want to have a nutrition program; not more food stamps, but a better nutrition program; a strong economy where people can get a job, go to work, earn a paycheck, take the paycheck to the grocery store, buy groceries, and put the groceries on the kitchen table. That is the nutrition program in which I want the peace dividend invested.

I want it invested in a housing program, not more Government housing. I want it invested in good jobs, economic growth, so people can save their money and can build and buy their own homes. No Government housing project is a substitute for that.

In terms of education, I want people to have good jobs, to save their money to send their children to Texas A&M University, and other colleges and universities all over America.

There is a fundamental disagreement. We are going to debate the peace dividend for the remainder of this century, and we are going to debate it for the remainder of this century for a simple reason. There is a fundamental difference in the Congress; there is a fundamental difference between the two parties. One party believes that Government is the answer. One party believes that more Government spending is going to solve our problem. The other party, of which I am proud to call myself a member, believes that freedom is the answer.

I believe that letting people keep more of what they earn to invest is what made us, and is going to keep us the dominant economic force on Earth.

The idea that somehow we can promote economic growth by having more Government spending is laughable, but unfortunately it gets few chuckles when we cast votes in the Senate.

So, Mr. President, let me just tick off a few points, and then I will let other people have the floor.

First of all, we had an agreement. Those who voted for this agreement voted to raise taxes by \$160 billion, to cut defense by \$170 billion, and to set out caps on spending. That was the deal.

All the President got out of this whole agreement was the caps, and now our colleagues want to repeal the caps. I say no. The President says no. I think when the votes are counted, the Senate is going to say no.

Second, the idea that we cannot invest in science and technology, that we cannot build scientific projects that are important to the future with only \$10.2 billion of additional spending is, I think, ridiculous. The President sent us a budget that met the spending cap. He proposed increased Head Start funding so that it is 127 percent above the 1989 level. He funded the SSC. He proposed increased math and science education by 69 percent; Pell grants by 48 percent; WIC by 47 percent; community health centers by 42 percent; infant mortality reduction by 65 percent; energy R&D by 130 percent; NSF basic research by 57 percent; Federal aid to highways by 42 percent; aviation modernization by 95 percent.

Our colleague from Maryland talks about needing to spend more money on aviation. As my memory serves me, every year for the last half dozen years the President has proposed more funding for FAA out of the airport trust fund than Congress has provided. We did not provide the money, because we were reducing the deficit. We did not provide the money, because we were spending it on other things.

So my bottom-line point is this: A deal is a deal. When it got down to the final deal, I thought it was a bad deal and I voted against it. But people voted for it. It became the law of the land. Now the time has come to live up to

the spending part of it. There was great rejoicing in the \$160 million in new taxes that Congress spent. There was great rejoicing in Congress cutting \$170 billion in defense, most of which has now been spent.

But now the time has come that the purse strings are beginning to tighten on domestic spending. One of the reasons they are tightening, as our colleague from New Mexico pointed out, is we have been cheating. We have been starting all these new programs on the last day of the fiscal year, or the last week of the fiscal year, so we could run out and tell some special interest group we had given them something. They all sent out letters congratulating us, thanking us, and now the bill collector is at the door.

My view is this 4.7-percent increase in domestic spending, which is what this cap limits us to, is not cruel and unusual punishment. It represents the kind of budget constraint that working Americans all over the country live with every single day. I want to tell you how we could live with that very easily.

We ought to apply the Dicky Flatt test, and for those of you who are not from Mexia, TX, let me share it with you. In 1981, when we passed the Reagan program in the House, I was walking down the steps, and a lady with a New York newspaper came running up to me and said, "Congressman Gramm, in a 1,350-page budget, how did you decide what programs ought to be cut and what programs ought to grow?" as if somehow it was arbitrary or we had a computer.

I thought a minute, and I said: "Well, I used the Dicky Flatt test." Not being from Mexia, she did not know the Dicky Flatt test. So I explained it to her. I said, "I tried to understand these programs, look at them, and see what they were doing. Then I tried to think of some hard-working person in my district."

I often thought of a printer from Mexia, TX, sitting in my old congressional district, named Dicky Flatt. I thought about Dicky Flatt because he works hard for a living. His printshop is open till 7 or 8 o'clock every weeknight, open to 6 on Saturday. He is in business with his mama, was in business with his daddy. His daddy since passed away. He is in business with his mama and his wife and his brother and his brother's wife. They all just worked hard.

Whether you see Dicky Flatt at the PTA or whether you see him at the Boy Scouts or whether you see him at the Presbyterian Church, he never gets that blue ink off the end of his fingers, never, try as he may.

So I said, "The Dicky Flatt test is as follows: You take the program, you look at it, then you think of people like Dicky Flatt and you ask a simple question. Will the benefits to be de-

rived by spending money on this program be worth taking the money away from Dicky Flatt and pay for it?"

Let me tell you something. If we applied the Dicky Flatt test this year, we not only could live within the 4.7-percent growth in domestic spending that this terrible cap has imposed on us, but we could live within it and give 10 or 15 percent back starting with our own budget right here in the U.S. Congress. We could just start right here and start cutting back on the money we spend on ourselves and go from there. I think it would be remarkable what we could do.

So, do I think it is some terrible, inhumane thing that, after having pocketed this tax money, after having spent these defense cuts, that the time has now come for Congress to live up to the commitment to limit domestic spending to 4.7 percent growth? Despite all the screams, squeals, and hollers, I do not think it is cruel and inhumane. I am ready to see us live up to it and set priorities by applying the Dicky Flatt test. I think when we do, we will find it is not so hard.

Finally, before I yield the floor and go back to work, I want to congratulate our colleague from New Mexico. PETE DOMENICI is one of the people around here that is serious about fiscal responsibility. Balancing the budget is like going to heaven. Everybody wants to do it; they just do not want to do what you have to do to make the trip. They want the credit for it, but they do not want to do it.

PETE DOMENICI is one of the people around here that is a leader in doing it, in making the hard choices. I congratulate him for fighting this effort.

Last week our Democratic colleagues tried to raise taxes. The President vetoed their bill. This week they are trying to break the budget caps so they can increase domestic spending. I predict the President will not have to veto this bill. I do not believe our colleagues have the votes to pass it. And they do not have the votes to pass it because, one, when you say you are going to do something, people expect you to do it. That is an unusual standard here in Congress, but it is a standard applied in the country all the time, with good purpose and good result.

I think we ought to hold Congress' feet to the fire and, if we want to reduce defense, not spend up to the cap. I have my own priority as to what I want done with the money. I do not want it spent by Congress because I do not trust Congress.

I have every faith in the American family. I am willing to let them have the peace dividend, and bet the future of America on them. I am not willing to bet the future of America on the U.S. Congress.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GRAMM. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Does the Senator from Texas have an opinion? I have

heard it said this afternoon that there are a number of groups in America that are urging us to tear down the wall, get rid of this cap.

In fact, one of my friends on the other side of the aisle listed all of these names of these so-called influential people that wanted to get rid of the cap. Do you have an opinion as to whether that was something that was a matter of principle, or do you have a suspicion it might be something else?

Mr. GRAMM. Well, my suspicion is that there are a lot of groups who want a bigger spot at the public trough. I think our problem is basically this: Everybody who wants something for nothing from the Federal Government is looking over our left shoulder. When we vote this afternoon or tomorrow or whenever our colleagues finish talking, all these people are going to send out a letter and say, "PETE DOMENICI voted against us. We wanted this money and PETE DOMENICI denied it to us."

That is their right. That is how our system works. The tragedy is that nobody is looking over the right shoulder sending out letters saying, "PETE DOMENICI cared about the working people of this country and cared about the future."

And one of the reasons we are going to get so many people who are going to respond to all of these hordes of people knocking on our door saying, "Give us somebody else's money," is because we do not have people as vigilant as they ought to be in going back, looking at the facts and telling the story.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have one additional question, I say to my friend from Texas. First, let me say to him I appreciate the kind remarks. Frankly, he knows that I have great admiration and respect for him when it comes to fiscal policy and what we ought to do with economic policy. I am very pleased to say to him that I think he adds measurably to our efforts to do a better job for America here in the Senate.

Having said that, I wonder if he might permit me to give him a fact pattern and see what he thinks the consequences and the result might be.

All over America it is being said that the Soviet Union has changed dramatically, there is not even a Soviet Union left. There are some nuclear weapons around—a lot of them—and people are wondering what is going to happen over there in the former Soviet Union. Everybody is also saying, "Let's cut defense." I want to cut defense. You want to reduce defense. But we have been told that every time America has decided it is time to build down, we have done it wrong. We have been told that we build down without any order, without any common sense, and within a few years we are looking at what we did and we are having to build it back up because we have done it wrong, disorderly precipitously. I ask the Sen-

ator, does he think, under those circumstances, the circumstances we have now—are we all trying to find out how do we rationally build down our defenses?

If I were to list the entire array of domestic discretionary programs the Senator has enumerated that he would like to see increased, some of them that the President wanted to increase, I say to my friend, if I heard the list right, it is only a few ten's. There are 2,600 programs. More programs that he did not mention, little ones and big ones, many that Americans never heard of.

We have only gotten rid of three programs in 12 years. The American people do not know that. They think we have been ravaging domestic programs. Right? Three in 12 years because many of them have eternal life. They have the halo. They are supposed to go on forever.

Does the Senator think, under the circumstances I have described, if you take the wall down, you count the President out on defense spending, on how much we should spend and you put all discretionary appropriations in the same pool, competing? How does the Senator think, knowing the way we do things here, the defense of our country is apt to come out under those circumstances?

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, there is no doubt about the fact that, if we take the caps off, domestic spending is going to skyrocket because that is where the votes are. If we take the caps off, defense, which has already been cut by \$170 billion over 5 years, is going to be absolutely decimated.

Mr. DOMENICI. Plus \$50 billion more that is in the President's recommendation.

Mr. GRAMM. That is right. So basically what we are talking about here is that we already have established orderly build-down in defense. The distinguished Republican ranking member of the Budget Committee has said that he is willing to sit down and talk to people about some long-term agreement that would extend beyond this year to continue orderly process in defense.

But my fear basically is this: We are not at the end of history. There will be more tyrants. Despite the best of diplomacy, reason will fail. And when reason fails, we have to have an army, a navy, and an air force that do not fail. We have been down this road many times where we have disarmed America, destroyed our investment, and we have come back in a few years and deeply regretted it.

I think it is very important that we not allow it to happen this time around, and we can prevent it from happening by having an orderly process to plan it. Quite frankly, even without the concern about national security in the future, to go in now and just have dramatic reductions in defense, with no

long-term plan, is going to put a very great hardship on the people that have dedicated their lives to keeping Ivan back from the gate. Whether they wear the uniform of the country or whether they work in the defense industry, they are going to have their lives disrupted and great hardship imposed on them.

We are already in a situation where tens of thousands of them are out of work. We need an orderly process where we can look 5 years into the future and see what we are going to do. That is what the whole budget cap process was about. The President did not want to raise taxes. The President did not want to slash defense, but what the President got in return for the bargain was an agreement that we would control domestic spending, and that we would have an orderly build-down in defense. And what we have here today is to renege on the only part of the budget agreement that the President was for.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I know there are others who desire to speak. I want to say to some on my side of the aisle that I am most appreciative of their support in this regard. Many Senators on my side, and some on the other side, are concerned about the issue that is being discussed here. They do not take it very lightly that we take this cap down, and that there be some kind of an oral commitment that obviously we will not take money away from defense that they need. We do not know what that means; or we will set a new limit, a new cap, just leave it up to us; or we will give you some promise that we will have a new cap that the Defense Department can live with; just give us the extra money to spend.

Well, Mr. President, frankly, it seems to this Senator that there is no just cause at this point to take savings from defense and spend it. There is only one just cause, and that is to reduce defense to the levels that this Congress wants and that the President wants, and it can be lower than the caps. The caps only say you cannot spend the money somewhere else. We ought to take that overage and, from my standpoint, we ought to put it to deficit reduction.

I have heard other proposals. I have heard the one made by my friend from Texas, and I am not even sure I support that at this point. I think we ought to make sure that we understand and care about the future of our children. Some educators have petitioned us to break this wall. They have been told by some that if we break it somebody will give them some more money. That is what they have been told. But they do that saying they are for children.

Well, Mr. President, if we want to save our children, or save the economy for our children, or save jobs for our children, or save prosperity for our children, then we better start worrying

about the deficit. If there is a peace dividend beyond the \$170 billion, which we already spent in the 5-year agreement, we better live up to the deal that says if you cut defense more than these caps, put it on the deficit.

Having said that, I do not want to leave false impressions on the discretionary appropriation. That is what we are talking about here today, the annual part of that budget that you vote on up or down here in 13 bills, including defense, foreign assistance, and a series of domestic appropriation bills. I do not stand here and say that this is what is breaking the budget and putting us into this severe deficit posture. However, I do say that the economic summit was fair on domestic programs—I cited the numbers before—in order to get agreement. Some on our side of the aisle are complaining that too much was given to domestic discretionary. It went up more than 10 percent one year and more than 12 percent another year in budget authority. That was the concession to get the caps. That was the concession.

We went there thinking we would freeze everything. That was the concession to get an agreement. And now the agreement is to be broken, and some relationship is sought between the changes in the Soviet Union and breaking this cap.

Mr. President, what happened in the Soviet Union has nothing to do with this. This agreement had to do with how much we agreed to allocate to domestic spending. We are going to live up to that. Nobody has taken any of that away. The agreement said what you do not spend in defense, put it on the deficit. That was the deal.

For those who are wondering about this bill, S. 2399, there is another interesting part to it. The occupant of the chair will remember that we have discretionary spending in this 5-year agreement divided into foreign assistance, defense, and domestic spending caps. Well, it is interesting that the cap on foreign assistance is not sought to be changed. The bill leaves it in effect. So we are saying we are going to treat foreign aid better than we treat defense in S. 2399.

I do not think that is fair. If they are going to take the walls down, take them all down, and put all of the programs in that pool of money to compete.

Frankly, I do not want that to happen. I am one who does not think either defense or foreign affairs, foreign assistance, gets a fair shake in that pool of resources to be used. It is pretty obvious, without repeating what I said a while ago, why. It is because there is never an end to what is needed in domestic spending, even if we have not looked at the program's value in 15 years. There is just no end to its magnetic pull on any resources that are around.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me conclude by saying to those who are wondering about debating this measure, we are debating this measure right now. We will vote tomorrow evening or the next day. I am hopeful that we will make it quick and decide that we are not going to close off debate, which will just be a signal that we ought to get the bill off of the floor and start talking about something realistic, something which will impose some meaningful caps and add a couple more years to a realistic set of caps.

Those who come here and say we ought to vote on this bill—when it has never had a hearing, never been to a committee—are those on the side of wanting to pit defense spending up against the array of domestic programs in difficult defense times.

My last observation has to do with what was said by someone on the floor that has to do with economic incentives and stimulations and stimulating the economy. I do not believe there is a chance that Congress will come up with a conversion bill to use military expenditures in the civilian side of the American economy to do some stimulating and job creation. I do not believe we can come up with anything that will do the amount of good necessary to relieve the damage caused by dramatically cutting defense will cause.

I believe we have no way of figuring out how to help our military men and women get jobs and we want to cancel their contracts early. We want to close defense industries quicker because somebody is going to invent a proposal, put it in effect, that says use that money for economic prosperity. It will not happen. It will be sent right into a pool of money that will be competed for by the existing domestic programs, 2,600 or 2,700 in nature that all get a little bit of it.

I frankly do not believe it will have a thing to do with jobs and prosperity but the defense cuts will be on the negative side.

So, as I see it, the time is not now to pass this bill. The time is to sit down and talk with real understanding about some defense caps that we are going to need in 1993, 1994, and 1995, and clearly some adjustments should be made. That is what we ought to be talking about both for our domestic programs and for our military, and for those who have given their lives to the military, and those who have sacrificed and are part of that U.S. Defense Department.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has the credentials to speak on the question of the budget summit agreement. And I want to say in behalf of the distinguished ranking member

from New Mexico, he is consistent. He has been steadfast in his support of the summit agreement that was worked out about 18 months ago.

So, he comes to this debate, I must say, with clean hands. There is an old saying in equity, that he who comes into equity must come there with clean hands.

The same cannot be said for others who have entered into this debate. We heard the distinguished junior Senator from Texas a moment ago deliver his characteristic ideologic partisan message. Many of us have heard this so many times that we can almost quote the refrain about Havana, Cuba, et cetera. Of course, this is not a debate about Havana, or Bucharest, or East Berlin. This is a debate about the United States of America and what is to be done about it and what we do to meet and solve our problems.

Just let me make this point: Our friend from Texas a moment ago was saying a deal is a deal is a deal. I will say for the Senator from New Mexico he went out there and he negotiated on that budget summit agreement. He did not like everything in it and neither did I. But he came back here and he voted for it, and he supported it, and he stuck up for it all down the line, and it has cost him something along the way. I happen to know that and I respect him for what he did.

But just a few days ago an amendment was offered here on the floor by the Senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] to cut taxes and to pay for that tax cut by a cut in domestic discretionary spending, a clear violation of a most important part of that budget summit agreement, the pay-as-you-go mechanism. That is the heart of it. If you rip that out you rip the guts of it out. You can come in here and cut taxes. You do not have to pay for it; just put it on the deficit. Raise an entitlement program. You do not have to pay for it; put it on the deficit.

Thirty-five Senators on the other side of the aisle, including our friend from Texas who stood on this floor a moment ago saying a deal is a deal is a deal and you should not renege on it, voted to rip the guts out of a pay-as-you-go section of this budget agreement.

If they had had their way, if he had had his way, you would simply come in here and offer an amendment. We are going to cut taxes by \$30 billion, and, oh, by the way we do not have to pay for it, just put it on the tab, put it on the deficit. Let somebody else's grandkids pay for it.

So much for a deal is a deal is a deal.

Then much was made about: Let us give it to the American family. That is what I am for. I am for the American family. I am for the family, and I am for apple pie, and I am for the American flag.

Well, who is not? Some of us grow weary of hearing that pedestrian approach to problems of this country.

If you are for the family, you had an opportunity to vote for them just the other day. The distinguished senior Senator from Texas brought a tax bill to this floor and it provided for a tax cut for middle-income Americans who have been paying the bills and pulling the wagon, as some like to say, for the past 10 or 12 years.

I know some dismissed that tax cut as inconsequential. But the facts are that for the median-income American family for a family of four, husband and wife and 2 children, making \$32,000 a year, that was a \$600 tax reduction, a 20-percent reduction in that family of four's tax liability. That is \$600, and a 20-percent reduction for a man and a wife struggling to make it with 2 children on \$32,000 a year. That \$600 may not seem like much here in Washington, DC., but I will tell you it is quite a bit in Gallatin, TN, and I bet it is quite a bit in some of the small towns and areas in the State of Texas.

Let me tell you what else the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, did. He brought in that middle-class tax cut, and he paid for every dime of it. He did not increase that deficit by a penny. And how did he do it? He did it by raising the revenues from the richest people in this country, with the surtax on millionaires. Those are the ones who benefited from the policies of the last 12 years. We know who got wealthy over the past 12 years. And the American people know it. And the hard-pressed middle-income wage earner knows it.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SASSER. I yield for a question.

Mr. SARBANES. Our colleagues on the other side like to refer to the measure that was before us that the President vetoed as the tax increase bill. They have been spreading that kind of description. Is it not correct that the only taxes increased in that bill were taxes on people in top 1 percent in this country, the very richest people in the country?

Mr. SASSER. The distinguished Senator from Maryland is right.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to make it very clear that I recognize that there was a tax increase on people whose incomes are in the top 1 percent of the population. But that was in order to obtain the revenues with which to give a tax break to middle-income people, to fund investment tax incentives, and to reduce the deficit. That is what that bill was all about. So, what has happened for some reason, which I do not understand, is our colleagues are desperate to protect the top 1 percent of the income scale from paying a little additional taxes so they carry more of their fair share. They are

the ones who have gotten these enormous breaks over the last decade, and have had incredible escalation in their income.

Mr. SASSER. Well, the Senator is quite correct.

I see our friend from Colorado on the floor, and I want to yield to him in just a moment.

But at the same time that we are hearing these discussions about concern over the deficit—oh, something must be done about the deficit. If we let these walls come down, they will just simply increase the deficit with their spending. The same individuals who are making that argument just a few days ago voted for a tax package offered by the administration, offered by the President, that would have increased the deficit by \$30 billion over 5 years—\$30 billion over 5 years. And almost every individual on the other side of the aisle voted for it, including the junior Senator from Texas, who has expressed such great concern about the deficit on the floor of this Chamber just a few minutes ago.

With regard to my friend from New Mexico who has departed the floor now, I respect his statements about the budget. I respect his statements about concern for the deficit. But when you come into a court of equity, you must come in with clean hands to discuss these matters. And it is questionable as to whether some of these allegations that have been made on the floor here this afternoon should really be taken seriously in view of that old maxim of equity.

Well, I see our distinguished colleague from Colorado on the floor, Mr. WIRTH, a very valuable member of the Senate Budget Committee. I say to the Presiding Officer, and also a member of the Armed Services Committee, and very knowledgeable in his own right not just about budgetary matters but also about military spending and military budgets.

I like to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for his kind comments.

I might just add a footnote to the earlier discussion about the equity in the previous tax bill that was vetoed by the President. It is my understanding—I say to the chairman of the Budget Committee, if I might ask him a question—and it was reported at extensive length in the national news media, that personal income over the country in the last decade went up some \$850 billion and about 77 percent of that, I understand, went to people in the top 1 percent of wage earners. We had income growth in the country over the

last decade, but it was skewed way at the top of the income scale. And one casualty of this was the notion of equity.

Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. SASSER. Well, that was my understanding. The tax bill that was advanced by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, [Mr. BENTSEN] was a tax bill to try to redress some of the inequities in the Tax Code that had occurred during the decade of the 1980's, in which the middle class saw their taxes actually increase in real terms, and those in the upper brackets saw their taxes decrease by 18 percent; while at the same time the top 1 percent in wealth in this country during the decade of the 1980's was capturing 60 to 70 percent of the economic growth, and the remaining 80 percent, down in the middle, were left to scramble for 6 percent growth that was left over.

Mr. WIRTH. I thank the chairman. I thought that was correct. It is a fundamental issue of fairness.

Mr. SYMMS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WIRTH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I have been listening to this debate in my office and here on the floor. I would just like to ask either the Senator from Colorado or the distinguished chairman of the committee, if this tax bill that they talk about it so wonderful, why is it that in the other body, the veto to override that took place today, 215 voted "no" and 211 voted "yes"? It seems the Democrats in the House do not share the same point of view that the distinguished chairman has.

Do you have any explanation for that?

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I cannot speak for what the motivations of people in the other body are. I thought that we had a basic commitment to fairness in the United States, and that is one of the fundamental themes that I believe most Americans are committed to and that we ought to continue to advocate no matter what the rhetoric is surrounding that at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue or from the other side of the aisle.

But what we are talking about today, Mr. President, is not about taxes. Some of it is about fairness, but not as blatantly. What we are talking about here is a budget. What we are talking about here are the values. We are talking about values.

What I am going to talk about mostly this afternoon, Mr. President, is one basic idea—who is for kids and who is just kidding. Who is going to make a commitment to future generations in this country or who is just going to talk about it.

Today, a Russian cosmonaut is returning to Earth after spending 10 months in space. But the Earth he is returning to is not the same one that he left behind.

When he left, he left behind the Soviet Union, a Communist country. The existence of that country and the threat it implied has determined our entire military strategy and posture since World War II. Every decision on the size, structure, and armament of our armed services has been made with an eye toward the Kremlin and the leadership and agenda it housed.

For all of our adult lifetime, every Member of this body and every voting American practically has had his or her values, goals, sense of America, sense of our shared values outlined by the confrontation with the Soviet Union.

But today, Mr. President, that dominating, defining phenomenon is over. The cosmonaut is not returning to the Soviet Union. He is not returning to his hometown of Leningrad. The Soviet Union is gone, Leningrad is now once again St. Petersburg and the Soviet Communists have been replaced with reform-minded leaders determined to guide the new Commonwealth of Independent States into a new era of democracy and a free-market commerce.

The world has changed. Defense goals, therefore, must change, and we must change. We must change. But we are hearing enormous resistance—some people are acting as if the world is still as it was in 1980's. We know that generals still fight the least war. It sees to me, we are seeing a lot of the Congress trying to fight the last war, as well.

At the end of 1990, in the closing days of 101st Congress, we passed a Budget Enforcement Act. I voted against it. While I supported some of the new discipline called for in that law, I could not rationale the need to protect defense spending at a time when the Soviet Union was undergoing such profound changes. What we said in that act is we are going to stick, no matter what happens to the threat, we are going to stick with a designated pot of money, and build walls around it and then be able to spend it. Clearly, it seemed to me—and I think distinguished occupant of the chair was in agreement with that—we needed to maintain our flexibility in responding to the rapidly shifting international conditions. Today, that is more so than ever before. The Soviet Union is gone but we are still locked in the spending pattern set up when it existed.

Let me point this out in chart form, if I might, Mr. President.

What is illustrated here, Mr. President, is the pattern of national defense spending since the Second World War. We can see here how defense spending went up during Korea, defense spending went up during Vietnam, and defense spending ramped up with the Reagan buildup in 1980's. By peacetime norm, when we were not at war but during the cold war, we were spending \$233 billion a year.

We increased spending for the conflict in Korea, we increased for Viet-

nam, and we increased with the Reagan buildup. The peacetime cold war average—and these are numbers from the Congressional Budget Office; there is no disagreement with these numbers—the peacetime cold war average defense spending was \$233 billion in constant 1993 dollars. These are constant dollars, all put into 1993 dollars; \$233 billion during the cold war, which we had at that point to defend against a unified and militarized Soviet Union, Warsaw Pact, Red China, and countless other threats, including North Korea, Cuba, the Middle East, and so on.

President Bush calls for defense spending in fiscal year 1993 of \$281 billion. He calls for a gradual downsizing of defense to \$252 billion by 1997. The cold war is over, but the Bush administration response is a 3-percent annual cut in defense spending.

Under the Bush plan, the United States will still be spending \$19 billion more in 1997 on defense than the cold war peacetime average. After their so-called build-down, at the end of 1997, they are going to be spending \$252 billion, and the cold war norm, the cold war average, peacetime average, is \$233 billion. To do what? What are we going to defend America against, spending more than we were at the height of the cold war? I'll tell you what—General Powell told us last year, "I am down to Castro and Kim Il Song."

Let us look at this in another way with this other chart, if I might, Mr. President. Here we have different budget paths right here. We have, if you look at this, the peacetime average—this line that goes straight across here—in 1993 dollars. This is what we spent during the peacetime of the cold war.

Remember, this was a spike-up in Korea, a spike-up in Vietnam, a ramp-up for the Reagan defense buildup. But during the height of the cold war, without those hostilities, we were spending \$233 billion a year.

Can we trim some more? Let us look at what happens here. President Bush is the top line coming down here. He does not even get down to the peacetime cold war average in 5 years. This is out to 1997, from the President's budget. The cold war is over, and we have not even gotten down to where we were at the height of the cold war.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield for a question on that?

Mr. WIRTH. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SASSER. As I understand the Senator's chart, what we are seeing here is the Senator took an average of all of the military spending during the cold war period?

Mr. WIRTH. One correction; I did not do this. It is the General Accounting Office and Congressional Budget Office who did this. We asked them to do it.

Mr. SASSER. I see. But now that the cold war is over and the old Soviet Union is no more and has collapsed, we

find ourselves, on the administration's military spending pattern in 1997, still at a higher level in military spending than the peacetime cold war average, even though the Soviet Union is no more?

Mr. WIRTH. Yes. The cold war is over. And we will still be spending nearly \$20 billion a year more than we were at the height of the cold war, in 1997.

Will the Senator tell me how to explain that to the American public who are proud of the sacrifice that was made for 50 years during the cold war. We invested trillions of dollars of scarce national treasure to defend the West, our democratic institutions and free markets, against the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union, the cold war, the Berlin Wall—today all gone. But we are still going to be spending more under the administration plan than we were at height of the cold war.

Let me tell you a story. In 1961, I was a private in the Army. The Berlin Wall went up and we thought we were going to war. We thought we were going to be in a land war in Europe. We were mobilizing and getting ready to go in the fall of 1961. It was a searing experience for all of us in the military at that time.

Thirty years later, to show you how the world has changed generationally and in thought patterns, my kids were sitting on top of that same Berlin Wall at a Pink Floyd concert with kids from Eastern Europe, Western Europe, the United States, the old Soviet Union, all there, hundreds of thousands gathered in this rejoicing of the collapse of the Berlin Wall. What a shift in 30 years. They know that. All those young people know that. And they all look at us and say: What are you all doing?

And that is a good question. What are we doing to their future by continuing at this level?

Let me point out one other item. If, in fact, we did just a little more rational budgeting—let us look at the proposal offered by our good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, Senator EXON. Senator EXON is also a valued member of the Budget Committee; sits next to Senator NUNN, as the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee. And he has been very tough in standing for a strong defense. He has held the line, really pushed it very hard, and today has said what we ought to do.

What did Senator EXON, from my neighboring State of Nebraska, suggest? What has he suggested leads us to this blue line coming right down here. Senator EXON has proposed a cut to \$272 billion for fiscal year 1993. We drew his line to 1997. Why do we not at least, by 1997, get back to the cold war average? Starting from his number we still do not even go below the cold war average, which incidentally I think we ought to do. Senator EXON, an expert

in defense, points out there is ample room to cut. There is no question about it.

He says let us return to the same defense spending level as under Presidents Nixon and Ford. What might one do to get there? Is this a radical change?

One, do we need to keep 150,000 troops in Europe? Do we need to do that? I do not think so, any more than the Europeans need to be stationing troops in the United States. It does not make any sense. Threats are coming down. We are spending nearly \$1.3 billion a year—Senator PRYOR has pointed this out over and over and over again—\$1.3 billion a year recruiting new soldiers when, at the same time, we are reducing our forces. Does that make a lot of sense?

The General Accounting Office estimates we could supply inventory purchases by up to \$5 billion, and we all saw the "60 Minutes" program on those huge warehouses full of materiel. Senator BYRD from West Virginia spoke about this on any number of occasions. B-2 bombers and advanced tactical fighters yield billions of dollars in savings.

We are no longer in the nuclear arms business, but the administration wants \$500 million more for nuclear testing. We ought to be going the other way and having a moratorium on testing, if we are interested in nonproliferation, if we are interested in making sure that the world becomes a safer place. Let us have a moratorium on nuclear testing, not an expansion of it.

Senator EXON has outlined a very responsible and reasonable proposal. In my opinion, it is a de minimis proposal to cut defense spending in fiscal year 1993.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a little more detail on Senator EXON's proposal.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, Senator EXON is also aware of proposals the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] and I are putting together on defense conversion. We have a lot of work to do, which I think is only going on up here on the Hill taking on the responsibility for examining the impact on the Defense Department of these international changes that are going to occur—the impact on communities and work forces and businesses, and so on. We have a responsibility, there is room for that, also, in Senator EXON's numbers.

Let us be honest and thoughtful and careful about this very significant conversion activity. At a lot of these plants, like the Rocky Flats plant in Colorado, which is going to close down, we have people who have committed their whole lives to defense. They

ought to be treated like veterans. We ought to be sure that transition for them is there. We have tremendous conversion problems.

Defense is an insurance policy. The risk is vastly reduced. And now it is time to cut the premium.

America must remain strong and secure. But assuming the role of globocorp is unnecessary and unaffordable. We cannot be strong abroad and weak at home. That is what this debate is all about. How we are going to maintain a much better balance of America as policeman around the world, as very strong around the globe, with what everybody understands is significant weakness at home.

Economists from all across the board have said the investments that had to be made in our economy in the past, that made our economy strong, are lacking today. For the last decade, we have, as symptom of disinvestment here at home, shortchanged our children's education while saddling them with debt accumulated by a decade of huge deficits.

We must invest in education, in child health and nutrition, in research and development, and infrastructure. Our failure to do so carries a terrible, terrible price. Not only are we not adding value to that pair of American hands and moving, if we do not do that, right into economic disaster internationally, but if a pair of American hands is competing hand on hand with a pair of hands in Mexico or a pair of hands in Taiwan or a pair of hands in Hong Kong or a pair of hands in Bangladesh, we lose. That is a direct invitation to the decline in America's standard of living and our economic power base. We have to add value to those hands. And the way in which we add value to those hands is through education.

The key place in the budget where these programs are so important are in the section of the budget called domestic discretionary. Let me show another chart, if I might, Mr. President. This chart talks about where the budget has gone in the last 10 years, a quite remarkable figure. It is a pie chart representing the Federal budget for fiscal year 1981, and a pie chart 10 years later for fiscal year 1991.

Let us look at the difference. In 1981, we know the proportion of the budget dedicated to defense has declined from 22 to 20.6 percent, but our economy has grown significantly. We know the amount of defense expenditures pointed out in the earlier chart in real terms have gone up significantly in real dollars. As far as Social Security and Medicare, people say we have had this huge explosion of entitlements, from 25 to 26 percent. That size of the pie remains about the same. The other entitlements programs—retirement programs, Government service and so on—have in fact gone down from 19 to 17 percent.

Where we have seen huge changes are in three areas, Mr. President, and that

is what this debate is all about, priorities and values. First, we have seen growing net interest, going up from 9 to 13 percent. It has increased about 50 percent. We have seen the so-called Reaganomics program where we dramatically cut taxes, dramatically increase spending and say we can balance the budget at the same time. Wrong. The debt has gone from \$1 to \$4 trillion in 12 short years.

What do we have to do with that? We have to pay interest on the debt, and as Ross Perot said so clearly, you only have to pay interest on that debt, those notes are coming due in the next 4, 5 years, and 60 percent of that debt has to be redone. You have 60 percent increase of interest on the debt.

What else is in here, Mr. President? Let me show you another item that is in here that is starkly surprising. If you look up at 1981, there is nothing here that says deposit insurance. We did not have any failed financial institutions; banks were not going down the chute, S&L's were not going down the chute. But one of the glories of Reaganomics was deregulation of the savings and loan institutions, and as we look at fiscal year 1991, deposit insurance is taking up 7.1 percent of Federal spending.

No wonder the budget is being squeezed. Eleven percent plus of this budget is going for nothing. It is going to pay interest on the debt which does not build a school; it does not build a hospital; it does not pave a highway; it does not research fiber optics or invest in plant and equipment. Interest on the debt is probably, more than anything else, a massive income transfer in the United States. And then there is deposit insurance, which is another massive income transfer in the United States in which the average taxpayer is bailing out people who were engaged in these institutions and did very well for themselves. And I think that there are some very significant equity questions in there.

We not only have that "fairness" issue of who benefits from these huge investments that never happened before, but also let us look at the issue of values again, domestic discretionary, what everybody wants: schools, hospitals, training, housing, highways. Domestic discretionary has gone down from 23 percent of the budget to 15 percent of the budget.

The program that we need for the future strength and growth of this country, for our ability to compete around the world have gone down by 8 percent.

What has happened to us, Mr. President, and why are we in such trouble? There is effectively at least a 20-percent gap in our budget. We are paying 4 percent of the budget more for interest on the debt because of this Reaganomics business; we are paying more than 8 percent on deposit insurance. That is nearly 12 percent right out of

there doing nothing, and we have an 8-percent drop in domestic discretionary. No wonder we are in trouble. Our priorities are all wrong. It shows what has happened and what has happened in particular, Mr. President, in education. The support for education has gone from 2.5 percent of the budget in 1981 to 1.8 percent and it is dropping; 2.5 percent to 1.8. It is cut by a factor of almost a third.

Discretionary programs and as a part of those, education are the most important programs for us all.

On the final chart, Mr. President, let me illustrate in greater detail what is happening in the support of education. In the area of education, if we were just to keep funding at the 1981 Federal level, we would have gone from \$14.4 billion to \$33 billion over this period of time, if education had maintained its share of the budget from 1981 when we were making significant investments in our country's future before passing Gramm-Latta in 1981, before all of the so-called wonderful Reaganomics budget cuts, where we cut into the sinew of our investment programs. No new widgets, no new social engineering, as it is called, whatever it may be; just make that commitment. We would be up here at \$33 billion.

What has happened? Reality is in struggling to keep this support alive, seen in the square boxes. We are down by \$9 billion in what the Congress has done, and under this line, is the President's budget request, which was significantly lower than the congressional spending levels. Presidents Reagan and Bush wanted to invest significantly less, and requested significantly less from the Congress. This is where we would be with constant spending, and this is what we managed to maintain in the Congress; this is what these administrations wanted to do.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WIRTH. Let me finish and then I will be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

For example, what kinds of things have gone on? Despite 25 years of proven success, not even 30 percent of Head Start eligible kids are enrolled in Head Start. We know after 25 years of work that this program succeeds. Kids who have been through Head Start have much better life chances. Their opportunities to graduate from high school and get and keep a job are significantly better. And yet we talk about Head Start, the President talks about Head Start, probably every Member of this body and the other one has talked about Head Start. So you think Head Start is funded? Is it? Wrong.

Only one child in four who is eligible for Head Start goes through a Head Start program. One child in four, Mr. President. The argument is made that we do not have the money to put all these kids in Head Start. Let us think

about how much it would cost. If you enrolled three out of those other four children in Head Start, it would cost a little less than \$2.2 billion a year. That is a lot of money. We can enroll every Head Start child 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old in Head Start for \$2.2 billion a year, all of them. We know that is a good investment.

What kind of tradeoffs are we talking about in a real way? Let me give some examples. The increase requested last year by the President for star wars was \$2.5 billion. Many of us believe that we ought to do a research program there, but not a massive deployment program. The cost, Mr. President, of the advanced tactical fighter, which is designed to take on advanced stealthy technology fighters from the old Soviet Union, would cost about \$2.2 billion.

What kinds of priorities do we want? What does the American public want us to be investing in? Head Start is just one example.

For a modest amount of money in teacher training, Mr. President, we can have an enormous amount of leverage through the whole system.

Everybody on this floor as well has talked about the need to change our schools, to reform our institutions. One of the places where you start is, one, helping teachers to cope with these vast new demands that are made upon them; helping teachers to retool for the 21st century to teach kids for the 21st century and, Mr. President, helping kids to feel good about themselves.

What we used to do was provide teachers the opportunity to go to summer retraining programs. In the 1960's and 1970's, we did an enormous amount under the aegis of the National Defense Education Act and others. We gave teachers the opportunity to go through summer programs. It was a very small investment and a very big return. Almost all of that has been wiped out. Those are the kinds of things that we ought to be doing, Mr. President, and we are not doing.

That is what this debate is all about. This debate is all about if we are going to be serious about the problems of the country and make investments in the future of the country or, as we have done in the past, are we going to continue to starve it?

Mr. President, it would be my fervent hope that we are going to be able to break down these walls and be able to increase the investments in the future of the country. That is what this debate is all about. Some of that is, yes, fairness. But more important, it is a question of values and judgment. Are we going to make these kinds of investments in our own future, in our economic health and our own ability to compete around the world, or are we going to continue this kind of very post-cold war, nonthinking about defense?

We have to break down these walls. We have to exercise our judgment and

change a deal that we made in 1990, at a time when the cold war was still on, the Soviet Union was still there, that cosmonaut was about to go up, coming from old Leningrad, going up into the air and representing the Soviet Union. He is now down; he has come back; the Soviet Union is no more; his hometown of Leningrad is now St. Petersburg. He comes home to change. In the United States of America, it is time for us to come home, Mr. President, and recognize that we ought to be making these investments right here in our own backyard.

Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Idaho I would yield to him.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding, and I appreciate his point of view and comments. But the question continues to occur to this Senator, as I see him make his pitch for more money for education, will the Senator not agree with me that one of the best Government school systems that has ever been established in the history of the universe is that of the U.S. military? The military has provided training for aviation mechanics, truck drivers, engineers, computer operators, and many other fields.

The military is an incredible educational tool to put productive citizens back into our society. With what does he suggest we replace it?

Mr. WIRTH. We are not talking about dismantling the military. I hope the Senator from Idaho is not suggesting for a minute we are going to dismantle the military. It is going to be downsized. The Senator from Idaho knows that, so do I, so does most of the American public. The question is how much are we going to downsize it?

It is a training exercise. It is a training function. The military has done that. It has also provided a lot of jobs. But the primary purpose of the military, Mr. President, is not jobs. If we want to have a jobs program, let us launch and fund a jobs program. The function of the military has spilled out and there has been some productive education. But if we want to have an education program, let us fund an education program.

There are some spinoffs that have been very valuable from the military, no question about it. And some of those are going to remain. I believe the single most important thing for us to do is to fund education and fund education in all its diversity and all its richness in the United States of America.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me earlier, and I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, March 18, 1992.

Hon. SAM NUNN,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SAM: I am writing you to express my thoughts about the upcoming debate on the

level of defense spending for Fiscal Year 1993. I believe it is important that the Senate Armed Services Committee provide to the Senate Budget Committee its opinion as to the appropriate level of spending. As you have noted on many occasions, a number of budget cut proposals have been made in both the Senate and the House—by Democrats and Republicans alike—targeting savings greater than the President's proposed cuts through Fiscal Year 1997.

Many of these suggested budget cut plans, however, are short on specifics or fail to tie the reductions in our military forces to its ability to meet the security threat, the nature of which is changing for the better, but which has not as of yet clarified. With this in mind, I believe it is presumptuous to address defense spending levels beyond the upcoming year. Our challenge is to come up with a responsible Pentagon budget for Fiscal Year 1993 given the state of world events as we know them. The last three years should teach us that extended planning, though essential to our force planning, is a crude tool when it comes to defense budgeting. We can project some outyears for spending to meet budget requirements but they should be clearly identified as "guesstimates" only to be formalized later after our committee completes in 1992 an in-depth study for the out-years.

My analysis of the President's 1993 defense budget convinces me that greater savings can be realized without harming our military's ability to meet our security needs. Below I outline with specificity where sizeable savings can be obtained without cutting into the muscle of our forces. If my 1993 defense spending plan is open to criticism, it would be that it is too cautious, too conservative. I propose that we can responsibly cut the budget by \$8.8 billion in Budget Authority and \$4.2 billion in Outlays through modest reductions. These are cuts even somewhat more than the House recommendations. Generally, as you will see in more detail later, I've been cautious so as to provide a comfort factor when considering these spending cuts. But as you know, many of the proposals that will be offered in the Budget Committee will be in excess of my suggested cuts. I believe that unless the approximate level of cuts I am suggesting is endorsed by you and Senator Warner, then our committee recommendation will quickly become irrelevant. My plan, I believe, stands a good chance of receiving support in the Budget Committee as a workable compromise after the President's plan and much higher cut numbers are voted down.

PROPOSED AND SUGGESTED SPENDING LEVELS

	Bush—1993		Aspin/House—1993		Exon—1993	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
DOE	267.6	272.8			259.2	269.0
DOE total	13.3	13.1			12.9	12.7
Total	280.9	285.9	274.9	282.1	272.1	281.7

COMPARISON OF CUT LEVELS

	Budget Authority		Below Bush		Outlays		Below Bush	
	Cut	Below Bush	Cut	Below Bush	Cut	Below Bush	Cut	Below Bush
Bush	280.9	8.0	285.9	5.2				
Aspin/House	274.9	14.0	282.1	9.0				3.8
Exon	272.1	16.8	281.7	9.4				4.2

ACCOUNT COMPARISON OF BUSH AND EXON PLANS

Account	Bush budget authority	Proposed cuts	Exon budget authority
Military personnel	77.1	0.8	76.3
Operations/maintenance	84.5	.9	83.6
Procurement	54.4	4.4	50.0
RDT&E	38.8	2.1	36.7
Military construction	6.2	.1	6.1
Family housing	4.0	.1	3.9
Revolving funds transfer	2.0		2.0
All other	.6		.6
DOE total	267.6	8.4	259.2
DOE total	13.3	.4	12.9
National defense total	280.9	8.8	272.1

THE EXON PLAN: WHAT IT DOES AND DOESN'T CUT

No cuts are taken in any of the services' top ten most expensive programs (totalling about \$28 billion), which are shown below with their 1993 budgets:

Services' top 10 fiscal year 1993 programs¹
(Cost in millions of then-year dollars)

Army:	
RAH-66	\$443.0
UH-60	428.3
ASM	367.2
FHTV	315.7
FMTV	291.1
Longbow engine	281.8
HMMWV	229.5
Singgars	223.2
MLRS launchers	217.2
ATACMS	188.3
Total	2,985.3

Navy	
DDG-51	3,369.6
F/A-18	1,808.6
F/A-18E/F	1,079.7
Trident II	986.8
Carrier	832.2
E/A-6B	530.0
CH/MH-53E	513.1
Tomahawk	404.2
F1tsatcom	326.0
T-45	303.5
Total	10,153.7

Air Force	
B-2	4,028.0
C-17	3,142.0
ATF (F-22)	2,224.0
Milstar	1,552.0
F-16	901.0
Amraam	773.0
Jstars	744.0
Titan IV	525.0
Navstar GPS	509.0
DSP	413.0
Total	14,811.0

¹Includes procurement and R&D programs.

Some modernization and replacement is delayed. A review of the hundreds of programs and line items contained in the Procurement account reveals that many of these line items (i.e. approximately 150) have major increases over the last year's budget ranging from 20-30 percent to over 800 percent. The \$4.4 billion cut in Procurement doesn't require every item in the budget to hold to last year's levels (note the above increases); rather, it shows how much can be cut from smaller dollar amount programs which have huge increases in their budgets. This is a modest proposal, one that could be enlarged if the big-dollar weapons programs were pared to some degree.

SDI is cut by \$1 billion from \$5.312B down to \$4.312B, higher still than last year's

\$4.116B. Much more can be—and likely, will be—cut here. Once again, this is a conservative reduction.

Other R&D accounts are cut: reduce ASAT by \$24.7 million down to \$0; reduce NASP by \$100 million down to \$100 million, generous given the weak justification for the program; hold the Air Force RDT&E budget, which is proposed to increase by 6.9 percent to last year's level (this saves \$941 million); and hold the Director of Test and Evaluation to 1992 spending levels, thus saving \$71 million.

All the other major DOD accounts—Military Personnel, Operations and Maintenance, Military Construction, Family Housing—are reduced across the board by approximately 1 percent below the proposed amount. If these cuts resulted in significant involuntary active duty separations and other politically difficult actions, such as a pay raise reduction or freeze, the total cut of \$1.9B in these accounts can be realized, with less return in Outlay savings, by revisiting some of the larger weapons programs excluded from the cutting knife.

The DOE cut of \$400 million would hold the line at this year's (1992) spending level. Though it is true that the DOE Environmental Restoration and Waste Management funding should increase, savings can be found in the Weapons Complex account to counterbalance these plus-ups.

In summary, this plan is more than an illustrative way of cutting our defense spending; it represents a specific, balanced approach to realizing savings that the public, in light of both domestic and world events, will insist that we find. It's easy to get caught up in the marquee programs like the B-2, SDI, C-17 and forget that significant reductions can be realized by mining smaller line items of the budget and ask that many accounts live with a freeze in spending. A careful review shows we are "nicked and dimed" to fiscal oblivion by a hundred "small programs."

In light of an over \$4 trillion debt, a \$400 billion deficit this year, and growing, near-crisis resentment among Americans over their financial predicament, I believe the cuts that I propose—as a starting point—are quite reasonable. We can do more but need an in-depth study in our committee before we allow a magnificent "peace dividend" to be locked in place to serve other needs without concern for realistic national defense requirements.

Sincerely,

JIM EXON,
U.S. Senator.

NO ECONOMIC GROWTH STIMULUS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, there has been some discussion today of the tax increase bill which the President vetoed on Friday. For those who wondered about its strength, I am advised that the veto override in the House failed, a "yes" vote of 211 and a "no" vote of 215. It was not even given a simple majority when sent back. I believe it is because it was a tax increase bill and not an economic growth stimulus.

Another point I want to make, there has been discussion about how various income levels fared in taxation over the last decade. According to a chart published by the CBO in the 1990 Ways and Means "Green Book," in 1980, the top 1 percent of income earners paid 18.2 percent; by 1990, they paid 25.4 percent of all income taxes paid.

That means that the percentage paid by the top 1 percent went up 40 percent; the percentage paid by the top 5 percent went up 23 percent; the percentage paid by the top 10 percent went up 15 percent. At the other end, the bottom 60 percent, which paid 13.8 percent of all income taxes paid in 1980, went down to 11 percent in 1990, a drop of 20 percent. But most remarkably, the bottom 20 percent of income tax filers saw their tax liability fall 150 percent, meaning they were actually receiving net returns from the income tax system.

CORRECTING THE SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, on behalf of many Senators—and I know Governors from all across the United States—I want to express sincere appreciation to the majority leader and the Republican leader for passing last night a measure to correct the Surface Transportation Act to remove the earmarked funds for the Brooklyn courthouse which had caused the 5- to 6-percent reduction in highway funds available this year.

We have had some interesting discussions over that matter in the last several weeks here, and when it became clear that some \$1.2 billion was going to be lost, this body acted quickly. I commend Senator MOYNIHAN, whose bill passed. I commend Senator DOMENICI, who had brought this matter to the attention of all of us. It was a great relief to see this measure move so quickly.

I had been contacted by the Governor of Wisconsin, who is the chairman of the National Governor's Conference Committee on Transportation, to emphasize how important this measure is. This is the season where in most parts of the country highway construction must be planned and must begin for the summer and fall months. And if the other body will move as quickly as this body did this past week, we have an opportunity to correct this mistake which crept into the Surface Transportation Act last fall, in time to use the funds this year.

Again I express the thanks of many people across this country to the leadership and to the people who made that possible.

APPROPRIATIONS CATEGORY REFORM ACT

MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleague from New Mexico, the senior Senator, in opposing this bill. The bill before us is a bad idea. I think it will further worsen the budget deficit and we ought to reject it. We ought to reject it, as Senator DOMENICI has said, so we can go back and work on an honest budget package on which we can move forward.

The 1990 budget agreement was far from perfect. That may be the understatement of the day. I am sure that every Member of this body can list many of the flaws in it. I certainly could point out a few that are real clunkers in my view. The one thing that no one can argue with, however, is that it got us on the road toward some fiscal responsibility and it has forced a small amount of fiscal responsibility in the budget process.

As one who comes from State government, where we did not have the ability to print money, where the legislative and the executive had to live within the disciplines of the constitutional requirements and within the availability of funds coming into the State each year, I can tell you that some type of discipline is absolutely essential to come up with responsible budgets each year.

Under the budget agreement, defense spending was cut significantly. Since the budget summit, of course, as we have heard already today, the world has changed, and changed dramatically, and the defense budget has changed right along with it. In fact since the original summit agreement, an additional \$350 billion is projected to be cut from the defense budget through 1997—\$350 billion. Those are real, those are dramatic cuts.

The President and the Pentagon have offered realistic proposals in response to the changes we have seen in Eastern Europe and to the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The cuts they have proposed in troops and weapons are unprecedented in our Nation's history. I think it is worthwhile to review just a few of the major programs that the administration has agreed can be scaled back or eliminated.

They have said to do away with the *Sea Wolf* submarine, limit the B-2 bomber, cut back on the Comanche helicopter, the block 3 tank, the Losat antitank vehicle, the mobile small ICBM or Midgetman, the Peacekeeper or MX missile, the F-14D fighter, the F-16 fighter, the advanced cruise missile, the Adats air defense system, the Apache helicopter. The list goes on and on.

No one can argue that these are not significant actions or that the administration has not reacted in a major way to the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the disappearance of the Soviet Union. They have acted and they have acted quickly. The administration's cuts are not just limited to procurement programs.

The President is taking advantage of the world situation to scale back on U.S. troops both at home and overseas. His cuts have included deactivation of several divisions both in the United States and in Europe. In addition, we are seeing the deactivation of several air wings and the mothballing of dozens of Navy ships. I will not argue that

the President's cuts, significant as they are, are the final word on how to scale back our national security commitments. To the contrary, I proposed a plan that would cut at least \$60 billion from defense spending through 1997. And I know that many of my colleagues, including the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, obviously, whose cuts have a great deal of credibility in this Chamber, have proposed cuts with similar numbers. Reasonable people can and will disagree on the exact number, and I have no doubt that when we recess this fall, we will have had a very thorough and extensive debate on exactly what that number should be.

However, regardless however of whether we decide to cut an additional \$50 billion over 5 years, or \$60 billion, or even \$75 billion, we must use the savings to reduce the burgeoning budget deficit. To do otherwise would be to miss a once in a lifetime opportunity, and would once again squander our children's future to pay our bills today.

I would like to comment briefly on what defense spending ought to be. There is no question that we now face a unique opportunity to scale back on our national security force commitments around the world. The cold war is over, and we have won. Although Russia and the other members of the CIS retain the capability to destroy our Nation with nuclear weapons, or to attack our allies with conventional weapons, we have little reason to believe they will try to do so any time soon. That means we can greatly reduce our presence in Europe for the first time since World War II. It means we can scale back on our forces around the world. And it presents a great opportunity to scale back our nuclear arsenal as other countries do the same.

What the recent changes in the world do not mean however, is that the world is a safe place and that we can pack up our military and go home. Those both in Congress and in various think tanks around this city who want to slash our military and withdraw our presence from the world simply are not being realistic. Yes, the United States has emerged as the world's only superpower. And, yes, we should listen to our commitments overseas, and focus on our domestic needs. But we must not ignore the fact that we will have to defend our interests around the world, and the best way to ensure that we do not have to fight is by maintaining a credible deterrent.

The chances of having to fight another regional conflict like we fought in Desert Storm will greatly increase with the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the disintegration of the U.S.S.R. They are not less. What we seek to do is to provide a military which is capable of deterring aggressive action.

We followed the course of dismantling our military after World War I.

The sad fact is that we had neither the will nor the manpower and the weaponry to stop Hitler on his march of the thirties that led to the millions of deaths and the tragedies of World War II.

We have to maintain a credible deterrent. At another time and another place we will debate exactly what that deterrent force needs to be.

Another point that has been raised is the possibility of using all of these funds that we take out of the military for economic growth. What are we going to do to provide jobs? Well, that struck a chord in my memory. I went back.

I just read in the last day or so an article by Alan Reynolds in *Forbes* magazine pointing out something very interesting: Why we are having a slowdown, why we are still having a recession. He argues it is because of the significant cutback, the reduction in defense spending of over 15 percent in the past year. He says that if defense and other Government purchases are excluded, private real GNP rose at a 3.1-percent rate in the third quarter and 2.3 percent in the fourth. Since last April, he argues the only recession has been in Government and then mainly in defense.

Defense does provide a component to our economic engine. That is not the reason to keep defense spending high. But those who would take our military down below what is needed as a responsible deterrent as protection for this country cannot do so credibly and say that we need to do it so that we can create more jobs and provide more opportunities.

As my colleague from Idaho has pointed out, our military not only has the finest weaponry but it has the finest training programs for the outstanding men and women who go into the service these days.

But, Mr. President, let me get back to what this debate should be about, and that is the question of when are we going to get serious about the budget deficit?

If you talk to anyone in my State of Missouri, they will tell you that Congress has been ignoring the deficit far too long. And then in the next breath they will tell you that this program or that program might need a little additional funding.

Well, that debate is today's debate in a microcosm. Which way is Congress going to go? Are we going to follow those whose basic instincts are to promise the additional funds to somebody, or are we going to prove my very wise friend, WARREN RUDMAN, wrong, and actually come forward and say that we need to reduce the deficit first and foremost?

Since I have been in this body—since 1987—I have seen budget after budget come and go. Each promises deficit reduction, but usually delivers only in-

creased spending and higher deficits. That has gotten us to the point today where our deficit is projected to be some \$367 billion for this fiscal year. It has also put us on a course whereby the status quo means Congress will manage to increase the Federal debt by 50 percent over the next 5 years while running deficits in the \$300 billion range for as far as the eye can see.

We have had discussions today about our children. I count myself as one very concerned about the world we leave our children and our children's children. What are we doing to the future of this country, our children? Well if we do nothing on the deficit, Congress will be adding nearly \$2 trillion to our debt during the period of the next 5 years, saddling our children, our grandchildren and their grandchildren with a burden which is almost indescribable.

Mr. President, we already have a Federal debt of nearly \$4 trillion, meaning that for every man, woman, and child in the United States today there is a \$14,000 debt to be repaid. Doing nothing means that by fiscal year 1997, this debt will have grown to over \$21,000 per person. That is not a legacy I want to be part of.

Today's debate clearly shows the difference in this Chamber on how we should address this compelling issue. Incredibly, facing the prospects of a \$400 billion deficit with interest payments on the debt rapidly becoming not only the fastest growing but the largest Federal expenditure, there are those who want to take potential savings and spend them. They are not taking savings out of revenue that is coming in. They are taking so-called savings that really are savings on borrowing we would otherwise incur and then spending them. So what happens? We simply have to borrow more.

Let me repeat. There are some who would take whatever defense reductions can be achieved and spend them so that we keep the debt high. Is that leadership? I think not.

My friend, WARREN RUDMAN, is right. And we are sorely going to miss his ability to stand up and say what is right. What is right is that somebody has to step forward and say the Emperor has no clothes. We are running up this huge debt solely on the credit card of this country.

Congress must own up to the fact that what we should be debating are the deficit-reduction proposals which will get us on the right path, rather than trying to figure out a way where we can transfer defense spending, which was already spending of borrowed dollars, and turn it over to other spending so Congress can keep its spending up and can keep the level of increase growing in our debt.

Mr. President, do I believe Congress can do the right thing? I do not know. Looking at the reaction to the Presi-

dent's rescission list which has come up does not give me a great deal of hope.

What did we see when the rescissions came up? Handwriters dashing about worrying about who is on the list. Some called the first round of cuts unfair, "targeted at Democrats." Other dismissed them saying the proposal did not really amount to anything, as what is \$3.6 billion when the deficit is \$367 billion. Talk about missing the point. How can we ever attack \$367 billion in deficit if Congress does not even have the guts to take the first step?

How could people take talk of deficit reduction seriously if Congress reaction is "not me," or to say cuts are "just symbolism," as if any of those who called the cuts too small would support a bigger cut?

Mr. President, if it appears that I am frustrated, I am.

Being on the floor discussing a piece of legislation designed to do nothing more than keep the deficit as high as possible seems just the place to discuss these concerns. Members can disagree over the size of the defense budget. That will be a healthy debate. I look forward to that. But there should be no disagreement that whatever the savings, whatever we can reduce it by, should go toward reducing the deficit.

As a member of both the Budget and Appropriations Committees, I understand full well the enormity of the problems we are facing and the tough choices we must make. Unfortunately, the legislation we are debating today says, let us put off those choices. Let us wait. We do not need to face the deficit today. The credit card is still hot, still working, let us spend the money. No wonder the public has a minimum amount of high enthusiasm for Congress.

Mr. President, every Member of this Chamber could find ways to spend the peace dividend. We have heard some wonderful creative, innovative, exciting proposals laid out today. Some of the ideas would be excellent ones, ones I could support. I might be willing to make some shifts in existing spending programs to fund them, but that misses the point.

If we cannot make the relatively easy decision to use defense savings to reduce the deficit, how in the world are we going to make more difficult decisions to cut programs to reduce the deficit? If Congress cannot discipline itself when the choice is simple, why should anyone ever believe that Congress will agree to cut spending anywhere at any time?

Mr. President, today, we are spending about \$215 billion on domestic discretionary programs. These are very important programs. They include everything from education and child care to highways, mass transit, and soil conservation. But at the same time we are also spending \$201 billion paying the interest on our Federal debt.

That money is not buying us anything. We are not providing any services; we are not providing research; we are not constructing anything with that money. It is simply lost paying for the borrowings of the past. Congress is doing what millions of American households are trying to avoid doing, and that is paying only the minimum on our credit card while we watch our unpaid balances getting larger and larger.

The difference is that Uncle Sam has no credit card limit. So the debt just keeps piling up. If we keep up at our current pace, CBO projects we will be spending more on interest than domestic discretionary as soon as next year, if not 1995.

That means for every dollar spent on education, or highways or child care, a dollar will be going to pay for spending decisions of the past. We should be looking to the future, not spending our precious resources paying for the past. CBO states in its report to Congress on economic and budget outlook for fiscal years 1993 through 1997:

One of the major problems affecting the long-term outlook for growth and productivity and living standards in the United States is the size of the Federal deficit.

I could not have said it better myself. Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that it is time for Congress to get serious about the deficit, and spending the peace dividend, whether it be \$50 billion, \$60 billion, \$85 billion, or \$150 billion, is exactly the wrong way to go.

We have an opportunity to begin to reduce the deficit and to thus begin the work on turning around our buildup of debt.

I will be offering with my colleagues in the near future measures that go beyond this to make significant reductions in that deficit so that we can look forward in the reasonable future to a time when that line of spending will cross from deficit into surplus, so that we can stop building up the tremendous interest payment each year. Then we will have money to spend on vital programs, domestic discretionary, and others.

Let me repeat: The legislation we are debating today simply says let us put off dealing with the deficit. Let us wait. We do not need to face the deficit today. Let us keep spending the money as fast as we can.

I urge my colleagues to reject that worn out thinking. I urge my colleagues to get serious about the deficit and not to go forward with this legislation.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor of this important legislation to revise the budget agreement to allow shifts of funds from defense programs to domestic initiatives.

First, I went to commend and thank the distinguished, hardworking, energetic and committed chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator SASSER, for his leadership in this area, as well as in so many others. This is a vitally important piece of legislation. And Chairman SASSER has worked on it with determination and persistence.

Mr. President, listening to some of the arguments against this legislation has made me chuckle. But it's also made me sad. Because what I hear is sanctimonious hypocrisy. I do not hear the truth. I hear cries to reduce the deficit and cut out the spending, and the credit card is no good, and we use it here willy-nilly. Lots of rhetoric.

But, Mr. President, I am chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation; everybody here knows that. I have a budget of about \$31 billion a year. I have yet to see any volunteers come into my office and say, "Frank, I want to help reduce this deficit. And so I'm going to sacrifice my State's need for roads, bridges, tunnels, airports, and economic development."

No, I have not heard anybody do that. I would like to hear it. I would like to hear it from those who are screaming about the deficit and its effect on the economic future of this country.

My friends, one approach we could take would be to put up a list and ask for volunteers. We can get the staff to take the names of senders who are willing to step forward. They can say cancel me out for highway money or for transit money, cancel out that bridge or airport, because I want to do my share. And my constituents are going to follow me, they are going to want me to declare that I am willing to have less money for education in my State and less money for the elderly and less money for AIDS research.

Yes, they can say, we are going to volunteer, because we are going to show the American way—voluntarism.

There will be plenty of opportunities for volunteers to turn back their budget requests, Mr. President. I get requests for transportation support from every State in this country, bar none.

I also heard an argument that says "a deal is a deal is a deal." Well, "a deal," to put it crudely, "ain't always a deal," or shouldn't we say, for example, that you have a fence between your house and your neighbor's and an understanding to stay off each other's property. That is a type of deal. But if the neighbor's house is on fire, or someone is attacking one of her children, I would hope you would hop over the fence and say this deal is no deal.

To take another example, if someone falls behind on a mortgage because they cannot afford to keep it up, we wouldn't want every banker to simply say "A deal is a deal, get out."

Mr. President, this budget deal, which protects outmoded levels of de-

fense spending, should not be sacrosanct either. It's just not enough to say "A deal's a deal" when conditions have changed so dramatically.

Mr. President, we have heard lots of reasons why we should not move ahead. I would like to talk about some of the reasons why we should.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, can I pose a question to my friend from New Jersey?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am happy to yield to the chairman for a question.

Mr. SASSER. First, the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee has enormous responsibility, as we all know, those of us who serve on the Appropriations Committee, because he has the responsibility of assigning priorities and funding very vital and crucial and critical projects in the transportation sector of this Government, including highways, as I understand it, airports, a whole host of infrastructure construction, and agencies that affect transportation.

My friend said that we should have volunteers from those who were so concerned about the deficit. We have heard a lot of concerns expressed about that today.

I will ask my friend from New Jersey, in his position as chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, has he heard any of these Senators who have expressed such concern about the deficit today, have any of them ever requested of him that he cancel a project in their State and apply the funds to deficit reduction?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have yet to hear it. I await that moment anxiously, because it may give me latitude to take care of more urgent needs. I would point out, for example, that our subcommittee is responsible for funding the Coast Guard. We send them out in the high seas to interdict drugs, to watch for pollution, to rescue tankers off the coast so they do not spill toxic cargo in the sea.

We have need for a lot more funding. So, for Members who want to help reduce the deficit, we can leave a list they can sign to sacrifice the projects that they now beg for so ardently because of what they say is the real need. Instead, they can come in and say this: my town is so congested people cannot get back and forth to work. We lose work time: we lose productivity; we violate the Clean Air Act. But listen; I am going to do my part as a good American. I am going to stand up for that deficit, and my State is the first one to volunteer.

Mr. President, it would be so nice.

Mr. SASSER. Another question, if I may propound it to my friend from New Jersey, the distinguished chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

During the Senator's years of service as chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I assume

he received numerous communications and letters from various of our colleagues asking that projects be funded in their State.

Is that correct?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes, and I remind the chairman of the Budget Committee, who also is a colleague of mine on the Appropriations Committee and who serves as the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee on Appropriations. We both sit on several subcommittees on the Appropriations Committee. And I'm sure we both hear from people who not only want help with matters related to the subcommittees we chair, but from people who call about items in our other subcommittees, to see if we can talk to the chairs of those subcommittees to help out their State. We sit on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, for example, which is responsible for funding the FBI and other crime-fighting initiatives among other things. I have never had anybody send me a slip saying: Here is \$3 million we do not need in our State; use it for something else.

Mr. SASSER. I will ask my friend from New Jersey. Our friends on the floor today have been so concerned about the deficit, and we all are concerned.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Absolutely.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, it is a matter of grave concern to all of us. But as to those who expressed this acute concern over it, has my friend received any communication from them with regard to transportation projects in their State that they wish to have funded at levels perhaps higher than the administration had proposed, or perhaps funding projects that the administration had opposed in times past, and that sort of thing?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the chairman know very well that when the Budget Committee considers the budget resolution or other matters there are always people who will say no, we have to stop increasing this budget deficit; and no, we are not going to go along with it.

In the next breath, they see me wearing the other hat, the transportation hat, and they say: Listen, that bridge that runs across the river may not look so important; it is only a small river. But I have jobs out there we desperately need. We have companies that want to invest. If we only had that transportation access, Mr. Chairman, we could get people to work.

But in the public forum, when there are opportunities to express views that people can read or hear, they will say: Oh, no, the budget deficit, Mr. Chairman, no one has worked harder than you to reduce the budget deficit, and I have supported you in those efforts. I voted against the budget agreement, just like I voted against Gramm-Rudman. I knew it wouldn't work to reduce

the deficit. And I knew it would lead to endless fights over a shrinking domestic pie instead of ensuring the peace dividend that we are all waiting so anxiously to see arrive in our mail boxes. So far, that peace dividend has not come. And it is not the Post Office's fault.

Mr. SASSER. One final question to my friend from New Jersey, Mr. President. I know this is an arduous task, assigning priorities for spending and for projects, badly needed transportation projects in the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, and in essence that is what we do in the Appropriations Committee is sort of assign priorities and fund this and do not fund that, and do it on the basis of what we calculate is in the best interest of the country.

But in the event, I ask my friend from New Jersey, that we are held to the caps in the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, and a cut below the so-called current policy or baseline comes in your committee, if you are forced to suffer a decrease in real spending power as a result of the ax of inflation, what effect is this going to have on your ability to fund some of these badly needed transportation projects and infrastructure projects?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is going to impede our efforts severely.

Mr. President, I also want to respond to something that was said on the floor a while ago, suggesting that President Bush has just loaded these programs with more money for this and more money for that. Supposedly, there is more money for everything.

Well, the President signed the surface transportation bill, known as ISTEA with fanfare and flourish and photos back in December. At the time, he saluted the bill not only for promoting essential investment in America's infrastructure, but he called the legislation a jobs bill to get people back to work.

Within 4 weeks, however, the President submitted a budget request that was \$1.6 billion less than he proposed when he signed that bill with such fanfare. The fellow in the hard hat standing next to him was thinking about his job and how good it would be to get back to work. Immediately, when you deduct \$1.6 billion off the top, you are saying, A, it is not so important; and B, those jobs, too bad; find jobs other places. Except there are not enough to go around.

So what we see, Mr. President, is that when there are cuts in programs, we cannot satisfy the requests. I tell you that in my bill, the transportation bill, I get several hundred requests a year, and there is not a State—not a State—that does not have its request. And also, accompanying the request, is a very nice message. That is when I get the "Dear Franks." Otherwise, the name may be different, or the greeting may be different.

But it is: "Dear Frank," and, "You know how important it is, the bridge across the River Y. Why? Because I need those votes back home, and I want those people to vote for me. I want to show them that Senator X is out there standing at Bridge Y, to show we are giving our constituents the kind of service they want."

All right. But then here on the Senate floor, the table is theatrical, the abstract. We talk about the need to bring down that budget deficit. That is the overriding thing, and we cannot tear down the wall. A deal is a deal. The world has changed, but a deal is a deal.

So, Mr. President, what we see at times is some utter foolishness, and the fools are among ourselves because we are taking a message to the public the public does not believe.

Mr. SASSER. If I may propound one more question to the chairman. Is he aware that at least one of the Senators who was emphatic, saying a deal is a deal, did not even vote for the budget summit agreement?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That is my recollection.

Mr. SASSER. Is the chairman aware that this same Senator voted for an amendment on the floor just a few weeks ago that would have taken domestic discretionary money and used it for a tax cut, tearing down the wall to do that, and in clear violation of the pay-as-you-go provision, which is the very heart of the budget agreement itself, which he said is a deal is a deal is a deal? And this same Senator, who expressed such chagrin over the magnitude of the deficit and the increase of it, voted for the President's tax package, which would have increased the deficit by \$30 billion over the next 5 years, just in the past few days. Was the chairman aware of that?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

And I would respond, if I may, to the manager of this bill with a question. As chairman of the Budget Committee, does the Senator from Tennessee recall when, within the last few years, the President has sent up a balanced budget for our consideration?

Mr. SASSER. Well, I have served in this body, I say to my friend from New Jersey, now for almost 17 years. During that period of time, no President has ever sent up a balanced budget.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Is the Senator sure about that?

Mr. SASSER. Positive; as far as I can recall.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. My goodness.

Mr. SASSER. And the budgets that were most grotesquely out of balance were the ones that we received from President Reagan, you will remember. That is when the deficits began to explode on us.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Has President Bush been sending us balanced budgets?

Mr. SASSER. No, he has not been sending balanced budgets, I say to my friend from New Jersey.

My friend from New Jersey might be interested in knowing there is a new concept developing. It is called funnel spending and it originates in the White House. It is administered by the Chief of Staff, Mr. Samuel Skinner, and his deputy, Mr. Dennis Moore. Funnel spending always occurs in States on the eve of their Presidential primaries.

Now, a very distinguished journalist, Mr. Robert Pear, in a New York Times article dated March 10, and another equally distinguished journalist, Mr. John Yang, of the Washington Post, in an article dated March 14, described this program, I say to my friend from New Jersey, in some detail. For example, just before the Florida primary, the White House released \$514 million for completion of a major water project affecting the Kissimmee River. That would not be a pork-barrel project that they are working on.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Sounds like funnel spending to me.

Mr. SASSER. And, in a campaign swing to southern California, the President announced some \$800 million, I say to the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, \$800 million in road improvements and sewer and water and other public works projects to be put in place along the Mexican border. And I will wager that those projects had to come through the Appropriations Subcommittee of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, at least the roads.

And then, finally, perhaps the best example of what has been described as funnel spending occurred in that most favored of States, the one with the first Presidential primary, New Hampshire.

Throughout all the years of the Reagan and Bush administrations, they have consistently opposed the Small Business Administration. They tried to abolish it. They tried to terminate the direct lending programs. They tried to emasculate the guarantee programs through fee increases and other measures. But, lo and behold, this year's budget proposes—and this year's budget, by the way, proposes to cut SBA programs by a total of \$347 million. But, I say to the Chair, lo and behold, the administration took a new liking to the Small Business Administration shortly before the New Hampshire primary. They initiated a new small business lending program for economically troubled businesses in New England. All told, some \$900 million will flow to the troubled businesses in the region. And guess what? The pilot program for the region began in New Hampshire just before the New Hampshire primary.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. What a coincidence.

Mr. SASSER. I thought my friend would find that interesting.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That is very interesting information.

Will the chairman of the Budget Committee help refresh my memory? What was the budget deficit that the President proposed for 1993?

Mr. SASSER. Well, the budget deficit for fiscal year 1993 is approaching \$400 billion. This will be the largest peacetime budget deficit in the history of the country; indeed, perhaps the largest budget deficit in the history of the country. And it is, once again, inching up as the percentage of gross national product to the point that we may set a new record.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Well, does the chairman of the Budget Committee think that perhaps some of our friends on the other side of the aisle may misinterpret what the President has requested, because they say they want to balance the budget? I do not think that the President, in his budget message to us, which says, "Here is what I am proposing," is delivering the same message. Perhaps there has been a miscommunication.

Mr. SASSER. Well, there must be a miscommunication, I say to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Because, you say, the President has proposed this year—I think the budget deficit that was suggested in the President's budget was something in the area of \$400 billion.

Mr. SASSER. Well, it was somewhere in the high—we are looking at it now.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I think it was close to \$400 billion.

Mr. SASSER. The projected budget deficit will be close to \$380 billion.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So there is obviously, again, a lack of direct communication between the White House and those colleagues in the Senate from the other side because they talk about reducing the deficit. The President does not seem to agree with that message.

Mr. President, I want to continue and talk about the shift we have seen in the environment. I am not talking about the traditional use of the word "environment." I am talking about the total environment, the political, economic, financial environment.

The world was a different place in 1990 when the budget agreement was enacted. While dramatic change was already well underway in the Soviet Union, many in the United States still feared that country and still thought in cold war terms. Now, however, conditions have changed. The cold war is in our past.

And yet, Mr. President, while the world around us has changed so dramatically, our budget priorities remain in a time warp. We are still spending close to \$300 billion each year on defense. We still spend billions defending our European allies from a threat that most believe no longer exists. And we are still committed to a range of weap-

ons programs that serve no useful purpose. Meanwhile, Mr. President, our needs here at home are greater than ever.

Our economy is in the longest recession since the Great Depression. Unemployment is over 7 percent. And ordinary, hardworking, middle-class Americans are finding it tougher and tougher to pay their bills, to plan their kids' college education, and to keep their heads above water.

We created many of today's economic problems by our past underinvesting in the future. While our competitors have invested substantial sums in their infrastructure, and in the education and training of their people, we have not. And we are going to pay a price for that neglect in the decades to come.

I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations, responsible for most of the infrastructure spending. I also sit on the VA, HUD, and independent agencies which are responsible for a significant part of our infrastructure spending, such as construction grants. I see the difference between our total investment in infrastructure, and the investment in other countries.

Just take a look at the big competitor, Japan.

Between 1973 and 1985, Japan invested 5.1 percent of its GNP in public physical infrastructure. That number deserves to be repeated—5.1 percent. The equivalent figure in America was 0.3 percent. In other words they have spent 17 times what we have on their public physical infrastructure with respect to their transportation infrastructure, they spent 25 times more than we did, on roads, bridges, airports, and railroads.

We are 55th in per-capita expenditures on infrastructure. That is the level of a Third World country; America the beautiful, America the great.

Weak investment in our physical infrastructure leads directly to poor productivity, to lost hours spent in traffic and getting back and forth from home to work; wasted energy. We are energy dependent on foreign sources and our dependence grows every day because we failed to plan for the future in years past. We ought to do that now.

Endless traffic jams foul the environment and lend to violation of the laws we have written to protect the air for current and future generations.

And there's a tremendous economic impact according to testimony before the Appropriations Committee, for example, deteriorating highways alone are estimated to cost our economy \$35 billion, because of delayed interstate commerce. That is unacceptable.

Just as we have underinvested in our physical infrastructure, we have devoted inadequate resources to our social infrastructure, to education and training. For example, we know that a dollar invested in Head Start yields

several dollars in future savings in public assistance, in special education, in costs of crime. We also know that smaller classes substantially increase reading and math scores and improve learning generally. Yet we continue to underfund Head Start.

Many experts believe that if we involve ourselves at an earlier stage, when a child is 2, when he or she needs some external structure if the family is not there to support them, we get benefits galore. Our economic competitors continue to invest more than we do in the education of children.

We have also underinvested in our cities. Funds to States and localities have been slashed substantially while businesses and middle-class residents have moved to the suburbs. Left with fewer resources and without a solid tax base, and facing mounting economic and social problems, many urban areas have descended into virtual chaos.

We can continue to ignore that problem and continue to write off millions of young Americans who grow up in these war zones. But these are the people who have to carry our Nation into the future, and we ignore them at our peril.

Mr. President, the litany of needs that require greater domestic investment is long. It goes from health care to day care; from housing to environmental protection; from research and development to the fight against violent crime.

We have been ignoring many of these needs for the last 12 years. Unfortunately, it shows.

None of these needs can be met if we continue to spend billions of dollars on outdated weapons systems and on the security of our economic competitors.

Mr. President, we need a little perspective on the defense budget. The administration wants to spend about \$290 billion for the Pentagon next year. In real terms, that is about \$50 billion more than the average peacetime level in the middle of the cold war.

If we were not used to such astronomical defense budgets, it would seem preposterous. Unfortunately we are becoming inured to defense budgets of such size.

I am reminded of the cosmonaut, Sergei Krikalev, who today returned to Earth after spending 10 months in outer space. He went into space on May 13 of last year and he has come back to a world that has turned upside-down.

While he was away, his country, the Soviet Union, dissolved; his hometown, Leningrad, changed its name back to St. Petersburg. His Nation is struggling to make a new economic system work.

When he returned to Earth he saw these new realities, changes he could not have imagined when he went into orbit.

The cosmonaut saw these changes, but President Bush has not.

President Bush, come back to Earth and let us have a serious discussion about what this country needs.

Things have changed. Now is the time to recognize that change and to revise this outmoded budget agreement. Not only is the administration's proposed defense budget enormous when viewed in historical context, but it compounds a distortion of budget priorities that has afflicted our country for the past decade.

Between 1981 and 1991, we increased the defense budget by \$624 billion over baseline levels. At the same time, domestic discretionary spending has been cut by \$395 billion.

It is time for a change. It is time to focus on America's needs and America's future. But we cannot do so as long as our hands are tied behind our backs by this outdated budget agreement. So long as the budget agreement is allowed to stand, we are going to see continued excesses and waste in the Pentagon budget and continued underinvestment in the economic foundation of our country.

A chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I get to see many of the Nation's needs firsthand. I get requests, as I said earlier, from virtually every State and every Senator in this body. Every year the Senators from all the regions of the country ask me for help in addressing their State's transportation problems, desperately needed: Fix the roads, fix the bridges, get us another airport, continue our air service, help us, we want to work, our people need jobs.

We want to get investment but you cannot get investment in places you cannot get to or that employees cannot find. Some want help for a new highway. Others want support for airport expansion. And still others, like I, coming from States with urban areas, want more help for their transit systems.

I will not stand here and name the names. I do not have to. If you just pick up a list of Senators, you will find out who has requested help on the transportation budget. But many of the Members who fight so hard to retain the budget wall, preserve the deal and to strangle domestic programs, are the same ones who come to me year after year after year with numerous requests for funds. I do not think it is going to be any different this coming year, despite the message we have heard here.

Mr. President, we want the message to be clearly understood. You cannot have it both ways. If we cannot break down the budget wall, I am going to have to say no to many of my colleagues. The requests may be worthy but the money just will not be there. There are going to be a lot of unhappy Senators whose States will suffer, and a lot of serious unmet transportation needs throughout this country.

It is interesting, we heard the distinguished Senator from Colorado a few

minutes ago. He talked about his service in the military and the Berlin Wall. The wall stood for some 30 years. It did not take long to tear it down, and the reason it came down so quickly is because this division between democratic society and virtual imprisonment was not sustainable. The wall could not stand because it was out of date, it was antiquated. It could not even be protected by totalitarianism.

But our budget wall stands even though it is outdated, it is not necessary, and it is impairing our ability to get our society back to work.

In conclusion, Mr. President, if America is going to get back on track and give our children a better future, we are going to have to make some dramatic changes. Breaking down the wall between defense and discretionary domestic programs is an important and necessary first step.

I, once again, say thank you to Senator SASSER for his leadership. And I hope that my colleagues will think seriously about the messages that they give on this floor about the sanctity of an agreement, about the essentiality of reducing the budget deficit, and consider whether or not they want to be the early volunteers to the Lautenberg program for surrender of projects requested in their States. That is real leadership. That is what we would like to see. Enough of the debate; enough of the dialog. Come on in and volunteer to surrender your projects and maybe we can get a serious cut in the budget deficit.

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield 1 second?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Yes.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to the exemplary work done by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG]. He is a stalwart member of the Budget Committee. He is very helpful in the deliberations of that committee. But perhaps most important, he is an excellent chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. That subcommittee has enormous responsibility, and Senator LAUTENBERG discharges it not only well, but with considerable grace under considerable pressure on occasion.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELLSTONE). The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I appreciate hearing the remarks of my good friend from New Jersey. I must say I have worked with him on many transportation issues. He has one of the most successful personal business records in his private life of any Member of this Senate. And I would say, Mr. President, that in running his business, I think that he would take a look at where all the money is in the budget if he was going to make some savings.

If we want to build some bridges, I think we should listen to what Willie Sutton said when he was asked, why do you rob the banks? He said, that is where all the money is. We are looking at the wrong place if we think we can build all the bridges and roads in this country out of the defense budget, or if we can educate every child in the Head Start Program out of the defense budget.

I must say, and this is of some interest to me, that the Sasser bill, which I oppose, does not do anything about raiding the foreign aid funding, which does somewhat surprise me. If we are so concerned about saving money for domestic programs, why are we not looking at foreign aid and why are we looking only at the defense budget?

Mr. President, I want to say, here we go again. The majority party now has come in with a proposition to break down the firewalls, and I stood right here at this desk as a Senator in the fall of 1990 and criticized the 1990 budget agreement all the way through. I complement my friend from New Jersey because he voted against it.

I said on this floor that the 1990 Budget Act would create chaos, unemployment, disrupt the boat building industry, disrupt the fur industry, disrupt the jewelry industry, disrupt the aviation industry, disrupt many industries and cause a lot of unemployment. But one of the things I did vote for in that budget was the caps and the firewalls so that there would be some discipline under the budget.

I was just visiting with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator INOUE, and he reminded me that this is not a new event, not a new struggle. When General Washington became President Washington, he did all he could to talk the First Continental Congress out of dismantling the Continental Army.

The Congress did not take the advice of President Washington. They dismantled the Army down to 80 people. They had 55 people at West Point and the other 25 at Philadelphia. The British took notice of this after a few years and said, "Those stupid Americans. We will teach them a lesson." So they came over and burned down the White House and tried to burn the Capitol.

We have gone through this time and time again. We were ill-prepared for World War I. We dismantled after World War I. We were not prepared for World War II. We trained soldiers with wooden rifles. The first armored battalion in some part was paid for out of the private funds of a very wealthy general, George Patton, who bought the parts from Sears and Roebuck to get the first tank battalion operating because the tanks would not run because we had not maintained them.

The same thing happened again after World War II. We dismantled com-

pletely and ended up with a conflict in Korea where we suffered 10,000 casualties—many military experts afterward said at least half those casualties would not have lost their lives had we been prepared. We were not prepared. We were sending untrained, underarmed, ill-prepared troops into combat who were not prepared for what they were going up against.

I want to say in looking at the budget, look at where the money is. I invite any Senator who has not seen the briefing General Powell and Secretary Cheney give, as a U.S. Senator, to take it upon themselves to go to a committee that gets that briefing and watch the briefing or get your staff to get a copy of it from C-SPAN and look at it so you can see how much thought has gone into what has happened with respect to our defense budget.

We simply cannot allow the defense of our country to be taken so lightly.

The big money is in mandatory spending. I will show this chart which makes a better picture of it. Here is revenues and here is mandatory spending, mandatory spending is programs such as Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid and other entitlement programs. That is where all the spending goes.

I will just say, Mr. President, this is my 12th year on the Budget Committee. In 1981, we instituted the Budget Committee. The distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina, a very senior Senator here, but he will be the junior Senator as long as he comes from South Carolina, in the foreseeable future, in the next 50 years. Senator HOLLINGS had a proposition that he offered to then the Republican majority that I supported. We could never convince the Republican administration to support it. But what he offered was 85 percent of the CPI or the wage index to replace the cost-of-living adjustments. That was voted down. We voted on it in the Budget Committee, and I voted for it. We voted on it on the Senate floor, and I voted for it.

And, this Senator offered budget proposals in the next year in the Budget Committee and the year after and the year after that would have brought us to a balanced budget. It included attacking entitlement spending. When we did the Social Security Reform Act, how well I remember offering on this Senate floor three amendments which would have revised the way we spent out the money. One of those amendments was to raise the retirement age of Social Security benefit recipients by adding 1 month every year starting in 1984 for the next 36 years. It would save billions upon billions of dollars in budget outlays. It would have encouraged more people to work, to produce, to be productive members of our society for one extra month and would have had a huge budget impact.

It is very interesting that all of those ideas, although they were agreed to in

the Senate debate, were voted down by the Senate. The Senate put it in the proposal, but they did not want to put it in 1984. They put the change in the Social Security Reform Act of the year 2004, hoping no one would be there who would have to face the voters in that year.

How well I remember the next year, 1985. Senator DOLE, Senator DOMENICI, still in the majority, worked through a budget that would have brought us to a balanced budget by the third year. It was quickly scuttled after it passed this Senate by one vote with Republicans in the majority voting for it, the Democrats in the minority voting against it and then it was torpedoed by the White House and the House of Representatives within 2 days. We never got that budget passed.

So there have been many efforts and attempts to try to bring about a balanced budget.

I hear my colleagues being critical of the White House for not offering a balanced budget. I say to my colleagues if the White House and the President chose not to send a budget over to the Congress, they do not have to. There is no law they have to send a budget resolution. It is our responsibility. Any time the Members in the Congress decide they want to balance the budget they could.

But I say again, if we are ever going to balance the budget, we better look where all the spending is—\$849 billion in 1995 for Social Security, Medicare, farm supports, other entitlements and so forth—entitlement programs and interest. Sixty-five percent of the total budget is entitlement programs and interest on the debt, Mr. President—65 percent of the budget.

Now, who is kidding whom? Sure, we can raid the defense budget, and leave America in a weak condition. We do not know what is going to happen to the world or where the former Soviet Union is going to be. Who knows what will happen? Who knows what is going to happen with respect to the Persian Gulf? The menace of Saddam is still there. The Iranians are now rebuilding their military. They may be hooking up with Islamic Republics from the former Soviet Union to create another threat for us. We just do not know what is going to happen.

But there is just not that much money available, and I think for us to take anything more than the \$50 billion that has been taken out by the recommendation of the administration is penny-wise, pound-foolish. This is very risky and very dangerous for our security.

There are many needs in this country that must be addressed. I do not argue with that. I agree in large part with my friend from New Jersey in his comments about roads, transportation, transportation improvements, and efficiencies in transportation. These im-

provements create an environment where you can have a better business climate get more jobs. But there is not enough money in the defense budget to make a significant difference with respect to roads and bridges with only defense savings. My friends who want to remove the firewalls are blinded by the dollar signs. They see this as a way to advance their own agenda.

We should be looking for ways, Mr. President, in which Government intrusion and regulation are decreased or eliminated. Freedom, including freedom from Government intervention will be the engine that will drive America toward prosperity, recovery and ultimately get us out of the current economic mess.

As bad as that budget agreement was, it made it very clear that any defense savings should go to deficit reduction.

I hear my colleagues from the other side being critical of some votes that have been cast by Republicans to give the defense savings money back to the taxpayers. It is obvious to this Senator, if there is going to be a peace dividend, the people who deserve the peace dividend are the people who made it possible for us to win the cold war. The people who paid the taxes, provided the enthusiasm and moral should get the money back—not having a bunch of vote buying schemes by Members of Congress to do other things they think are more important.

Some say the cold war is over so the budget agreement should be pruned down. In my view, we do not know what the world holds for us. But all we have to do is look back at history and know there may be a problem ahead.

It is interesting to this Senator that we fought the biggest military operation 1 year ago today. We had 500,000 troops in the Persian Gulf. We have not had that many troops focused on one battlefield, on one objective since World War II. The evil empire, the former Soviet Union, was not a factor in that battle. It was Saddam Hussein, with the fourth largest military in the world. If we allow the firewalls to come down and the majority party to have their way, they will do to the world's best military what Saddam Hussein could not do to it—they will do it here in this budget process—destroy it.

I know that a lot of my colleagues do not agree that we have squeezed the defense budget. But from the 1987 peak, defense levels will decline by nearly 1 million people by 1995. This means 51,000 active duty personnel, 245,000 reservists, 193,000 civilians. By 1995, we will have reduced our military by 10 army divisions, 3 aircraft carriers, 2 carrier air wings, 100 battle force ships, 10 tactical fighter wings, and 88 strategic bombers.

Mr. President, I do not know how much more we should be talking about cutting, but I can tell you, the distin-

guished senior Senator from Virginia and the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the two people who are charged with the responsibility of this Senate to stay on top of these matters, as well as Senator STEVENS from Alaska and Senator INOUE from Hawaii on the appropriations side, those Senators all think it is a folly to cut the defense budget any more than we are cutting it right now—all four of them, Republican and Democrat alike.

Since 1990, Mr. President, the Department of Defense has proposed the termination of 118 weapons systems and made adjustments to 10 other major programs under the new acquisition approach. The President's numbers for 1993 are as low as this country can afford to go.

As I said, Senator WARNER, Senator NUNN, Senator STEVENS, and Senator INOUE all disagree with this proposition: How much lower can we go without seriously harming our national security? In this Senator's opinion, we can go no lower than what the President has asked.

When Senators talk about the need to use defense savings to improve our social structure, I would like to remind my colleagues that education and job training is one of the spinoffs that we have enjoyed. The military provides one of the best school systems ever run by Government. I am not a great fan of Government school systems, Mr. President, but I will tell you that the U.S. military, the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, they have done one of the best jobs of educating, producing, and helping put good citizens in the work force of this country for the last 40 years.

We have trained people to do everything from driving trucks, to being engineers, to running computers, to working on airplanes, to flying airplanes—all kinds of skills and trades and occupations. In a sense a discipline, a purpose has been taught through our military.

We are not going to be able to have that kind of spinoff if we dismantle our military as was done after World War I, after World War II, and now we are attempting to do today. It is a big mistake. The military has been a very good educational opportunity for people. It has made a very good career choice.

When we start talking about spending cuts, I have said time and time again the only way to get the budget and deficit under control is to cut spending. It appears the only place Congress will cut spending is the defense of the country. We have been reducing defense spending every single year since 1985. There is just not anymore to take without jeopardizing the security of the country.

Last year, Mr. President, it took the U.S. military 43 days to decimate the fourth strongest military in the world.

If we allow those firewalls to be taken down, it will take Congress about the same length of time to decimate the military service of the United States.

If Senators think that they can make these impersonal, tough slashes to defense and not have those fine young men and women in the military know it, they are mistaken. These young people in our military are very keenly aware. They are making career choices as we are debating this issue.

If this vote happened today and the chairman of the Budget Committee, who is my friend, would be successful on this proposal, those young men and women in the military will start making their decisions: They'll begin to say: "I am getting out of this place before the roof caves in."

We must remember it is the people that make our military so successful.

Of course, our equipment is important—and the technology, the training, the management, and the leadership. But it is essentially a people business running the military organization. When we cut the defense budget people will lose their jobs in the direct defense-related, private-sector employment. It could decline by as much as 500,000. No matter how great capitalism is, no matter how wonderful the market system is, there is a limit to how much it can adjust and absorb these cuts overnight—these dramatic draconian cuts, if you will.

By 1997, under the current defense budget plan, defense-related employment could be down almost a million people lower than it was in 1990. That is under the current plan. That is not talking about taking down the firewall and ripping out another \$50 billion or \$75 billion.

Tomorrow, you just cannot simply tell the men and women both in uniform and out of uniform in the defense-related industry: We no longer need you. Go find a new job; find a new career.

If Congress does that and makes the same mistake that past Congresses made, we will find when we are in trouble, in time of need, we will be ill-prepared. And if we start the program with the volunteer military again—these are people that have made this commitment; they volunteered. We sign a contract. They are making a commitment for a 20-year service hitch in the military. People are going to know. In the next generation, if we do something now to go back on them, kick them out, RIF them out, which is happening already at a very rapid rate, they will simply not be there the next time, and we will be back to the old days of the draft, where we were before.

Mr. President, I do not know if the American people or we here in Congress understand the importance of this debate today. I just cannot tell you how important I believe this is. If we allow the defense budget to be cut

to shreds at the whims of Congress, where will we be when Saddam Hussein gets himself back together again, gets his military organization back together, or another Saddam Hussein in another country somewhere else on this globe?

As much as we would like to believe that the world is at peace, there are still a lot of threats out there. There are still thousands of nuclear warheads targeted on the United States. We do not know what is going to happen in the Commonwealth of Independent States. But I think we do know that if these firewalls come down and we lose this vote, and if the majority has their way on this issue, that we will do a great deal to jeopardize the security of this country.

The answer to our budget problem does not lie in tearing down the firewalls. Congress must control spending, not only in the defense budget, but in all other areas, including mandatory spending. I think a good place to start would be right here in this body. Maybe we ought to cut the budget for Congress by about 25 percent, Mr. President; put the Congress on the same diet that we are proposing to put the military on. It might be a good place to start.

Mr. President, I find it fascinating that we are having this debate here on this floor. I picked up the Washington Post today, and I saw that a great Nobel laureate, Friedrich Hayek, at age 92, had died. I happen to have had the privilege of personally knowing Friedrich Hayek. I hosted a lunch for him when I was in the other body, where we had many, many people in attendance.

I met him through another late and dear friend of mine, Leonard Reid, from the Foundation of Economic Education, and a group of people that have still kept the Foundation of Economic Education together at Irvington on the Hudson—Bob Anderson, and Ed Ovelts, from Grove City College. Those people made it possible for me to have had an acquaintance with Friedrich von Hayek. I guess he dropped the "von" from his name.

He was 92 years old. He was an Austrian-born British free-market economist whose work inspired political leaders on both sides of the Atlantic. He won the Nobel Prize, and was really the first free-market economist to win the Nobel Prize and gain some status with his great book, "The Road to Serfdom" that was so widely read, and is now being read throughout the world; and throughout the Iron Curtain countries.

But what fascinates me, Mr. President, about Von "Hayek's Victory"—and the Wall Street Journal today editorialized that—Von Hayek lived to see, as he bashed the Keynesian liberal socialist economics for 45 or 50 years, that he was proven right and they were

proven wrong. He lived long enough to see that his ideas were vindicated by history, and he was honored by not only his friends and supporters, but also he was honored by his opponents.

But somehow, here in the U.S. Congress, we have not gotten the message that the rest of the world loves America. They love freedom. They want private ownership, they do not want oppressive government.

Here what we are talking about doing is dismantling our ability to defend peace and freedom throughout the world, and then taking the money and building a welfare state, which is exactly what those people in the other parts of the world behind the Iron Curtain, which is now coming down, are trying to escape.

It begs to reason. It just begs for common sense.

Mr. President, I will just say in closing that I oppose this taking down of the firewall. I oppose this lack of discipline. The little bit of discipline that we might get in our budget process, I do not think is enough. I think we ought to look at entitlement programs. I think we ought to examine all parts of the Government.

We should not hesitate to cut the budget of the Congress, of the executive branch, of all of the agencies, and put caps on all of the entitlement programs and try to fix the budget so that those people who have slipped through the cracks and need the safety net can be protected and taken care of, but we should reduce the price of the subsidies that go to very well-off people through many of these entitlement programs. We should stop all of those things.

But if this bill passed, it would be a mistake that would simply send exactly the opposite signal to the American people.

So in closing, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the obituary from the Washington Post of Friedrich Hayek, at age 92, the Nobel Prize winning economist, be printed in the RECORD: and that the editorial "Hayek's Victory," from the Wall Street Journal of today be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 1992]

FRIEDRICH HAYEK, 92, DIES; NOBEL-WINNING ECONOMIST

(By Richard Pearson)

Friedrich Hayek, 92, the Austrian-born British free-market economist whose work inspired conservative political leaders on both sides of the Atlantic and won a Nobel Prize, died March 23 at his home in Freiburg, Germany. He had a heart ailment.

He was a champion of free markets and political liberty, opponent of the welfare state and most government economic intervention, and a leading foe since the early 1930s of the economic school of thought led by John Maynard Keynes.

Dr. Hayek, who always placed top priority on money supply as the key to economic

growth, has been called the "father of monetarism." He used his work in economics, including notable work on business cycles and price theory, as a springboard to research and comment on history, philosophy, psychology and political science.

His work has been hailed not only by other economists, such as the University of Chicago's Milton Friedman, but by leading conservative politicians in this country and abroad.

Dr. Hayek shared the 1974 Nobel Prize for economics with Gunnar Myrdal of Sweden. Representatives of different economic camps, they were cited "for pioneering work in the theory of money and economic fluctuations and for their penetrating analysis of the interdependence of economic, social and institutional phenomena."

Dr. Hayek's best-known book probably is his landmark "The Road to Serfdom," which was published in 1944 by the University of Chicago Press and printed in 12 languages.

The book was a reasoned and unrelenting attack on socialism. Its premises included the thesis that economic security is not as important as freedom and that socialized planning leads to totalitarianism. He also wrote that central planning was dangerous because it was unwieldy compared with the free market. Competition, he added, was "the only method which does not require coercive or arbitrary intervention of authority."

In short, central planning favored by socialists not only was evil, but inefficient. He also maintained that a free market, the best and most efficient economic system, could only function in free societies and could never exist in a totalitarian one.

Until 1944, his books, such as "Monetary Theory and the Trade Cycle" and "The Pure Theory of Capital," were contributions to theoretical economics and were written largely for other economists. But "The Road to Serfdom" became a best-seller and raised a storm of controversy in Britain and the United States.

In this country, the book was made into a radio serial, published for the Book-of-the-Month Club and appeared in a condensed edition published by Reader's Digest. It also was syndicated in 10 parts by the King Features news syndicate.

Dr. Hayek was attacked by a great many economists, some of whom wrote books to answer his. In the House of Commons, Labor leader Clement Attlee scorned Prime Minister Winston Churchill's 1945 parliamentary campaign speeches as "a secondhand version of the academic views" of Dr. Hayek.

For the next 30 years, Dr. Hayek continued his attack on Keynesian economics, continuing to churn out research while teaching. He wrote more than 50 books and nearly 200 technical papers. But, despite a Nobel Prize, most believed he was getting the worst of the battle for the minds of his fellow economists.

But his theories seemed by some to receive vindication in the 1980s. Communist states of Europe, with their totalitarian governments and "planned" economies, were falling. And conservative politicians such as Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, who employed economists and policies favored by Dr. Hayek, seemed invincible at the polls.

Thatcher often cited him as an intellectual mentor and told fellow MPs, voters, foreign leaders and reporters to study the work of Dr. Hayek for the answer to economic questions. After becoming prime minister in 1979, Thatcher followed his advice on curtailing the power of labor unions.

Last year, President Bush presented him with the Medal of Freedom, calling him "one of the great thinkers of our age who explored the promise and contours of liberty" and saying he "revolutionized the world's intellectual and political life."

He was born Friedrich August von Hayek (he dropped the "von") on May 8, 1889, in Vienna. He served as an artillery officer on the Italian front during World War I. After the war, he entered the University of Vienna, from which he received doctorates in law and political science. He received a third doctorate, in economics from the University of London.

He worked for the Austrian civil service and taught at the University of Vienna until moving to Britain and becoming an economics professor at the London School of Economics, where he taught from 1931 to 1950. For the next 12 years, he taught at the University of Chicago, then at the University of Freiburg, from 1962 to 1968, then the University of Salzburg until 1977.

Dr. Hayek's major later works included the three-volume "Law, Legislation, and Liberty," published between 1973 and 1979.

His first marriage, to the former Helen von Fritsch, ended in divorce.

Survivors include his wife, the former Helene Bitterlich, of Freiburg, and two children by his first marriage.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 25, 1992]

HAYEK'S VICTORY

That fortune favors the brave was surely true for Friedrich A. Hayek, economist, political philosopher and friend of freedom. He lived to see his ideas vindicated by history and honored by his opponents.

For the last 45 years of his life, Hayek dedicated himself to the proposition that capitalism is morally superior to socialism; this is so, he argued, because economic and political liberty are inseparable.

That Hayek was right is no longer in doubt. But while his free-market ideas still come in for derision from intellectuals and journalists in Europe and the United States, they are pursued ardently by those who have actually traveled the road to serfdom. "If the ideologists of socialism would single out the one book that ought to be * * * strictly forbidden," says Czechoslovakia's minister of privatization, Tomas Jezek, "they would surely point to 'The Road to Serfdom.'"

In Hungary and Poland, there are Hayek reading groups to share copies of his books; in Russia, economist Vitaly Naishul boasted in December, "We've moved from an economic system that only a Leninist could love to one that Hayek should approve of."

Hayek's insight now bears the mark of conventional wisdom among the entrepreneurial classes, but that was certainly not the case in 1944, when he published "The Road to Serfdom." Here he argued, at a time when "Uncle Joe" Stalin was widely admired and many intellectuals thought socialism the wave of the future, that command economies were doomed to fail. Worse, they would kill freedom as well as prosperity.

Such forthright views embarrassed colleagues who were certain that a world defined by economists would be egalitarian, prosperous, clever, orderly and probably favored with better weather. In ironic deference to them, he dedicated the "The Road to Serfdom" to "The Socialists of All Parties."

Hayek's vision won the day because it was essentially humane; he believed in the central value of individual liberty against the power of the state. Many of his counter-

parts saw socialism as a kind of vanguard economics leading the ignorant masses toward the promised land of equality. Keynes wrote to Hayek that central planning could work as long as "those carrying it out are rightly orientated in their own minds and hearts to the moral issue." Alas.

Hayek believed, as time has proved, that the average Tomas, Dinh and Hari preferred liberty to an egalitarian poverty. Where the left sees shantytowns outside Mexico City as proof of the need for a population-control program, Hayek saw families making a responsible economic decision based on profound local knowledge. In the city, the migrants "learn to adapt, often very quickly, and improve their lot. Not that they have an easy time of it," he wrote in *The Wall Street Journal* in 1988. But "ambition does better than charity could ever do."

It's a far cry from Keynes's aristocracy of planners, and even further from the socialist kleptocracy that beggared Eastern Europe. We suspect that the planners, however benign in their modern incarnations, will always be with us. At least one candidate now running for the U.S. presidency is saying that the country suffers for want of a national economic policy, a national energy policy and a national education policy. The good news is that the writings which Friedrich Hayek left behind make it impossible for an informed electorate to claim ignorance of the perils.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. President, I hope my colleagues will read "Hayek's Victory," the editorial, and think a little bit about what it is we are doing here—when here was a man who was born in Austria, believed in freedom, did enormous research, published 500 works, was demonstrated and proven to be correct, was read by people all over the world, and was the basis of what happened in Great Britain and the United States in the revival of our economic strength.

I hear my colleagues from the other side of the aisle bashing what happened during the eighties. They always forget to mention the fact that when we had the Democrats in charge of both the White House and in charge of the Congress, we had double-digit inflation, double-digit interest rates, and massive problems of unemployment. We had chaos.

By just doing a little bit to recognize what freedom, capitalism and a free market system will do, by giving a little bit of incentives to people—what happened was a we built 20 million new jobs during the eighties. We had the longest period of sustained growth. We did more for poor people, than in any other time in our history.

What really appalls me is to hear Senator after Senator come to the floor and talk about how all of the tax breaks went to the rich. Today, the top 20 percent of the income earners in the United States pay 75 percent of all Federal income taxes. That is way up from what it was when President Carter was in office and the Democrats controlled both the House and the Senate, and the White House.

So I do not know why we are so afraid of success and so afraid of en-

couraging people to work, save, and invest, when it is proven that it works. Von Hayek talked about it, and he proved it. It was demonstrably proven by the people of the world with decisions they made to throw out the Communist command-and-control economy and replace it with democratic capitalism.

Mr. President, I think it would be a tragic mistake for Congress to adopt this bill. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, as a member of the Budget Committee, and a member who has been on that committee for 12 years, I think that this bill which the distinguished chairman brings to the floor is one of the best arguments to do away with the Budget Committee I have seen. We have not had a hearing on this bill. We have not discussed it or brought the budget up in committee. No one has had a chance in the Budget Committee to talk about these things. We have a bill, and we bring it to the floor—bypassing the committees—and we are going to break down the firewalls?

Where is the budget? I hear everybody criticizing President Bush. Where is the budget from the Senate Budget Committee? I say it is not here. We are not talking about it. And my view of this is, Mr. President: If they had the votes, we would have already voted on this. This bill is not going anywhere, nor should it.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WOFFORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I am glad that I agree with the Senator from Idaho on at least three issues. One, that we should reread Von Hayek's *Road to Serfdom*, which instructed and challenged me 45 years ago. Second, that this is a debate of something vital to the future of our country. Third, that we probably should cut the budget of Congress and the administrative budgets of all Federal agencies.

But this is not a debate about budget cuts in particular agencies or in military savings. It is about whether there should be a wall that prevents us from making the right choices about how to use whatever those savings are. And I want to say that there is a wall standing over there behind the Senator from Idaho. It is a wall between our past and our future.

I rise, as a cosponsor of this bill, to salute the Senator from Tennessee for his leadership in bringing about this action to try, to the best of our ability, to bring down that wall that prevents us from investing military savings in the domestic needs of this country.

"Something there is that does not like a wall." That is Robert Frost. I recall that other line: "Before I built a wall, I asked to know what I was walling in and walling out."

Well, let me say a few things about what we are walling in and walling out. This budget wall walls us in with our cold war past and walls us out from the new opportunities that are opening before us.

Since that budget wall was erected in 1990, the world turned upside down. The Soviet Union has unraveled. The adversary against which we poured trillions of dollars and maintained one of the largest standing military forces in the history of the world is no more. No other such threat to our survival is on the horizon. So, as the world is turned upside down, we have an historic opportunity to turn our national priorities right side up. But we cannot even turn this administration around to look at the new realities of this new world.

Since that budget agreement, we have been given this opportunity now to turn our resources and our energy toward building our economic strength and human capacities. Then we will build the kind of America which can carry out our responsibilities in this postwar world.

John Kennedy said, 30 years ago, that we cannot be strong abroad if we are weak at home. President Kennedy understood, as George Bush does not understand, that our citizens will find it difficult to support the extension of American ideals, the extension of a helping hand to the lands of the former Soviet Union, the extension of democracy to others across the globe if they feel cheated out of the American dream themselves here at home. To be strong at home, we need now to invest in our schools and our workers, in our health care and in our transportation systems, in building the kind of American economy that allows us to be strong both at home and abroad.

Last week, I was with the former Director of the CIA, William Colby, a man who has devoted his whole life to the security of this country. I heard him define our national security in terms of these new realities of a world in which the Soviet Union is no longer the central threat. National security, he said, is now, above all, the security that comes from a strong economy, from safe streets, from good schools, from our health and productivity as a Nation. Security now comes not so much from military might as from economic strength, not just making missiles with smart bombs, but training workers with smart minds.

Of course, it is true that there is still danger and instability in the world. We will certainly need an efficient, mobile, flexible armed force that is equal to any test. But we must also recognize, as the President does, that large savings in military spending are now possible. We may disagree on how large those savings can safely be, but that is not the question today. The question today is whether we let that wall

stand, this wall that prevents the investment of any of these savings in the conversion from a military to a peacetime economy, in job training, education, transportation, health care, housing, and the other pressing needs of American communities.

This is the kind of public investment in which we have been falling so far behind our competitors. It is the kind of public investment that is essential for private enterprise to prosper. And I think Friedrich von Hayek would understand that.

But, unfortunately, this administration does not understand. It has already signalled its unwillingness to seize the day and respond to a new and very different world. The President's call of the week was "do nothing."

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this administration's policy of doing nothing to invest in America again. We can do something to get America moving again. We can declare our new priorities in this new world. We can bring homeward, as Lincoln put it, "the better angels of our nature." We can respond to the challenges of America and its future with the same energy and commitment, the same will and resources we are so willing to apply to the challenges we faced in the last 40 years of the cold war.

The people of Berlin tore down their wall to mark the end of the era of Soviet oppression. Bringing down this budgetary wall is an American way of marking the new era and taking a step forward toward a better future for every American.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, it took more than 4 months back in 1990 to hammer out a bipartisan consensus on a 5-year budget agreement. I must say I have heard nothing in the last 4 hours that convinces me that while it was not the most enjoyable thing to watch it probably was one of the wiser things that bipartisanship produced. One of the pillars of that agreement was that spending reductions in one category such as national defense could not be transferred to another category such as domestic discretionary spending.

Why did we create these fire walls in spending categories? There are probably a variety of reasons, but the one that seems to have the greatest amount of consensus, if we realized savings in one category would be achieved we had to make a commitment to each other and to the American people to use those savings to reduce the deficit.

Now, less than 2 years later, we are confronted with a variety of our colleagues who want to abandon that effort, reduce the deficit and instead propose allowing a transfer of the so-called peace dividend into domestic spending.

Mr. President, I rise to say the obvious, and that is we are bankrupting our Nation, literally bankrupting our children and grandchildren with our never-ending appetite to spend and spend money that just isn't there. The reality is, and we all know it, that if we eliminated—and I repeat eliminated—all spending on all national defense in the next fiscal year, we would not save a single penny of additional revenue available for domestic spending. Not a single penny.

Figures do not lie. These are the figures. In fiscal year 1993, the President plans to spend \$291 billion on all national defense. If we eliminate all the personnel in the Army, Navy, all aircraft, nuclear weapons and everything else that make up the defense budget, Federal spending would in theory be reduced by \$291 billion, but the Federal Government would still be in the debt.

Next year's projected deficit is \$352 billion. Even if eliminated national defense, something nobody would suggest, we would still need to borrow \$63 billion to cover the deficit. So where is the additional money for domestic spending going to come from? From more debt. That means from our children and from our grandchildren.

Mr. President, I have listened to the debate this afternoon and I am reminded that during the course of the debate I have listened to all the discussion about all the money that would be available for education and for health care and for infrastructure building and a variety of these purposes, if only we could break down part of the firewall and transfer the money to these needs. And it reminds me of the debate that is taking place on national health policy and taking place in my own home State of Minnesota right now in terms of trying to get the universal coverage, of insurance coverage for everybody in this country so everyone might have equal financial access to health care.

When the proponents of comprehensive plans for universal coverage are asked how they are going to pay for it, they say they are going to discipline the system with cost containment and have a budgeted approach to this, only spend \$800 billion, something like that on health care. We ask them how they are going to restrain an engine increasing by \$100 billion a year.

They come up with relatively easy answers that you can do it by getting rid of unnecessary procedures, or you can do it by cleaning up the administrative overhead. And they have all kinds of presumptions about what is wrong with the system and all kinds of ways in which to find some saving that somehow or other will satisfy the need to hold the deficit in check, holding the spending in check, but at the same time satisfy all these needs. I was reminded of that as I listened to the debate.

The logic is we have got only so much money we are going to spend, let us spend some of that in some other category, and we literally will not increase the deficit in any way.

I must say Mr. President, I am just having a great deal of difficulty with the logic because I have been here since 1978, I have watched the debt grow from \$900 billion or \$800 billion the year I got here to \$4 trillion today.

Mr. President, like you and others, I have watched during the past week all education folks come from my home State, the people who have really tough jobs, and schools dealing with 4-year-olds, 5-year-olds, 6-year-olds, 8-year-olds who are not even ready for school in the morning, to say nothing of the beginning of the year.

I have listened to them and I share their concern and I have a great deal of sympathy for them. But I remind them of the fact that this year alone we are going to spend 10 times as much on interest on the national debt as we spend in all of the educational accounts at the Federal level. Ten times as much, just on interest on that \$4 trillion debt.

So, Mr. President, I cannot commit myself to another \$408 billion. I cannot commit myself to another \$362 billion. I was here in 1981 when the defense buildup began. No President, President Reagan, no President, President Bush, no Secretary of Defense, Secretary Weinberger, came to us and asked us to increase the taxes so we could finance that. We financed the whole thing on debt. We financed the whole thing on our children and grandchildren, and that is the notion of national security is to preserve our posterity.

Well, to the degree that our needs change, I am not going to see that. I am going to see, and I intend to see with my vote, that their needs are met by deficit reduction.

So, Mr. President, this is not a debate about transferring defense saving to domestic saving. It is a debate about transferring money from children from the future, to pay for today's consumption. At least with this minimal fiscal discipline in place, we know any reduction in defense spending will be used to control the cancer that is eating away at national health. The world changed. The Soviet Union no longer exists. The Berlin Wall no longer exists except in little chunks in peoples' libraries. Our defense needs, our force structure, our weapons priorities have all shifted. Yes we should reduce defense spending further. The Senator from Pennsylvania is right, our greatest national security in the future is our economic security.

There is no question in mind of this Senator that that means our priorities are to reduce the national debt.

The deficit is \$400 billion, 6.8 percent of GNP or gross domestic product. And you add all the interest related to the trust fund surplus, that debt service this year alone accounts for more than

\$316 billion. That is more money than we ever spent on defense in a single year during the height of the buildup. That is more than spent to run the entire U.S. Government in 1984.

So, Mr. President, I hear a great deal about investing for the future, investing in jobs, health and education, and everyone has an excellent idea. Put another way, what is being proposed here today is not about investing in the future, it is simply borrowing for the future. The first responsibility of leadership is to define reality in 1992 to this. It is that we need to lower the deficit, raise people's confidence that somebody is taking responsibility for their future.

Lifting the firewall guarantees a raid on our kid's pocketbook, so let us get serious once and for all. Let us make a commitment to wipe out the \$4 trillion debt before the end of the century.

Mr. President, we built a firewall to prevent destruction from spreading from one area of our life to another. Take down the wall, and our lack of courage and responsibility destroys our children's future.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote scheduled to occur tomorrow 2 hours after resuming consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1696, the Montana Wilderness bill, be vitiated; that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill at 11:30 a.m.; that there be 1 hour of debate on the bill, equally divided and controlled between Senators JOHNSTON and LEAHY; that no amendments, other than the committee-reported substitute be in order; that at the conclusion or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the substitute amendment to be followed immediately by a third reading and final passage of the bill, with each of the above steps occurring without any intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to request the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill at this time.

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

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

APPROPRIATIONS CATEGORY REFORM ACT

MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague from Minnesota for a very, very thoughtful speech on this subject.

I must say, Mr. President, I find it really sad that we are even debating this measure. Indeed, I find it incomprehensible.

What we are talking about here, Mr. President, is not about cutting defense. That does not have anything to do with the subject before us. There are going to be cuts in defense. The question is, what do we do with the cuts that are made in defense?

There is some suggestion and the term is tossed around here that this is a peace dividend, as though somehow we saved money and now it is available for us to spend elsewhere. The truth of the matter, Mr. President, is that all this money is borrowed. Every single nickel that we spend on defense is borrowed, and then some. As has been pointed out, you can wipe out the entire defense budget, get rid of every soldier, sailor, marine, airman, ship, aircraft, tank, rifle, and spend not a nickel, and this Government would still be borrowing money. To put it in other terms, Mr. President, the Government of the United States, for every dollar we are now spending, is borrowing 25 cents.

And so the question is: When we have a chance to reduce expenditures, what do we do with that money? The Senator from Tennessee is saying take that money and put it over and spend it. Whereas those on this side are—

Mr. SASSER. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CHAFEE. Not at this time.

Mr. SASSER. The Senator referred to the Senator from Tennessee, and I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island if he will yield for a point of clarification.

Mr. CHAFEE. I am glad to yield, if it is not too long.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, is the Senator from Rhode Island aware that what this legislation does is take down the wall between defense spending and discretionary spending? The decision will be made later as to whether or not transfers will be made from domestic spending to defense spending or, conversely, whether transfers might be made from defense spending to domestic spending. The Senator from Tennessee is not advocating with this legislation that transfers be made. That is a decision that will be made by the appropriate committees of the U.S. Senate and by the body as a whole after proper debate at a later date.

(Mr. BRYAN assumed the chair.)

Mr. CHAFEE. Will the Senator from Tennessee, since he is on his feet, re-

spond to a question? Will the Senator from Tennessee acknowledge that, absent this measure which he is fostering, those reductions in defense spending would go to reduce the national deficit? Is that correct or wrong?

Mr. SASSER. I think that, yes, that under the present agreement, the present Budget Enforcement Act, reductions in defense spending will return to the Treasury. But as a matter of fact, and as a matter of pragmatic authority, what has been my experience with the appropriate committees dealing with defense matters here, whatever the cap is, is there a tendency, a strong tendency, to spend to that level.

Let me give the Senator from Rhode Island an example. I sat in the defense appropriations subcommittee about, I guess it was, 3 or 4 years ago, when we had the first budget agreement with the then new Bush administration. So we apportioned out all the money. And then somebody said: "Well, wait a minute, we have about 2 billion dollars' worth of budget authority here. What are you going to do with that?" So there was sort of a silence. And then someone said: "Well, let us build a new aircraft carrier and name it after Senator Stennis." And that, I say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, is how we embarked on the program of building a new aircraft carrier, because the money just happened to be in the till.

So the Senator is right. And I want to say the Senator from Rhode Island is correct, that reductions in defense spending particularly ought to go to deficit reductions under the present Budget Endorsement Act.

Mr. CHAFEE. And would the Senator from Tennessee furthermore confirm the point that was made several times on this floor this evening, that if we eliminated every nickel that was spent on defense and made the total appropriation for defense zero—zero—that the U.S. Government would still be borrowing money to balance its budget?

Mr. SASSER. Well, no question, if by some wave of the wand you could reduce the defense appropriations bill to zero and you applied all that money to the deficit, we would still have a substantial deficit. In fact, if you reduce the defense appropriation bill to zero, you might find that you would worsen the deficit considerably because of decreased economic activity and probably end up pushing ourselves off into a very severe recession or depression.

Mr. CHAFEE. Well, the point I am making is that this country is spending \$400 billion that it does not have, that it is borrowing, in order to fund not only defense, which is say \$300 billion, but other programs as well. In other words, the point I am making is that we have a long way to go before we are even close to balancing this budget.

And to term, as some do, any savings we make in defense as a peace dividend is violating the Truth in Labeling Act. Because the facts are, it is no dividend. It is just reducing the amount we are borrowing from our children.

Mr. President, we really have a tragedy here, in my judgment. I have looked over the list of those who are sponsoring this legislation, and on this list I find many for whom I have a great deal of respect.

But what they are saying, in effect, is, no, no, do not take those savings in defense and allocate them to reducing the deficit but instead put them up for grabs before the appropriate committee; namely, the Appropriations Committee. Now, I do not think anybody in this Chamber believes that any of that money is going to survive. Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the committee has said publicly that he believes these sums should go toward infrastructure improvements, welfare programs, education, and hundreds of things that we all believe this country needs desperately.

But the question, Mr. President, is, are we going to continue on this reckless course, a course that if we keep it up is going to reduce this Nation to a Third World country? The alarm has been sounded, and I wish more of those on the other side would respond to the alarm and do something about these deficits.

Here is a chance. Do not break down this wall.

I heard a very fine speech from the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania talking about the Berlin Wall came down, now bring this wall down. Mr. President, I think it is the last thing we ought to do is to bring this wall down. If we want to cut defense, fine. Let us go ahead and cut defense. But every nickel that we cut defense, let us have it go toward reducing this horrible deficit.

Mr. President, there is talk about caring about the future of our country, doing something about the things that are going to make this a stronger Nation. The best thing we can do for this country—and I feel this very deeply—the best thing we can do for this country on the domestic side is to reduce these horrible deficits.

We are on a wild careening path—\$400 billion. Mr. President, I am no octogenarian but I can remember when the budget of the United States first went through the \$100 billion total expenditures—\$100 billion. And now we have a deficit of \$400 billion.

Now who is going to pay this? Well, blithely, we say run up the deficit, don't have this defense money go that direction, and just let our children pay for it. And the result of this reckless path we are on, Mr. President, is that the interest portion of our budget is now the highest single item, \$300 billion a year. And not a nickel of that for principal. That is solely for interest.

So, I do hope my colleagues will respond to the urgent pleas that have been made on this side. Do not tear down this wall. Let us assure everybody, and particularly our children and grandchildren, that we are doing what we can to see that these deficits are reduced. If we cut defense—whatever the amount is, and we will debate that, whether it is \$50 billion or \$90 billion, whatever the sum—let us have it all go to reduce this horrible deficit which is going to so dog our children and grandchildren in the future.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, before the Senator from Rhode Island leaves and before I make a very short statement on this issue, I wonder if the Senator from Rhode Island, who has been most eloquent about the deficit, would share with me how he voted on my amendment to eliminate the space station last year, an amendment which would have saved between 113 and 200 billion dollars over the next 23 years?

Mr. CHAFEE. I am not sure how I did vote in that. From the fact that he has asked the question, I suppose my colleague knows how I voted.

Mr. BUMPERS. I do not know. I think I got three Republican votes.

Mr. CHAFEE. One of them might have been mine. I think the Senator from Arkansas will testify that, on this side of the aisle, I have been one of the biggest budget cutters there is. I think I joined with the Senator from Arkansas time and time again in voting, for example, about the SDI program and, indeed, we have made progress. The Senator from Arkansas and I were the prime leaders about one of the most ridiculous spending items that came before this body as he well knows, the re-commissioning of 30-year-old battleships, a fight in which we went after battleship No. 1 and lost; went after battleship No. 2 and lost. I do not think we got more than 35 votes at our high watermark.

Mr. BUMPERS. The Senator hit it right on the nose.

Mr. CHAFEE. If I do recall, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will corroborate this, they recommissioned these foolish battleships at a tremendous cost and soon thereafter decommissioned them.

Mr. BUMPERS. They are either all in mothballs or about to be in mothballs, which again shows the vision and the wisdom of the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CHAFEE. That is a sentiment I will heartily agree with.

Mr. BUMPERS. I would say the question was not asked pejoratively. But I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island and the other Senators on the floor, they are going to get a chance to revisit every one of those things this

year—the space station, the superconducting super collider, SDI, the intelligence program. “We are spending \$30 billion a year,” so the New York Times says, “on intelligence,” the lion’s share of which is going to spy on Russia, which has applied for admission to NATO. You think about that one for awhile.

When it comes to the deficit and doing something about it, I believe in really doing something about it.

I think the most defining moment I ever had in the Senate was in 1981 when I was 1 of 11 Senators who voted against that tax cut. That was the genesis of where we are right now. But I do not want to revisit all of that. I want to assure everybody that when they come over here and wail about the deficit, they are going to have opportunity after opportunity to do something about it, because this Senator is going to give them that opportunity.

Mr. President, one other thing before the Senator from Rhode Island leaves the floor. He asked the Senator from Tennessee, “If we eliminated all defense spending, would we still have a deficit?” The obvious answer to that is yes, because defense spending is \$285 billion and the deficit is \$400 billion.

If you could wave a magic wand and do that, Mr. President, obviously, we would still have a \$115 billion deficit, but that certainly is a lot better than \$400 billion. But nobody is going to suggest that.

What we have to do is come up with a realistic long-term plan to reduce the deficit without throwing the economy into a further tailspin at the same time. It is not easily done. But the point I want to make is this: You can take seven programs—listen carefully to this—here they are: Defense, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the debt, veterans’ pensions, and Civil Service pensions. Just take those seven programs. There are roughly about 500 spending programs in the Federal Government, as I recall. Just take those seven and totally wipe out all the other 493 spending programs. And you will still have a deficit. That is how bad it is.

People sit around the coffee shop and say why do you not cut welfare? Or why do you not cut Medicaid? Nobody on the Senate floor ever proposes cutting or eliminating a single one of the seven things. Are you going to vote to cut Civil Service pensions? Are you going to vote to cut Medicare and Social Security? The obvious answer is no. But if you just fund those seven programs—and that is all—you would still have a deficit.

Mr. CHAFEE. Could I make one point with the Senator?

Mr. BUMPERS. Yes, of course.

Mr. CHAFEE. I just want to say the Senator from Arkansas has put his finger right on the very, very politically sensitive programs that are there.

Sometimes they are called entitlements. And the fact of the matter is that unless people from this side and people from that side get together with the administration and say somehow we are going to wrestle with these programs and get them under control, this country is never going to straighten itself out. And we will get in worse and worse condition.

I personally believe—and I would be interested if the Senator from Arkansas confirms this—that one of the reasons this recession is so difficult and that we are not coming out of it like we have in past recessions is because of the overhang of the Federal debt; not only the deficit which we are running every year, but the debt that is overhanging this Nation. I believe that has changed the equation from past situations.

The point is that unless we get control of this situation, it is going to get worse and worse in the future. The Senator from Arkansas has just pointed out, he discussed seven programs.

Mr. BUMPERS. Seven programs.

Mr. CHAFEE. He is absolutely right.

Mr. BUMPERS. Incidentally, I say to my colleague, up until this year, defense was one of those sacred cows. Anybody who talked about cutting defense could face those 30-second spots when he ran for reelection about how he was soft on defense. This is the first time you can talk sensibly about defense without being threatened with the loss of your seat.

Mr. CHAFEE. I say this, also: This is politically risky territory as every single one of us knows. But the question is, are we going to be able to do it? I certainly hope we can. I have previously thought the most nagging domestic problem in the balance of this decade was health care. But now I have come to believe it is these deficits.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, has my colleague noticed how people around here talk about how they are for national health insurance but when you ask them how they are going to pay for it, they fall strangely silent? It is because everybody would like to have national health care but nobody wants to tell the people of this country that it is very expensive and it is going to cost some money.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for staying for this short colloquy. I thought it was interesting and edifying.

I might say one other thing in his presence. I strongly believe—I am not asking the Senator to comment on this—the President vetoed the bill we passed here last week and he vetoed it because there was a tax increase in it. I do not think anybody would argue with that. He vetoed the bill because there was a \$12 billion annual tax increase to be paid by the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in this country.

Somebody said, well, that is class warfare. In a sense, it is class warfare

because for the past 10 years, the top 20 percent, especially the top 1 percent, have done very, very well. The middle 67 million people have done very, very badly.

Here is my point. I think we ought to pass the same bill again and send it to the President and say, Mr. President, you did not favor that middle-income tax cut for the 67 million people in the middle. You did not favor that. We are sending you one where the entire \$12 billion goes on the deficit.

I do not mind telling you I was not very enthusiastic about that middle-income tax cut. I made no bones about that. I voted for it in the interests of fairness. I just did not see how I could not vote for it because that middle class has lost ground in the last 12 years. But I think we ought to send it to the President and say put every dime of it on deficit reduction. He may veto it. But I would also up the ante on that one.

I would say to him, Mr. President, if you will sign this bill to cut the deficit by \$12 billion, we will match you, dollar for dollar in spending cuts on the deficit. Do not cut the deficit \$12 billion, cut it \$25 billion.

That is when I will be coming with my amendments to cut funding for the space station and Super Collider and all the rest of it. I promise my colleague, he and I together in 2 hours time can find \$12 to \$20 billion dollars in spending cuts in that budget.

Somebody said, big deal, \$400 billion deficit and you are going to cut it by \$2 billion? One of the reasons we have a \$400 billion deficit is because we have that kind of mentality.

I will tell you an interesting story. I have not told this story, have not issued a press release on it, but it just goes to something I was pleased about.

Two weeks ago, a good friend of mine who is a roofer called and said “Dale, GSA wants to put a new roof on the Ozark National Forest Headquarters in Russellville, AR.” He said, “I went up there and was going to bid on it.” “It was going to cost \$250,000 to \$300,000. I looked at it and there was a beautiful tile roof. I looked it over and concluded that 100 new tiles would make that roof like new.” So I called the GSA in Dallas or Fort Worth, wherever they are. I said, “Why do you want to tear this beautiful tile roof off, tear the deck off and put shingles on it?”

“Well, a tile fell off last week and almost hit a woman on the head. So we decided we don’t want a lawsuit and so will put a new roof on it.” I said, “You can put tile catchers on a roof like that for little or nothing.” He said, “Why don’t you call this architect up in Fort Smith.”

I called the guy who is the maintenance building grounds supervisor at Arkansas Tech University. They have three tile roofs out there. I did all of that. And they both confirmed what he

had just said. The fellow who was the maintenance building grounds supervisor at Arkansas Tech University said he disagreed, it might take 200 tiles. He said, "Since you called me, I called and the tile is still being made out in Indiana. You can buy 100 of them for \$12.50 or you can buy 500 of them for \$8 each."

He said, "You can repair that roof for something under \$10,000." So I wrote the GSA a letter, a long letter. I spent all day at this. You know sometimes our constituents wonder what we do. I spent all day at this. I wrote the GSA and I said this is the silliest thing I have ever heard of, and I am sending a copy of this letter to the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee and Senator HOLLINGS who is chairman of the appropriate appropriations subcommittee, and so on. Do you know what? Within a week that was all scrapped and they are going to repair the roof.

The reason I took the time to do that is because I do not want to fall into the mentality of saying \$250,000 saved does not amount to anything, but the reason we have a \$400 billion deficit is because people have the idea around here that if you cannot cut it all at one time, it is not worth messing with.

Mr. President, I intend to support the pending bill by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to take down the walls. I want most of the cuts in defense spending to go on the deficit. Senator NUNN says that the \$50 billion cut in defense spending is not enough. He says it ought to be \$85 billion. Chairman ASPIN, chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the House of Representatives, says we ought to cut \$100 billion over the next 5 years.

I do not know who is right, but it is going to be more than the \$50 billion the President is proposing. It is probably going to be closer to Senator NUNN's proposal of \$85 billion over the next 5 years.

If you want to put every dime of it on the deficit, that is fine with me. But when you consider the fact that 20 percent of the children in this country are in poverty, when you consider that there are 10 million people out of work waiting for Congress to pass a program that will stimulate the economy and put them back to work it just may be that some of the additional 5 to 10 billion dollars that will be taken out of defense next year should go to vital domestic programs. I would like to see most of it go on the deficit because that is the thing that threatens the economic viability of this country—but there is not any point in leaving that wall up as the budgeters did back in 1990.

I will tell you something, Mr. President, that is not meant to denigrate any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle. I believe there is a feeling that if we leave the walls up knowing

that any defense cuts must necessarily go on the deficit and cannot be transferred to any domestic use, whether it is education, health care, Head Start, you name it, I think there is a feeling that everybody will lose interest on this side of the aisle. If we cannot take that money and squander it on some domestic program, we just do not care whether we cut defense or not.

I am not just hot to cut defense. I want it cut selectively. I want us to eliminate weapons systems we no longer need, man power we do not any longer need. But it does not make any sense to leave those so-called firewalls up. My votes on defense are going to be the same whether this bill passes or does not pass. If it does not pass, I know every dime of it will go on the deficit. If it does pass, and we see a need, and Lord knows there are plenty of needs in this economy, then we can take at least part of it and put it over on getting this economy rolling again.

Mr. President, do you know how to eliminate the deficit? A vibrant economy. We will never make a dent in the economy as long as we have 10 million people unemployed and growing at 1 percent or less. The key to deficit reduction is to have people working and paying taxes into the U.S. Treasury and corporate profits. Look at the Wall Street Journal; look at where corporate profits are. Take General Motors. The automobile industry alone lost \$7 billion last year. Think of it. They are not going to be paying taxes for a long time because they are going to be writing off that loss.

So, Mr. President, this is not something that I am just obsessed with, taking the so-called firewall down so you transfer funds from one area to another, so far as I am concerned every dime of it can go in the deficit. It would be a good place to challenge the President on the tax bill. Say, "Mr. President, if you will sign this bill, that will cut the deficit \$12 billion and we will find spending cuts of \$12 billion to match it." That is a good challenge to the President. He ought to jump on it like a chicken after a June bug. Mr. President, because we are not going to vote tonight, I have nothing further to say. I see the Senator from Iowa apparently waiting to speak. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to add my voice to those who have spoken already against the motion to proceed to the consideration of S. 2399. I also want to use this opportunity to voice my disappointment at seeing the majority party resorting to a roundabout approach in the way that this bill was brought to the floor because obviously it circumvents the Budget Committee. I am a member of that committee, and I would like to

have the deliberation of that committee involved in the process before legislation comes to the floor.

I think it is fair to ask, Mr. President, what has become of the budget process? Here we are late at night and yet the Senate Budget Committee has not cast a single vote and has not even begun to consider a budget resolution.

With each passing day, we on that committee move 1 day closer to being discharged of our responsibility for developing a budget resolution and, quite frankly, I am finding it increasingly difficult to convince my constituents and even sometimes myself that the Budget Committee serves a useful purpose.

Of course, I cannot speak for the Members of the majority party on the Budget Committee, but I do not think I am overstepping my bounds in saying that my colleagues and I on the minority are ready to get down to work, have the Budget Committee meet, have us deliberate and by a majority vote get a budget resolution out of that committee for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

More than one Member of the majority party has stood on this floor today to complain that we in the minority are somehow obstructing the process by not allowing this bill to proceed. We are willing to look at this or any other budget-related proposal, but we have a clearly defined procedure by which that is to be accomplished, and that is the work through the Budget Committee.

If the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee would truly like his measure fairly considered, I respectfully suggest that he dispense with the parliamentary gymnastics and abandon this effort that has been going on today to subvert the committee process. It is totally uncharacteristic of the chairman of the committee. I have worked on that committee with him for 12 years and have found him very cooperative, have found him willing, until now, to have the process work. So I am a little surprised.

We have been all through this winter hearing lots of talk about tough choices which would be waiting for us when Congress returned to work in 1992, and we have been hearing that, to some extent, since we have convened this year.

Unfortunately today, as we face the first and, arguably, the easiest of those choices, we find the majority already caving in to the pressures of the process clearly unprepared, clearly unwilling to deal with those choices, preferring instead to abandon the process that normally we go through in the Budget Committee.

It is no secret that I opposed the adoption of the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act. I did so on the basis of the tax increases which were a part of that package. Still, the Budget Enforce-

ment Act was adopted, and its budget rules then became the law of land. So it is about time that we start playing by the rules that the majority of this body adopted back there in October 1990 rather than rushing out to change those rules each time they do not suit our spending fancy.

It is also no secret that I have long been a watchdog of the Pentagon, seeking to curb wasteful military spending, seeking to achieve greater management efficiency, seeking to reform the acquisition procedures, and generally to ensure that the United States gets the most bang for its military buck.

But as far as I am concerned—and it is one of the major points of this debate—Pentagon spending is not what this debate is all about. At the heart of this debate is just one underlying question: Are we in Congress ever going to get serious about balancing the Federal budget?

I look around, and I sure do not see many signs of a serious approach to deficit reduction from the other side of the aisle of this body. We have heard lots of elaborate numbers quoted on the floor today, and we have heard and read about them through the various media of our country, all people trying to make a case that this program has grown faster than that program or as a percentage of some other abstract measure.

We can use all this mumbo jumbo, but the American people are not buying our statistical doubletalk, for they know and I know the simple truth is that our annual deficits are achieving record levels and our national debt total has become incomprehensible. That is what the people understand, and that is what they expect us to deal with. The simple truth is that our accumulated debt is so great that in the most recently completed fiscal year of 1991, outlays for interest on the public debt exceeded outlays for defense expenditures and accounted for the single largest component of our Federal budget.

Now, just one more time to get that straight. For the first time, in fiscal year 1991, the interest on the national debt became the largest component in the Federal budget. No longer is it defense expenditures. No longer is it Social Security.

It has been suggested to us that somehow, if we will just break down these firewalls, it will have absolutely no impact on our deficit in fiscal year 1993, that we will just be somehow shifting funds from one category to another category, and in this instance it is obviously going to be from defense to a myriad of domestic programs.

But it is not that simple, and this just is not so. What we are going to be doing, if that happens, is piling up annual deficits in the neighborhood of \$400 billion so that every dollar that we refuse to save and refuse to apply to

deficit reduction does, in fact, increase that deficit.

The majority party has been portraying the budget caps as some sort of divine right to spend. If by some stroke of budgetary restraint Congress spent right up to the caps in each discretionary category and not a dollar beyond, some in this Chamber would contend that we have done nothing to increase the deficit. But that just is not so. For the truth is that current revenue levels, coupled with spending at the discretionary cap levels, will yield hundreds of millions of dollars of new deficit spending and, consequently, new debt. By suggesting that we take down the firewalls, the majority party, I believe, has admitted that it cannot satisfy its desire to spend by simply exhausting every last dollar permitted under the domestic discretionary cap, which, I think, if you look at that budget agreement of 1990, you would find in those caps increases from the previous year for inflation and increases in addition to inflation for new programs, or net increases.

By suggesting that we take down the firewalls, the majority party is admitting that it just does not have the stomach to see a few dollars go unspent, to see reductions in defense expenditures actually reducing that deficit. And those are real reductions in deficit because, when major leaders of both parties of the Congress, both Houses of the Congress agree that we ought to reduce at least by \$50 billion—and many agree much more than that—in conjunction with the White House already reaching a conclusion for at least a \$50 billion reduction in expenditures for defense, it is going to happen. We are going to spend \$50 billion less in defense, and, if we do nothing, that is \$50 billion less in the deficit over the next few years. But if these firewalls are down, it is going to be spent and I will bet all of it will be spent over here on the domestic side of that ledger.

In response to the rhetorical question proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the committee—he said this earlier today—I say “No.” I guess I do not believe the Senate can be trusted to act wisely this year without the discipline provided by the Budget Enforcement Act. I believe if these firewalls go down, we spend those dollars. If those firewalls stay up, \$50 billion less of defense expenditures, \$50 billion less of deficit and debt.

I think it is time we stop referring to this proposal as a firewall bill and that we start referring to it by a more appropriate name, the “floodgate” bill because the floodgates will be down and more spending will result. This bill seeks, then, to open the floodgates on a sea of more and newer red ink. Budgets written in red ink have always been the wrong formula for America, and it is the wrong formula this year as well.

We should stick by the formula of 1990. Imperfect as it might be, it is still better than the lack of restraint that is going to result from the passage of this proposed legislation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, has indeed been a stalwart on the Budget Committee and in the U.S. Senate in seeking to impose some type of rational control over defense spending.

He has been a watchdog of the military budget during the years that he served on the Budget Committee and has developed a particular interest, I think, and expertise in trying to bring a more cost efficient means or method to the Pentagon in the way they have managed their business, and in the way they make their purchases.

I want to pay tribute to the Senator from Iowa, this evening on the floor, for his stalwart efforts in that regard.

I might say to my friend that the reason we have chosen to bring this bill to the floor in this manner and not bring it first before the Senate Budget Committee is because to take this, in effect, an amendment to the Budget Enforcement Act to the Budget Committee for direct action would require, after our favorable action on the so-called walls bill, their referring the bill to the Governmental Affairs Committee where it would reside for a period of no less than 30 days where that committee could work its will on it, and amend it in any way that it sought, in any way that it felt was necessary and wise; and then bring the bill to the floor thereafter.

Time being of the essence, it was my view that we ought to resolve this dilemma one way or the other, resolve this dispute one way or the other as quickly as possible so we would know where we were going then when we took up the marking up of the budget resolution in the Budget Committee in a timely fashion.

Frankly, we have delayed for a couple of weeks here waiting for the House of Representatives to act. It is my view that perhaps the House would act. If the House acted unfavorably on amending the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, there is no reason for the Senate to take it up. If they acted favorably, then of course we would want to move to take it up.

But the House has not acted and they have simply been in limbo there for 2 weeks. It is my view that we ought to go forward here on the floor and let the Senate work its will on this particular piece of legislation so that when we return to the budget resolution we, in the Budget Committee, would know one of two things:

We would know, in domestic discretionary, if we simply mark to the caps, and this would mean a reduction of \$6.7 billion below the baseline; we would

know that is what we would be required to do if the walls are not taken down. Our only real task then before the Budget Committee would be to determine the magnitude of the reduction in defense spending that we would want to have under the cap; the magnitude of the defense reduction that the committee would vote out in its resolution.

I am hopeful that in the Budget Committee, and when we do get to a resolution the Senate, the Senator from Iowa will act in his characteristic fashion of taking a very hard look at military spending, and working with the chairman and others of a like mind on the committee to try to reduce this spending; and, if the walls are not taken down, allocate these savings purely and solely to deficit reduction.

But we simply are not in the position to know where we go in the Budget Committee until we know how the body feels about whether or not the walls should be taken down a year earlier.

So that is the reason that I brought this bill to the floor to get it acted on expeditiously rather than delaying for another 30 days or 6 weeks as it went through the budget process, then through the Governmental Affairs Committee, then bringing it to the floor where there would be extended debate, time running all the time, which meant our budget resolution would be delayed and we would certainly miss all of our deadlines.

I make that explanation to my friend from Iowa because he is a very conscientious and valuable member of the Budget Committee, and I would not want him to leave this Chamber thinking that the chairman had acted in a duplicitous way to try to avoid bringing this measure before the full Budget Committee.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee and the manager of this bill for his explanation. I hope I did not infer any bad motives in the process. I question it as a basis of procedure and policy as I did in my remarks.

I want to take this opportunity to thank him for his statements about me.

In addition, I want to say to the chairman that I do expect to be in that group that would be working to cut defense, at least the \$50 billion and perhaps more, an amount in my mind uncertain at this point. But I want to say at least that a generally agreed upon figure I will be working to have, but I also will be working to have it be used for deficit reduction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS].

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, as we draw the debate to a close, I will have more to say on this subject tomorrow.

But as I listen to the debate tonight on this issue and the thing about walls, it reminds me of some negotiations we were going through the other day in the business of allocating water. They kept using a figure, a certain figure that was about 2-million-acre feet which was more—actually called wet water—than was flowing down the canal.

We had a hard time in getting the negotiators together and to admit that we had only say 4 million feet rather than 6.

When we get back to reality, and I think that is what this Government has to come back to, is the reality that we only have so many dollars and how we spend those dollars, that is when the ruckus breaks out.

So I will address this tomorrow. I suggest to my colleagues that we look at real figures instead of guessing, that one day we abandon baseline budgeting, and get back into the real world and tell the American people this is how much we have, and this is what we will have to spend and quit borrowing against the future.

So I will have more to say on that tomorrow.

Mr. President, seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, on this day 171 years ago, the Greek people began their arduous struggle to reestablish their independence after nearly four centuries of Turkish Ottoman rule. In the following 8 difficult years, determined Greek patriots fought against tremendous odds to rid themselves of nearly four centuries of tyrannical rule. After nearly a decade of armed struggle, liberty for the Greek homeland was secured and with it came the reaffirmation of individual freedoms which are the heart of Greek tradition and culture.

The struggle for independence captured the imagination of a young republic on the other side of the Atlantic—the United States of America. In 1823, President James Monroe observed:

The whole civilized world took a deep interest in the heroic struggle of the Greeks which brought to mind both exalted sentiments and the best of feelings.

The struggle for Greek independence provoked sympathy and enthusiasm

from Americans of all walks of life. Many volunteers from various localities in America sailed to Greece to join the struggle. State legislatures and town meetings across the Nation passed resolutions in support of the Greek struggle. In the House of Representatives, Congressman Daniel Webster put the Greek case to his colleagues in the 18th Congress when he declared in a floor speech:

They look to us as the great Republic of the Earth and they ask us by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are now struggling for what we can so ably enjoy.

In many respects, this was a natural reaction to a momentous struggle occurring in the Old World. First, sympathy for the Greek uprising was rooted in our young Nation's own experience in overthrowing foreign domination and establishing a democratic republic. Second, and just as importantly, it was from ancient Greece, the birthplace of democracy, that our forefathers drew the form and substance for our new experience in governance.

Just as the founders of the American Republic had earlier drawn inspiration from the democratic ideals of the ancient Greeks, the Greek patriots drew inspiration as well from the American Revolution. Henry Steele Commager, the noted American historian, has discussed the extent to which the architects of the Revolution and the authors of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights were familiar with Plutarch and Thucydides, and with ancient Greek ideas of civil liberty and citizenship. There is, he wrote, a "continuous rain of references" in the debates of the Founding Fathers to the experience of the ancient world, and in the Federalist papers to ancient history.

As Thomas Jefferson observed of himself and his colleagues, "to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

Surely our Founding Fathers marveled, as we do today, over the words of Pericles 2,000 years ago, when the Athenian statesman observed that:

Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses.

The ties which binds the two nations and the two peoples were forged through mutual inspiration in the early days of both our republics. For more than 170 years these ties have been reinforced in countless ways. As nations and peoples in World War I, Americans and Greeks were steadfast allies. During the darkest days of World War II, when it seemed inevitable that Hitler and Mussolini's forces

would overrun Europe with little resistance, the courageous Greek people defeated Mussolini's army, thus giving the free world its first victory over the Axis powers and effectively delaying their occupation of Greece. Nowhere was the Nazi occupation more brutal than in Greece; and nowhere was the resistance more determined or heroic than in Greece. More than 600,000 Greeks, 9 percent of the entire population of that land, died fighting on the side of the Allies in World War II.

In the postwar period, the commitment of President Harry Truman and the American people helped the people of Greece to turn back a Communist insurgency and to rebuild their country. During Greece's post-World War struggle against communism, President Truman said:

The valor of Greece *** convinces me that the Greek people are equal to the task.

Greece continues to be a reliable ally and friends. During Operation Desert Storm, the Greek Government responded in impressive fashion in contributing to the successful efforts of the United States-led coalition forces to reverse Saddam Hussein's invasion and occupation of Kuwait.

Today, Greece stands as the only bulwark of democracy and stability in the Balkans where the dissolution of post-World War II Yugoslavia has led to renewed ethnic and religious turmoil in that region of the world.

President James Monroe, in his 1822 message to the 17th Congress, observed that:

The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosom the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible.

That sentiment was an expression of admiration for the ancient Greeks who gave to us the concept of governance which our Founding Fathers drew upon so heavily in creating our representative democracy. In celebrating Greek Independence Day we are reaffirming our appreciation for this unique gift given us by the ancient Greeks.

The global community is caught in the midst of impressive change where totalitarian and authoritarian ideologies are being swept aside. Yet, the one enduring idea which has stood the test of time and continues to capture the imagination of people around the world is the democratic ideal. It has stood the test of time because, as Pericles stated more than two millennia ago, democracy confers power on the whole people, not a minority.

**APPOINTMENT BY THE
REPUBLICAN LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has an announcement to make.

The chair, on behalf of the Republican leader, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, appoints Mr. Ralph Stanley, of Virginia, as a member of the Commis-

sion to Promote Investment in America's Infrastructure.

ESTABLISHING THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 102, a concurrent resolution establishing the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, submitted earlier today by Senators FORD and STEVENS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 102) to provide for a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, today I am submitting for myself and Mr. STEVENS a concurrent resolution authorizing the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol to be used on January 20, 1993, in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

The concurrent resolution is identical to the one approved by the Congress in 1988 and is essential in the event circumstances require that the inaugural ceremony be moved indoors. As you will recall, this was the case in 1985 when bitterly cold weather necessitated a last-minute change from the west front inside to the rotunda.

This concurrent resolution will assure that the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies has the necessary authority to take similar action in 1993 in the event it is required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 102) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 102

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1993.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BURNS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR INAUGURAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 103, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda for inaugural activities, submitted earlier today by Senators FORD and STEVENS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103) authorizing the rotunda of the United States Capitol to be used on January 20, 1993, in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 102 provides for a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, consisting of three Senators appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House. The joint committee will make the arrangements for the inauguration of the President and Vice President on January 20, 1993. This is the same resolution adopted by the Congress in 1984 and 1988. Senator STEVENS and I are pleased to cosponsor this concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 103) was agreed to; as follows:

S. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the rotunda of the United States Capitol is hereby authorized to be used on January 20, 1993, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States. Such Committee is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between such Committee and the heads of such departments and agencies, in connection with such proceedings and ceremonies.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BURNS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

**PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT
AMENDMENTS**

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1306.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree with the amendments to the House, agree to the request for a conference, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on behalf of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Hawaii.

The motion was agreed to, and the Chair appointed Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PELL, Mr. METZENBAUM, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. COATS, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. DURENBERGER conferees on behalf of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

**APPROPRIATIONS CATEGORY
REFORM ACT**

**MOTION TO PROCEED
CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this cloture motion occur tomorrow, Thursday, at a time to be determined by the majority leader, after consultation with the Republican leader, with the mandatory live quorum being waived.

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

The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the cloture motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 2399, a bill to allow rational choice between defense and domestic discretionary spending:

George Mitchell, Harris Wofford, Paul Sarbanes, Paul Simon, Jim Sasser, Howard Metzenbaum, Bob Graham, John Glenn, Terry Sanford, Timothy E. Wirth, Frank R. Lautenberg, Wendell Ford, Mark Hatfield, Patrick Leahy, Kent Conrad, Jeff Bingaman, Richard H. Bryan.

**EXECUTIVE AND OTHER
COMMUNICATIONS**

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

EC-2834. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Communications, Computers & Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report about converting the Custodial Services function at USAF Academy, Colorado to performance by contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2835. A communication from the Comptroller of the Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Department's Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) and associated Procurement and RDT&E Annexes for the FY 1993 President's Budget; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2836. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Water Quality Inventory Report for calendar year 1990; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2837. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 with respect to the activities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2838. A communication from the Director of the United States Information Agency, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to amend Section 235 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101-246) and to amend Section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (Public Law 80-402); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 2055. A bill to amend the Job Training Partnership Act to strengthen the program of employment and training assistance under the Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 102-264).

By Mr. RIEGLE, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2482. A bill to provide funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation, and for other purposes.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs approved additional funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation. Below is a brief summary of the action that was taken by the committee, together with a copy of the bill.

**SUMMARY
BACKGROUND**

In the 1989 FIRREA legislation, Congress created the Resolution Trust Corporation ("RTC") to protect depositors at failed savings and loans that are taken over by the Government between January 1, 1989, and August 9, 1992 (since amended to September 30, 1993) and to sell the assets that the RTC acquires from failed thrifts.

Congress has authorized RTC funding on 3 prior occasions: \$50 billion in August 1989; \$30 billion in March 1991; and \$25 billion in November 1991.

Originally, the Administration requested Congress provide \$50 billion to the RTC to close failed savings and loans. In 1990, it became apparent that the \$50 billion would be exhausted long before the RTC completed the program. In March of 1991, Congress authorized an interim \$30 billion for the RTC to continue to close failed savings and loans while it studied means of restructuring the RTC to make it more efficient. On November 27, 1991, Congress enacted legislation to eliminate the RTC's dual board structure, establish a presidentially appointed full-time Chief Executive Officer, and provide the RTC with \$25 billion to close failed savings and loans. Based on the representations on how long the money would last, the Congress provided that the money was only available until April 1, 1992.

It is now imperative that Congress approve additional funds for the RTC. The RTC has stated that it has stopped marketing its inventory of failed thrifts because it is not sure when after April 1, 1992 it will have the funding necessary to sell or close failed thrifts.

The Administration's official estimate is that, in addition to the \$105 billion previously authorized, the RTC will need an additional \$55 billion to finish closing thrifts through September 1993. Thus, when it is finished, the total cost of the RTC program may be \$160 billion.

The RTC has used these funds to protect 19.3 million accounts in 585 thrifts in 44 states. RTC funding is necessary to fulfill the obligation to protect thrift depositors' savings with the full faith and credit of the United States.

TITLE I

Section 101. Funding.

The funding section has two elements: it lifts the statutory deadline on previously authorized funds; and it provides additional funds.

The RTC has not completed enough transactions and will not be able to spend all of the previously authorized \$25 billion before the April 1, 1992 deadline imposed by Congress. To date, the RTC estimates it will use approximately \$8 billion of the \$25 billion by the April 1, 1992 deadline. This section will lift the April 1, 1992 deadline contained in that legislation and allow the RTC to spend the remainder of the previously authorized funds.

Additionally, this section will provide the RTC with \$25 billion in new money that can be used until April 1, 1993. Although the RTC Oversight Board estimates that the RTC will need an additional \$55 billion during the life of its program, the RTC CEO testified before the Banking Committee that if the April 1, 1992 funding deadline were lifted and the agency were to receive an additional \$25 billion in loss funds, that would be sufficient for the RTC to continue its operations until April 1, 1993. The General Accounting Office has testified before the Banking Committee that the Congress should provide sufficient funding for the RTC until the spring of 1993, and that withholding authorization of part of the final funding provides the Congress with an effective means of retaining oversight of the RTC's operations.

The amount of funding provided by this section is the same level of funding that was approved by the House Banking Committee.

TITLE II

Sections 201-208. Technical corrections.

These sections reflect technical corrections to each of the titles of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructur-

ing, and Improvement Act of 1991. These changes are noncontroversial and do not make any substantive changes. Instead, these provisions are intended to eliminate errors and correct inconsistencies from the 1991 Act. These sections incorporate all of the changes suggested by the RTC, the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board and the Office of Thrift Supervision.

TITLE III

Section 301. Repeal of Capital Forbearance Provision

The Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 included a provision, section 618, mandating lower capital standards for residential construction loans and for certain types of apartment loans. Section 618 required that loans to a company for the purpose of constructing certain types of residential housing and loans secured by certain types of multi-family housing should be included in the 50% risk weight category for purposes of the risk-based capital standard. All other business loans are in the 100% risk weight category for the purposes of the risk-based capital standard. In lowering the capital standard for these loans, the provision increased the possibility of risk of loss to the deposit insurance funds and violated the international accord on capital standards adopted by the central banks of the major industrial nations (the BASLE accord).

For the record, Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS) Director Ryan specifically requested that the repeal of section 618 be included in the RTC funding measure. The other bank regulators, including the Federal Reserve and the FDIC, have also written letters endorsing the repeal of section 618.

OTS has confirmed that, in general, construction loans to developers building homes were 15 times as risky as regular home mortgage loans. Loans for apartments and condominiums had even higher loss rates. However, repealing section 618 would not prevent the regulators from drafting their own plan to adjust capital standards. For example, the OTS has proposed a regulation that lowers the capital standard on construction loans for certain pre-sold homes that meet defined safety and soundness criteria. Indeed, section 313 of the bill encourages the regulators to review their current risk-based standards.

The Senate has previously adopted a repeal of section 618.

Section 302. Definition of property sold by United States agency.

This provision clarifies that a special Alaskan corporation established by the Secretary of the Treasury would have the legal authority to purchase intangible assets from the RTC and the FDIC in addition to its legal authority to purchase real property from the RTC or the FDIC.

This provision was passed as a floor amendment offered by Senator Murkowski in connection with the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991. This provision was passed at that time as a package with what now stands as section 301 of this bill. The House has not acted on either element of that legislative package or on the combination. Inclusion of these provisions in the bill is intended to bring closure on these issues.

Section 303. Continuation of health plan coverage.

This section clarifies the requirement enacted by Congress last year that the FDIC and the RTC provide for the continuation of health plan coverage for employees of failed banks and thrifts. Notwithstanding that last

year's requirement was intended to require the RTC and the FDIC to assure such continued coverage, the RTC interpreted the provision as not applying to the agency and the FDIC raised serious concerns about its ability to comply with the requirement.

Section 303 clarifies that the RTC and the FDIC must comply with the requirement under present law to provide for the continuation of health care coverage for employees of failed thrifts and banks. Additionally, section 303 provides a method so that both agencies are capable of complying with the requirement. The RTC and the FDIC do not oppose the implementation of this provision.

An amendment accepted by the Committee and reflected in this section of the bill clarifies that the continuation of health plan coverage by the RTC is made subject to appropriations.

Section 304. Judgment collection information.

This section requires the Attorney General to collect detailed information and report annually to Congress on fines and restitution orders and the money actually collected arising from fraud and other criminal activity involving failed thrifts and their insiders. This will enable the Congress to know exactly how much money is actually being collected by the federal government in connection with its prosecutions involving failed thrifts. At a February 6, 1992 hearing held by the Consumer Subcommittee of the Banking Committee, the GAO testified that the federal government has collected only \$365,000 out of \$84 million in court-ordered fines and repayments in 55 major savings and loan criminal convictions. GAO testified that "not even a penny for every dollar [in fines and restitution ordered] has been collected."

Additionally, this section would complement and supplement existing reporting requirements on the judgments and convictions obtained by the Justice Department and the financial services regulators. Information on uncollected judgments and agreements arising from civil enforcement efforts as well as the money actually received by the United States arising from prosecutions of financial institution crimes would need to be reported.

Section 305. Temporary vacancies in the office of chief executive officer.

Under present law, the RTC CEO has the sole authority to manage and direct the operations of the RTC and he is vested with all the powers of the RTC. Present law, however, does not provide a mechanism to allow the RTC to continue to operate if a temporary vacancy arises in the RTC CEO office. Section 305, which was included in the Committee bill at the behest of the RTC, is a technical amendment to address the problem of temporary vacancies in the RTC CEO office. This provision would permit the designation of an agency or other government official to act as RTC CEO on a temporary basis in the event of death, illness, incapacity or other similar circumstances with respect to the RTC CEO.

Section 306. Modifying separate capitalization rule for savings associations' subsidiaries engaged in activities not permissible for a national bank.

Under section 5(t)(5) of the Home Owners' Loan Act, if a federally insured savings association engages through a subsidiary in activities not permissible for a national bank, the savings association cannot count its investments in and extensions of credit to the subsidiary as part of its own capital. Congress adopted this rule in 1989 because of the record of significant losses by the thrifts

making direct investments through subsidiaries. Principally, these nonconforming subsidiaries were engaged in real estate development.

Section 5(t)(5) includes a transition rule permitting a savings association to include in its capital until July 1, 1992, 75 percent of its investments in and extensions of credit to a non-conforming subsidiary. That percentage will decline to 60 percent on July 1, 1992, 40 percent on July 1, 1993, and 0 percent on July 1, 1994. It should be noted that the deduction of capital for purposes of this transition rule is in addition to the obligation of the institution to establish all appropriate reserves pursuant to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles to fully reflect any losses incurred at the subsidiary.

Because of the nationwide drop in the commercial real estate values, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision has requested that thrifts be allowed some additional time to divest their real estate or otherwise comply with section 5(t)(5).

Section 306 delays the effective date of the 60 percent rule from July 1, 1992, until October 1, 1992, to give the Director time to review requests for relief (as described below).

Section 306 then gives the Director case-by-case discretion to extend the phase-out schedule by two years. The Director could allow a particular savings association to include in its capital, until July 1, 1994, up to 75 percent of its investments in and extensions of credit to a subsidiary. That percentage declines to 60 percent on July 1, 1994, 40 percent on July 1, 1995, and 0 percent on July 1, 1996.

To be eligible for such relief, a savings association must satisfy a five-part test. First, the savings association must be either (1) adequately capitalized or (2) in compliance with an approved capital restoration plan meeting the requirements of section 38 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. Such a plan must, (a) specify the steps the savings association will take to become adequately capitalized; (b) specify the levels of capital to be attained during each year in which the plan will be in effect; (c) specify how the savings association will comply with the restrictions or requirements of section 38; (d) specify the types and levels of activities in which the savings association will engage; (e) be based on realistic assumptions, and be likely to succeed in restoring the savings associations' capital; (f) not appreciably increase the risk to which the savings association is exposed; and (g) be guaranteed by any company controlling the savings association. To satisfy this requirement, a savings association with a plan approved under section 5(t) of the Home Owners' Loan Act need not necessarily submit a new plan, much less wait until section 38 becomes effective: to the extent that the prior plan satisfies the requirements of section 38, it suffices for purposes of this requirement.

Second, the savings association's current composite MACRO rating must be 1, 2, or 3.

Third, the savings association must be an "eligible savings association" as defined in section 5(t)(3)(B) of the Home Owners' Loan Act. Thus (1) the savings association's management must be competent; (2) the savings association must be in substantial compliance with all applicable statutes, regulations, orders, and supervisory agreements and directives; and (3) the savings association's management must not have engaged in insider dealing, speculative practices, or any other activities that have jeopardized the institution's safety and soundness or contributed to impairing the institution's capital.

Fourth, the capital-deduction rule of section 5(t)(5)(A) must apply to the subsidiary only because of the subsidiary's real-estate investments or other real-estate activities. This section affords no relief in the case of subsidiaries that are subject to the capital deduction rule because of junk-bond investments or other non-real-estate activities.

Fifth, the Director of the OTS must determine that granting the relief in question to the particular savings association would not increase the risk to the affected deposit insurance fund.

Section 307. Extension of statute of limitations.

In FIRREA, a federal statute of limitations was created that would give the RTC or FDIC at least 3 years after a savings and loan or bank failed to file tort claims. This is a minimum period, if a state has a longer period, then state law would govern. Recent reports indicate that the RTC is facing a tough burden trying to meet the 3 year deadline for hundreds of thrifts that failed in 1989. The bill reported by the Committee extends the minimum statute of limitations for tort actions by the RTC from 3 years to 5 years.

RTC has 318 failed thrifts that face the limit this year. In comparison, the RTC filed a total of 26 civil lawsuits in 1991. On March 16, 1992, the time limit for 47 thrifts expired. And in April of this year, the time will expire for another 43 thrifts. Any tort claims not brought by such a date might later be barred. With such a crush of cases in such a short time, there is a good chance that some claims will not be discovered in time.

The purpose of this section is to further enable the RTC to recover monies on behalf of the taxpayers by extending the statute of limitations on certain claims arising out of the failure of federally insured thrifts and reviving other claims with respect to which the statute of limitations has already run.

On March 11, 1992, RTC's Chief Financial Officer testified that extending the statute of limitations would help the RTC. On March 23, 1992, the Chief Executive Officer of the RTC endorsed a two year extension of the statute of limitations on tort actions.

Section 308. Directors not liable for acquiescing in conservatorship, receivership, or supervisory acquisition or combination.

Under section 308, an insured depository institution's shareholders or creditors cannot hold the institution's directors liable for acquiescing in or consenting in good faith to (1) the appointment of the RTC or FDIC as conservator or receiver for the institution, or (2) the acquisition of the institution by a depository institution holding company or the combination of the institution with another insured depository institution. The exemption for an acquisition or combination applies if the appropriate Federal banking agency has (a) requested the institution, in writing, to be acquired or to combine, and (b) notified the institution that one or more grounds exist for appointing a conservator or receiver for the institution.

Section 308 generally parallels section 11(c)(12) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. §1821(c)(12)), which was added by section 133(e) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991, and becomes effective December 19, 1992. Section 308 will apply from the date of enactment of this Act until December 19, 1992, when section 11(c)(12) will supersede it.

Section 309. Real Estate Appraisal Requirements.

In 1989, Congress found that inflated and fraudulent real estate appraisals signifi-

cantly contributed to the losses associated with failed savings and loans. To improve the quality of appraisals, FIRREA established professional standards for appraisers on transactions regulated by the federal financial institutions regulatory agencies—including sales, purchases, and mortgages of real property.

FIRREA intended to give discretion to the regulators to determine which transactions should be subject to the appraisal requirements. The regulators initially determined that appraisers working on transactions over \$50,000 in value must be State certified or licensed. The Federal Reserve and the FDIC have since decided that a \$100,000 threshold was more appropriate and so changed their *de minimus* thresholds from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

In pending litigation, some parties are arguing that FIRREA did not give regulators any discretion to set a monetary *de minimus* threshold for transactions requiring the services of a State licensed or certified appraiser. They argue that FIRREA requires the services of a State licensed or certified appraiser on all Federally-related real estate transactions. This amends FIRREA to state clearly that the regulators may establish threshold monetary levels for real estate transactions, below which the services of a State licensed or certified appraiser is not required.

Section 310. Funds for early resolution of thrifts.

This section earmarks \$1.85 billion of funds for the early resolution of weak but profitable savings and loans. The Director of the OTS has requested that this approach be implemented because he asserts that it will save money in the long run by reducing the cost of failures. Although this provision earmarks \$1.85 billion for the early resolution program, it does not compel the regulators to use this money. It is in the discretion of the regulators whether or not to spend the funds.

Section 311. Addition of Florida to list of distressed areas.

In FIRREA, Congress provided a mechanism for the RTC to avoid dumping real estate in communities and states with depressed real estate markets. In these distressed areas, the RTC is generally not to sell properties for less than 95% of market value, unless it determines that the specific transaction is in the best interests of the RTC.

FIRREA designated the states of Arkansas, Colorado, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas as distressed areas. Although the RTC has the authority to add or subtract states to the list of distressed areas, the RTC has never changed the list of distressed areas since enactment of FIRREA in 1989.

This section would add the state of Florida to the RTC list of distressed areas. Accordingly, under the RTC property disposition rules, the RTC could not sell properties for less than 95% of market value without documenting that doing so was consistent with the statutory goals of the RTC.

Section 312. Loan guarantees for RTC asset sales.

This provision specifically authorizes the RTC to establish a program to guarantee part of a loan to finance the sale of RTC real property. The RTC is directed to establish rules for a program that would allow financial institutions to apply to the RTC for a guarantee of a loan to a 3rd party purchasing property from the RTC. Under the terms of this program, the purchaser would have to invest at least 15% in a cash down payment,

and the lender would also have to retain the risk of loss on 15% of its loan to finance the sale of the property. Thus, the RTC's guarantee would retain a risk of loss no more than 72.25% of the purchase price of the property. The RTC shall establish the safeguards in its implementing regulations necessary to provide adequate underwriting criteria for the terms of the loan and the qualification of the borrower.

Section 313. Sense of the Congress on risk based capital.

This provision concerns the risk-based capital standards.

In part, it is related to the repeal of the mandatory forbearance provision, section 618, of H.R. 3435 (see section 301). This clarifies that the regulators retain the flexibility to set appropriate risk-based standards for loans for the construction of certain pre-sold homes and especially encourages them to review their standards with respect to loans to facilitate low and moderate income housing.

In addition, the provision encourages the regulator to accelerate the implementation of an interest-rate risk component in the risk-based standard. An interest-rate risk component was first proposed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in 1988. The current lack of an interest rate risk component may cause some banks and savings and loans to buy securities instead of making loans. This has the potential to be harmful for two reasons. First, it chokes off credit that the economy needs, especially now. Second, it encourages banks and thrifts to speculate on interest rates in the same way savings and loans did in the 1970s by holding long term assets that are funded with short term liabilities. Federally insured banks and thrifts should not be speculating on interest rates by investing in long term securities that are mismatched to their liabilities; they should be making loans to sound borrowers.

Section 314. Sense of the Congress regarding termination of the Resolution Trust Corporation.

The RTC is scheduled to terminate on December 31, 1996. It has the authority to resolve failed thrifts until September 30, 1993. Section 314 expresses the sense of the Congress that the life of the RTC should not be extended beyond its current statutory termination date, nor that the RTC should receive any additional failed savings and loans after September 30, 1993 when its legal authority to do so expires.

TITLE IV

Sections 401 to 408. Disclosure provisions.

The purpose of this Title is to enable the taxpayer to determine how his or her money has been spent on the savings and loan problem and how his or her money is exposed to loss with the Bank Insurance Fund (BIF). So far, the Administration estimates that it will spend \$160 billion in losses on thrifts at the RTC and another \$69 billion will be spent on transactions for failed thrifts being administered by the FSLIC Resolution Fund (the so-called 1988 deals). Last year, the BIF began borrowing funds from the taxpayer through the Federal Financing Bank (FFB). This disclosure provision applies to all failed insured savings associations in the RTC's jurisdiction and insured savings associations that failed and were resolved with assistance funded through the FSLIC Resolution Fund. Because the BIF began borrowing funds from the FFB in 1991, the disclosure provision applies to BIF member banks that failed in that year, and will continue to apply to BIF member banks and insured savings associations so long as the applicable federal deposit insurance fund relies directly or indi-

rectly on taxpayer dollars to fund its activities.

The public disclosure legislation has two principal parts. First, the legislation requires regulators to make available prior examination reports of a failed insured depository institution. Second, the legislation prohibits the FDIC and RTC from entering into secret agreements to settle lawsuits arising from the failure of an institution.

If a financial institution goes out of business, but it does not involve taxpayer funds, the requirements of this legislation do not apply. The requirements also do not apply to open healthy institutions.

As a practical matter, in most cases, examination reports do not contain large quantities of information on individual customers. However, the legislation includes several exceptions in order to protect the privacy of third parties. Regulators are directed to remove from an examination report the names and other identifying information of customers not affiliated (non-insiders) with the institution. Any information about institution-affiliated parties (insiders) will be removed from examination reports if it is not relevant to the relationship between the insider and the institution.

Regulators will also remove from examination reports the names of examiners and of any whistleblowers who provide information to federal banking agencies.

In most cases, examination reports will not include a complete accounting of bad loans or losses. However, the FDIC and RTC will become aware of insider-caused losses as they dispose of assets acquired through financial institution failures. The legislation would require the FDIC and RTC to identify insider borrowers who have defaulted on loans made by a failed institution.

Regulators will also compile a list of all pending and settled lawsuits brought against parties that caused a material loss to the insurance funds or to a failed financial institution.

Regulators can delay release of an examination report in order to protect the health of open insured institutions. Law enforcement officials and regulators can delay release of portions of reports for up to five years to avoid hindering an ongoing criminal investigation, and for up to two years to avoid interference with a civil or administrative proceeding.

GAO has documented that the federal bank regulators, "have wide discretion in choosing among enforcement actions . . . [and] share a common philosophy of trying to work informally with banks to promote cooperations with those having difficulties. This combination of wide discretion and a cooperative philosophy often did not resolve the problems regulators had identified in GAO's sampled cases." (Bank Supervision: Prompt and Forceful Regulatory Actions Needed, April 1991, p.3). Other government studies have confirmed that the lack of formal regulatory action contributed to the problems caused by the management of the failed savings and loans. The Congressional Budget Office has determined that the regulators' policy choice of forbearing from closing failed thrifts, which began in the early 1980s, increased the cost of the savings and loan crisis by \$66 billion (CBO; the Cost of Forbearance During the Thrift Crisis, June 1991).

Disclosure of formal enforcement actions by bank regulators was first mandated by Congress in FIRREA in 1989. In the Crime Control Act of 1990, Congress extended the disclosure requirement to any type of order or enforceable agreement used by bank regu-

lators. On both occasions, the bank regulatory agencies opposed the disclosure provisions claiming that disclosure of enforcement actions would weaken the banking system by causing runs at banks or thrifts that disclosed enforcement actions. There is no evidence suggesting that disclosure of enforcement actions during the past two years has caused any of the widespread problems the bank regulators suggested might occur when this issue was first raised in 1989.

CONCLUSION

The Congress must act to provide the RTC with the authority to spend funds to protect depositors at failing thrifts. Any delay past April 1, 1992 only increases the ultimate cost of the failure by the amount of the additional losses of the failed but unresolved savings and loans.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, Washington, DC, January 3, 1992.

Hon. DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and
Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am pleased to respond to your request for my views on the provisions of Section 618 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (H.R. 3435). Section 618 directs the federal banking agencies to amend their risk-based capital guidelines and regulations to assign a 50 percent risk weight to presold one- to four-family residential construction loans and multifamily housing loans that meet specified criteria. I strongly support the removal of Section 618.

As a general matter, I believe that it is inadvisable to set down in a statute specifications for the internationally established risk-based capital standards. These standards, commonly referred to as the Basle Accord, were developed after lengthy consultations among the banking supervisors of the G-10 countries. It is far preferable that any changes or modifications to these standards be left to the discretion of the federal banking agencies in order to ensure that they are coordinated with other parties to the agreement and are consistent with the spirit of the Basle Accord. To make unilateral changes could prompt other countries to take similar actions, which, when compounded, could result not only in the weakening of the international capital standards, but also in the promotion of international competitive inequity among banks.

In addition, I would like to point out that mandating risk weights for specific assets by statute poses the obvious danger of assigning risk weights that are more reflective of the preferences of specific interest groups than of the relative risks of the assets. Where such assets represent loans to the private sector, such statutorily mandated risk weights would also raise industry credit allocation concerns.

With respect to the provisions of Section 618 that pertain to certain presold one- to four-family residential construction loans, the federal banking agencies have been considering for some time a proposal to lower the risk weight on such loans. After careful review, the agencies may well be inclined to put in place a lower risk for these types of loans that meet terms and conditions similar to those set down in Section 618.

The provisions of Section 618 that deal with multifamily housing loans, however, raise more complex questions. Our super-

visory experience has indicated that such loans are considerably more risky than loans for one- to four-family houses. Assigning a 50 percent risk weight to mortgages on multifamily residences with a loan to value ratios (LTVs) as high as 80 percent—as mandated in Section 618—could well be viewed internationally as inconsistent with the spirit of the Basle Accord. The Accord states that the 50 percent risk weight may not be applied to speculative residential real estate loans and further indicates that valuation rules should ensure a substantial margin of additional security over the amount of the loan. The delinquency and charge-off rates on multifamily housing loans are far higher than on single family mortgages. Since the available performance data does not break down multifamily mortgage loans by LTVs, we do not know what the specific performance of such loans with an 80 percent LTV has been. However, given the performance of multifamily mortgage loans overall, we question whether an 80 percent LTV would provide an adequate margin of safety.

Furthermore, very few of the countries that are party to the Basle Accord give a preferential risk weight to multifamily housing loans. Those that do generally require that any mortgage assigned to the 50 percent risk category, whether for individual or multifamily housing, have an LTV that is relatively low compared to U.S. standards. Germany, for example, assigns residential mortgage loans a 50 percent risk weight only if the LTV does not exceed 60 percent. Assigning a 50 percent risk weight to loans on multifamily residences with LTVs much in excess of 60 percent could be viewed by other countries as contrary to the spirit of the Basle Accord. Moreover, such an action could prompt questions internationally with regard to the relatively liberal LTVs permitted in the U.S. for mortgages on one- to four-family residences included in 50 percent risk category.

In light of the above, I recommend the deletion of Section 618. Thank you again for giving me the opportunity to express my views on this matter. Please let me know if we can provide you with further information on the issues involved.

Sincerely,

ALAN GREENSPAN.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, Washington, DC, December 11, 1991.

Hon. DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washing-
ton, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express concern over Section 618 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (H.R. 3435). Section 618 would assign, for purposes of the banking and thrift regulators' risk-based capital standards, a fifty percent risk weight to one-to-four family residential construction loans and multifamily housing loans that meet certain criteria.

Statutorily mandating different risk weights for various types of loans to the private sector raises industry credit allocation concerns. The financial regulators should be permitted to retain their current discretion in regulating capital. In fact, the regulators currently are giving serious consideration to a lowered risk weight for certain pre-sold one-to-four family residential construction loans.

We appreciate your support of the adoption of S. Con. Res. 84 which deletes Section 618.

We will urge adoption of this Resolution by the House of Representatives early next year.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM TAYLOR,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THRIFT SUPERVISION,
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, December 27, 1991.

Hon. DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing and
Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my concern about the mandatory risk-weighting provisions included in the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991. Section 618 of this legislation requires that, for purposes of their risk-based capital regulations, the banking regulators assign certain one-to-four family residential construction loans and certain multifamily housing loans to the 50% risk-weighting category.

First, I believe this section is unnecessary. The Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS) has already acted to address the specific issues covered by section 618. OTS's risk-based capital regulation currently places certain conservatively underwritten and seasoned multifamily mortgage loans in the 50% risk-weighting category. See 12 C.F.R. §567.1(v) (1991) (OTS risk-based capital rules). In addition, OTS has proposed a rule, a copy of which is enclosed, that would reduce to the 50% category certain loans for "pre-sold" single-family homes.

Second, as the initiatives I have just described make clear, assignment of assets to risk-weighting categories for purposes of the capital rules should, be left to the regulators. It is essential that the regulators have the flexibility to use the risk-based capital regime for the very purpose for which it was designed, that is, to adjust the capital "charge" for assets depending on the degree of risk they pose. The level of risk may change over time, and the regulators should not be foreclosed by statute from adjusting the capital standards accordingly.

Finally, I note that the risk-based capital requirements that all of the banking regulators currently have in place reflect a lengthy international negotiation in which regulators from the United States participated. Assigning risk weights by statutory fiat is inconsistent with the process underlying the Basle Accord and runs counter to the goal of uniform, internationally agreed upon capital standards that apply worldwide.

For these reasons, I would urge modification of the RTC refunding bill to eliminate section 618.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY RYAN,
Director.

S. 2482

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Resolution Trust Corporation Funding Act of 1992".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

TITLE I—RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION FUNDING

Sec. 101. Funding.

TITLE II—RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

Sec. 201. Technical corrections relating to title I of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 202. Technical corrections relating to title II of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 203. Technical corrections relating to title III of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 204. Technical corrections relating to title IV of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 205. Technical corrections relating to title V of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 206. Technical corrections relating to title VI of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 207. Repeal of title VII consisting of amendments duplicated in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991.

Sec. 208. Effective date.

TITLE III—OTHER RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION-RELATED AMENDMENTS

Sec. 301. Repeal of risk weighted capital requirement.

Sec. 302. Definition of property sold by United States agency.

Sec. 303. Continuation of health plan coverage.

Sec. 304. Judgment collection information.

Sec. 305. Temporary vacancies in the office of chief executive officer.

Sec. 306. Modifying separate capitalization rule for savings associations' subsidiaries engaged in activities not permissible for national banks.

Sec. 307. Extension of civil statute of limitations.

Sec. 308. Directors not liable for acquiescing in conservatorship, receivership, or supervisory acquisition or combination.

Sec. 309. Real estate appraisal amendment.

Sec. 310. Set-aside of funds for assistance.

Sec. 311. Addition of Florida to list of distressed areas.

Sec. 312. Guarantee of loans to purchase RTC property.

Sec. 313. Sense of the Congress relating to standards on risk-based capital.

Sec. 314. Sense of the Congress regarding termination of the Resolution Trust Corporation.

TITLE IV—BANK AND THRIFT DISCLOSURE ACT

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Public availability of examination information.

Sec. 403. Prohibition of confidential settlements.

Sec. 404. Applicability.

Sec. 405. Removal of customer information from examination reports.

Sec. 406. Definitions.

Sec. 407. Additional disclosures by FDIC, NCUA, and RTC.

Sec. 408. GAO audits.

TITLE I—RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION FUNDING

SEC. 101. FUNDING.

Section 21A(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(i)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)—
(A) by striking "until April 1, 1992"; and
(B) by inserting ", out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated," after "provide"; and
(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—In addition to amounts provided under paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to the Corporation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary, not to exceed \$25,000,000,000, to carry out the purposes of this section until April 1, 1993."

TITLE II—RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TITLE I OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION REFINANCING, RESTRUCTURING, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 101.—Section 21A(i)(3) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(i)(3)) (as added by section 101 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by inserting a comma after "necessary" and after "billion".

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 102.—

(1) Section 11(c)(6)(B) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1821(c)(6)(B)) (as amended by section 102 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is further amended by striking "section 5(d)(2)(C)" and inserting "subparagraph (C) or (F) of section 5(d)(2)".

(2) Section 102 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1761) is amended—

(A) by striking "Section 11(c)(6)(B)" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11(c)(6)(B)"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) CONFORMING EFFECTIVE DATE.—Effective on December 19, 1992, section 11(c)(6)(B) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1821(c)(6)(B)) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by striking 'subparagraph (C) or (F) of section 5(d)(2)' and inserting 'subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 5(d)(2)'."

(c) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 103.—Section 103(a) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1761) is amended by striking "(12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(3)(A)(i)(II))" and inserting "(12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(3)(A)(i))".

(d) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 104.—Section 21(e)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441(e)(2)) (as amended by section 104 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "Thrift Depositor Protection Refinance" and inserting "Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement".

(e) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 106.—

(1) Section 21A(k)(7) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(k)(7)) (as amended by section 106(a) of the Resolution

Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "quarter ending on the last day of the month ending before the month in which such report is required to be submitted" and inserting "preceding calendar quarter".

(2) Section 21A(k)(11)(B) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(k)(11)(B)) (as added by section 106(d) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended—

(A) by striking "an employee" and inserting "employees"; and

(B) by striking "Government" and inserting "General".

(3) Section 106(e)(2) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 is amended by striking "annual reports" and inserting "supplemental unaudited financial statements".

SEC. 202. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TITLE II OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION REFINANCING, RESTRUCTURING, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

Section 21A(b)(9)(B)(i) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(9)(B)(i)) (as amended by section 201 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "Thrift Depositor Protection Refinance" each place such term appears and inserting "Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement".

SEC. 203. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TITLE III OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION REFINANCING, RESTRUCTURING, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 302.—

(1) Section 302 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (12 U.S.C. 1441a note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking "Except as provided in subsection (c), the" and inserting "The"; and

(B) by striking subsection (c).

(2) Section 21A(k)(6)(A)(vii) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(k)(6)(A)(vii)) is amended by inserting "Thrift Depositor Protection" before "Oversight Board's".

(3) The heading for section 21A(a)(6) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(a)(6)) is amended by striking "OVERSIGHT" and inserting "THRIFT DEPOSITOR PROTECTION OVERSIGHT".

(4) The heading for section 21A(n)(8) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(n)(8)) is amended by inserting "THRIFT DEPOSITOR PROTECTION" before "OVERSIGHT".

(5) The heading for section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a) is amended by inserting "THRIFT DEPOSITOR PROTECTION" before "OVERSIGHT BOARD".

(6) The headings for sections 21B(c)(8) and 21B(j)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441b(c)(8) and 1441B(j)(2)) are each amended by inserting "THRIFT DEPOSITOR PROTECTION" before "OVERSIGHT".

(7) The heading for section 21B(k)(7) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441b(k)(7)) is amended by striking "OVERSIGHT" and inserting "THRIFT DEPOSITOR PROTECTION OVERSIGHT".

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 305.—

(1) Section 21A(a)(6)(C) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C.

1441a(a)(6)(C)) is amended by striking "paragraph (8) of this subsection" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "paragraph (8)".

(2) Section 21A(a) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(a)) is amended by redesignating paragraph (15) as paragraph (16) and inserting after paragraph (14) the following new paragraph:

"(15) REPORTS ON ANY MODIFICATION TO ANY STRATEGY, POLICY, OR GOAL.—If, pursuant to paragraph (6)(A), the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board requires the Corporation to modify any overall strategy, policy, or goal, such Board shall submit, before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Board first notifies the Corporation of such requirement, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives an explanation of the grounds that the Board determined justified the review and the reasons why the modification is necessary to satisfy such grounds."

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 307.—

(1) Section 21A(a)(10) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(a)(10)) is amended—

(A) by striking "4" and inserting "6";

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "The Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board shall maintain a transcript of the Board's open meetings."; and

(C) in the heading, by striking "QUARTERLY" and inserting "OPEN".

(2) Section 21A(c)(10) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(c)(10)) is amended by striking the last sentence (as added by section 307(2) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991).

(d) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 311.—Section 21A(b)(8)(A) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(8)(A)) (as amended by section 311 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "IN GENERAL.—" and all that follows through the 1st comma and inserting "IN GENERAL.—Except for the chief executive officer of the Corporation."

(e) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 314.—Section 21A(o)(2) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(o)(2)) (as amended by section 314(5) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "includes" and all that follows through "any officer or employee of the Federal Deposit" and inserting "includes any officer or employee of the Federal Deposit".

(f) AMENDMENT RELATING TO SECTION 316.—Section 21A(l)(3)(B) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(l)(3)(B)) (as amended by section 316 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "for that party of the filing" and inserting "for that party or the filing".

(g) ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Paragraph (9) of section 21A(b) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)) (as redesignated by section 310 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (G) (as redesignated by section 314(2)(B)(i) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991), by striking "(11)(A)(iv)" and inserting "(10)(A)(iv)"; and

(B) in subparagraph (I) (as redesignated by section 314(2)(B)(i) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991), by striking "through its Board of Directors".

(2) Paragraph (10) of section 21A(b) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)) (as redesignated by section 310 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "(10)" and inserting "(9)"; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking "(12)" and inserting "(11)".

(3) Paragraph (11)(E)(i) of section 21A(b) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)) (as redesignated by section 310 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "its" and inserting "the chief executive officer's".

(4) Section 21A(c)(7) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(c)(7)) is amended by striking "(b)(11)(A)" and inserting "(b)(10)(A)".

(5) Section 21A(d)(1)(B)(ii) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(d)(1)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking "paragraph (2)" and inserting "paragraph (3)".

(6) Section 21A(k)(3)(B) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(k)(3)(B)) is amended by striking "subsection (b)(11)(B) of this section" and inserting "subsection (b)(10)(B)".

SEC. 204. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TITLE IV OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION REFINANCING, RESTRUCTURING, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO INCORRECT DESIGNATIONS OF NEW SUBSECTIONS AND PARAGRAPHS.—

(1) Section 401 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 is amended by striking "after subsection (s) (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1773) (as added by section 227 of this Act)" and inserting "after subsection (p) (as redesignated by section 314(3) of this Act)".

(2) Section 402(a) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1774) is amended by striking "301" and inserting "401".

(3) Section 403 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1776) is amended by striking "section 302" and inserting "section 402".

(4) Section 404 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1776) is amended by striking "section 303" and inserting "section 403".

(5) Section 471 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-242, 105 Stat. 2385) is amended by striking "Home Owners' Loan Act" and inserting "Federal Home Loan Bank Act", effective as of December 19, 1991.

(6) Section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (t) (as added by section 401 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) as subsection (q);

(B) by redesignating subsection (u) (as added by section 402(a) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) as subsection (r);

(C) by redesignating subsection (v) (as added by section 403 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) as subsection (s);

(D) by redesignating subsection (w) (as added by section 404 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) as subsection (t);

(E) by redesignating subsection (q) (as added by section 251(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991) as subsection (u); and

(F) by redesignating subsection (q) (as added by section 471 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991) as subsection (v).

(7) Section 405 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1777) is amended—

(A) by striking "Section 21A(b)(14)" and inserting "Section 21A(b)(13)"; and

(B) by striking "1441a(b)(14)" and inserting "1441a(b)(13)" (as redesignated by section 310).

(8) Section 21A(b)(13) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(13)) (as amended by section 405 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "(14) GOAL FOR PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—" and inserting "(13) GOAL FOR PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.—".

(b) OTHER TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO AMENDMENTS MADE BY TITLE IV.—

(1) Section 21A(b)(1) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(1)) (as added by section 403 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 and redesignated by subsection (a)(6) of this section) is amended by striking "minority interim capital assistance program established by the Oversight Board by regulation pursuant to the strategic plan under subsection (a)" and inserting "Interim Statement of Policy Regarding Resolutions of Minority-Owned Depository Institutions, adopted by the Corporation on January 30, 1990,".

(2) Section 21A(u)(1) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(u)(1)) (as added by section 404 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 and redesignated by subsection (a)(6) of this section) is amended by striking "minority interim capital assistance program established by the Oversight Board by regulation pursuant to the strategic plan under subsection (a)" and inserting "Interim Statement of Policy Regarding Resolutions of Minority-Owned Depository Institutions, adopted by the Corporation on January 30, 1990,".

(3) Subsections (t)(3)(B) and (u)(5)(B) of section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a) (as added by sections 403 and 404, respectively, of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 and redesignated by subsection (a)(6) of this section) are each amended by striking "section 13(c)(8)" and inserting "section 13(f)(8)(B)".

SEC. 205. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TITLE V OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION REFINANCING, RESTRUCTURING, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 501.—

(1) Section 501(a)(1) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1777) is amended by striking "Section 21A(b)(10)(K) of the Federal Home Loan

Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(10)(K))" and inserting "Section 21A(b)(9)(J) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(9)(J)) (as redesignated by sections 310 and 314(2)(B)(i) of this Act)".

(2) Section 21A(b)(9)(J) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(9)(J)) (as amended by section 501(a)(1) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "(K) To make loans and," and inserting "(J) To make loans and,".

(3) Section 21A(c)(8)(B)(ii) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(8)(B)(ii)) (as added by section 501(a)(2)(B) of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended by striking "subchapter A" and inserting "subchapter B".

(b) AMENDMENT TO SECTION HEADING.—The heading for section 501 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 501. CREDIT ENHANCEMENT."
SEC. 206. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TITLE VI OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION REFINANCING, RESTRUCTURING, AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO SECTION 607.—Section 21A(c)(3)(E) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(c)(3)(E)) (as amended by section 607 of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(I), by striking "building property structure in which the units are located: *Provided, That*" and inserting "property in which the units are located; and";

(2) in clause (i)(II)—

(A) by striking "shall be made available for occupancy" the 1st time such term appears;

(B) by inserting "(including very low-income families taken into account for purposes of subclause (I))" after "very low-income families"; and

(C) by striking "building or structure" and inserting "property"; and

(3) in clause (ii)(II)—

(A) by striking "building property structure" each place such term appears and inserting "property"; and

(B) by inserting "(including very low-income families taken into account for purposes of subdivision (a) of this subclause)" after "very low-income families" where such term appears in subdivision (b) of such clause.

(b) REPEAL OF DUPLICATE PROVISION.—The Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1761) is amended by striking section 611 and redesignating sections 612 through 619 as sections 611 through 618, respectively.

SEC. 207. REPEAL OF TITLE VII CONSISTING OF AMENDMENTS DUPLICATED IN THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1761) is hereby repealed.

(b) EFFECT OF REPEAL.—No amendments made by title VII of the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 shall be deemed to have taken effect before the date of the en-

actment of this Act and the provisions of law amended by title VII shall continue in effect as if no such amendments had been made by such title.

SEC. 208. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title to the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 and the Federal Home Loan Bank Act shall take effect as if such amendments had been included in the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 as of the date of the enactment of that Act.

TITLE III—OTHER RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION-RELATED AMENDMENTS

SEC. 301. REPEAL OF RISK WEIGHTED CAPITAL REQUIREMENT.

The Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-233, 105 Stat. 1761) is amended—

(1) by striking section 617 (as redesignated by section 206(b)); and

(2) by redesignating section 618 (as redesignated by section 206(b)) as section 617.

SEC. 302. DEFINITION OF PROPERTY SOLD BY UNITED STATES AGENCY.

(a) SALES OF PROPERTY BY UNITED STATES AGENCIES.—Section 9102(e) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1990 (Public Law 101-165, 103 Stat. 1151) is amended by striking "real, personal," and inserting "real, personal (including financial instruments, notes, loans, bonds, licenses, and other intangible assets)."

(b) COOK INLET REGION.—Section 12(b)(7)(vii) of the Act of January 2, 1976 (Public Law 94-204, 89 Stat. 1145) is amended by striking "real, personal," and inserting "real, personal (including financial instruments, notes, loans, bonds, licenses, and other intangible assets)."

SEC. 303. CONTINUATION OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 451 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (12 U.S.C. 1821 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 451. CONTINUATION OF HEALTH PLAN COVERAGE IN CASES OF FAILED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation shall, in their respective capacities as conservator or receiver for a failed depository institution, offer continuation coverage to eligible individuals under a health plan which provides medical care (as defined in section 213(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) effective as of the date of failure of the depository institution. Such continuation coverage shall not contain any exclusion with respect to any preexisting condition of an eligible individual.

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

"(1) health insurance coverage is 'continuation coverage' if—

"(A) the premium to be paid for such coverage by an eligible individual reasonably reflects the average costs of providing such coverage, including a reasonable allowance for administrative costs, to eligible individuals;

"(B) the coverage extends for a period beginning on the date of the failure of the depository institution and ending not earlier than the earliest of—

"(i) 18 months after the date of the failure of the depository institution, except that this date shall be extended in the same manner as coverage is extended under clauses (ii)

and (v) of section 602(2)(A) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (hereafter referred to as 'ERISA') for a qualifying event occurring after the date of failure of the depository institution;

"(ii) the date on which coverage ceases by reason of a failure to make timely payment of any required premium, as determined under regulations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation;

"(iii) the date on which the eligible individual becomes covered under any group health plan which does not contain any exclusion or limitation with respect to any preexisting condition of such eligible individual;

"(iv) the date on which the eligible individual becomes eligible for benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; or

"(v) if an eligible individual was receiving health care continuation coverage under section 602 of ERISA, the date on which such coverage would otherwise terminate under that section;

"(C) written notice describing such coverage is provided to the eligible individual not later than 60 days after the failure of the depository institution; and

"(D) eligible individuals may elect to receive such coverage by paying the initial monthly premium not later than 60 days after receiving written notice of such coverage, and thereafter paying the premiums on a monthly basis;

"(2) the term 'controlled employer' means any employer which is owned, in whole or in part, whether directly or indirectly, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Resolution Trust Corporation, in its capacity as conservator or receiver for a failed depository institution, and who together with the failed depository institution, is treated as a single employer under section 414(t) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

"(3) the term 'eligible individual' means any employee or former employee of the failed depository institution and qualified beneficiaries of such employees (as defined in section 607(3) of ERISA) who were covered by a group health plan sponsored by the failed depository institution on the date of the failure of the depository institution;

"(4) the term 'failed depository institution' means an insured depository institution for which a conservator or receiver has been appointed;

"(5) the term 'group health plan' has the same meaning as in section 607(1) of ERISA;

"(6) the term 'insured depository institution' has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; and

"(7) the term 'qualifying event' has the same meaning as in paragraph (1), (3), (4), or (5) of section 603 of ERISA.

"(c) PROVISION OF CONTINUATION COVERAGE.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation may enter into any 1 or more agreements with any insurer which is licensed under the laws of any State or any organization which is authorized under State law to provide medical care (as defined in section 213(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) if it determines that such action is appropriate to comply with the requirements of this section.

"(d) EXPENSES AND CLAIMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation may pay—

"(A) the expenses of the administration of any health plan established pursuant to subsection (a); and

"(B) the claims of eligible individuals in excess of the amounts of premiums paid by such individuals.

"(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Any payment by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Resolution Trust Corporation under paragraph (1) made with respect to the expenses of administration of a health plan under subsection (a) shall be an administrative expense of all affected conservatorships and receiverships, shared in proportion to the number of eligible individuals associated with each such conservatorship or receivership. Any such payment under paragraph (1) made with respect to a claim submitted by an eligible individual shall be treated as an administrative expense of the affected conservatorship or receivership."

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The provision of continuation coverage pursuant to the enactment of section 451 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (prior to the enactment of the amendment made by subsection (a)) shall not be construed to have created any obligation under any other provision of Federal law for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Resolution Trust Corporation that did not otherwise exist prior to the date of enactment of section 451 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991.

(c) RULEMAKING.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation shall promulgate appropriate regulations to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a). For purposes of section 451(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (as amended by subsection (a)), such regulations shall be substantially similar to section 602(2)(C) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(d) TRANSITION RULE.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Resolution Trust Corporation may provide continuation coverage under section 451 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991, as amended by subsection (a), in lieu of any continuation coverage required to be provided under section 451 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 as that section was originally enacted.

(e) AUTHORITY.—Continuation coverage shall only be made available from the Resolution Trust Corporation in accordance with the amendment made by subsection (a) to the extent or in such amounts as provided in appropriations Acts.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall become effective with respect to any failed depository institution for which the Resolution Trust Corporation (if the requirement of subsection (e) is first met) or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is appointed as conservator or receiver on or after the date of enactment of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991.

SEC. 304. JUDGMENT COLLECTION INFORMATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that the greatest practicable amount of money due to the United States and the Resolution Trust Corporation (hereafter referred to as the "Corporation") as a result of fines imposed and restitution ordered in connection with criminal proceedings involving insured savings associations and institution-affiliated parties is actually received by the United States.

(b) INFORMATION COLLECTION REQUIRED.—The Attorney General of the United States

(hereafter referred to as the "Attorney General") shall collect and maintain information on—

(1) fines imposed for the conviction of any insured savings association or any institution-affiliated party of an insured savings association for any offense involving fraud or other criminal activity related to the failure of an insured savings association;

(2) orders to make restitution to the Corporation which have been issued in connection with any conviction referred to in paragraph (1); and

(3) the extent to which fines referred to in paragraph (1) have been collected by the United States and restitution referred to in paragraph (2) has been received by the Corporation.

(c) COOPERATION OF OTHER AGENCIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision, the Chairperson of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Chairman of the Securities Exchange Commission, and the chief executive officer of the Corporation shall cooperate with the Attorney General to develop accurate and efficient means for providing the information described in subsection (a) to the Attorney General.

(d) SUMMARIES OF INFORMATION COLLECTED.—

(1) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The Attorney General shall transmit summaries of the information collected pursuant to this section, prepared in accordance with paragraph (2), to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF MONEY JUDGMENTS.—With respect to every civil or criminal proceeding initiated by an instrumentality of the United States that has resulted in an order, agreement, or award requiring the defendant in the proceeding to pay money to the United States Government, each summary transmitted under this subsection shall—

(A) identify the proceeding by name, jurisdiction, docket number, defendant, and the savings association in connection with which the events giving rise to the proceeding occurred;

(B) describe the result of the proceeding and state the amount of money required to be paid by the defendant;

(C) state the amount of money actually received from the defendant by any instrumentality of the United States as a result of the proceeding; and

(D) include such other information as the Attorney General may deem appropriate.

(3) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—In addition to the information required by paragraph (2), each summary transmitted under this section shall include a summary of the total number and aggregate amount of fines and restitutions that are—

(A) at least 30 (but not more than 90) days past due;

(B) at least 90 (but not more than 180) days past due;

(C) at least 180 (but not more than 365) days past due; and

(D) 365 days or more past due.

(4) SIGNATURES REQUIRED.—Each summary transmitted pursuant to this section shall be signed by the Attorney General and the head of each instrumentality of the United States providing information to the Attorney General for inclusion in the summary.

(5) DATES OF SUBMISSION.—The Attorney General shall transmit such summaries an-

nually, not later than April 1 of each calendar year. The summary submitted in calendar year 1993, shall cover the period from August 9, 1989, to the date of enactment of this Act. Summaries submitted in subsequent years shall cover the calendar year preceding the year in which the summary is submitted.

(6) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term "instrumentality of the United States" includes any department or agency of the United States and any trust, receivership, or conservatorship established by a department or agency of the United States.

(e) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN AGENCY REPORTS.—Section 918(a) of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 1833(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) through (6) as paragraphs (4) through (7), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) The number of individuals and institutions against whom civil judgments for damages or restitution were awarded in proceedings initiated by such agency during such 12-month period, or who, during the same period, formally agreed to pay money to the United States to fully or partially conclude or avoid such proceedings, the amount of each such judgment or agreement to pay, the total amount of all such judgments and agreements to pay, and data on uncollected judgments and agreements to pay for such period and prior years."; and

(3) in paragraph (6), as redesignated, by inserting before the period "including the amount of money actually received by the United States as a result of such prosecutions and civil actions".

SEC. 305. TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE OFFICE OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.

Section 21A(b)(1) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(D) TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE OFFICE OF C.E.O.—

"(i) DESIGNATION OF ACTING C.E.O.—The chief executive officer of the Corporation shall designate 1 officer of the Corporation to act as the chief executive officer in the event of a temporary vacancy in such office.

"(ii) TEMPORARY VACANCIES.—In the event that the chief executive officer of the Corporation is separated from service or is unable to carry out the duties of that office due to death, illness, incapacity, or other similar circumstances, the officer designated to serve as acting chief executive officer under clause (i) shall perform the duties of the chief executive officer.

"(iii) PRESIDENTIAL DESIGNATION.—Notwithstanding clauses (i) and (ii), the President may designate any officer of the Government appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to perform the duties of the chief executive officer of the Corporation in the event of a temporary vacancy in that office due to circumstances described in clause (ii).

"(iv) DURATION.—An acting chief executive officer designated under this subparagraph shall perform the duties of that office for a reasonable period of time, until a successor has been appointed or until the circumstances resulting in the temporary vacancy in the office have been rectified."

SEC. 306. MODIFYING SEPARATE CAPITALIZATION RULE FOR SAVINGS ASSOCIATIONS' SUBSIDIARIES ENGAGED IN ACTIVITIES NOT PERMISSIBLE FOR NATIONAL BANKS.

Section 5(t)(5)(D) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(t)(5)(D)) is amended—

(1) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

"(i) INCLUSION IN CAPITAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if a savings association's subsidiary was, as of April 12, 1989, engaged in activities not permissible for a national bank, the savings association may include in calculating capital either—

"(I) the applicable percentage, set forth in clause (ii), of the eligible amount of the savings association's investments in and extensions of credit to the subsidiary; or

"(II) with the approval of the Director under clause (iii), such percentage of the eligible amount as the Director may permit under that clause, but not exceeding the limit in clause (iv).";

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) by striking "June 30, 1992" and inserting "September 30, 1992"; and

(B) by striking "July 1, 1992" and inserting "October 1, 1992";

(3) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (vii); and

(4) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clauses:

"(iii) DIRECTOR'S DISCRETION.—The Director may permit the savings association to include in calculating capital a percentage of the eligible amount of the savings association's investments in and extensions of credit to the subsidiary, not exceeding the limit in clause (iv), if—

"(I) either—

"(aa) the savings association is adequately capitalized, as defined in section 38 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; or

"(bb) the savings association is in compliance with an approved capital restoration plan meeting the requirements of section 38 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and is not critically undercapitalized as defined in that section;

"(II) the savings association's current composite MACRO rating is 1, 2, or 3;

"(III) the savings association is an eligible savings association as defined in paragraph (3)(B);

"(IV) subparagraph (A) applies with respect to the subsidiary only because of the subsidiary's real estate investments or other real estate activities; and

"(V) the Director determines that the inclusion would not increase the risk to the affected deposit insurance fund.

"(iv) LIMIT.—The percentage allowed by the Director under clause (iii) shall not exceed the following limits:

For the following period:	The limit is:
Prior to July 1, 1994	75 percent
July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1995	60 percent
July 1, 1995 through June 30, 1996	40 percent
Thereafter	0 percent

"(v) COMMUNITY CREDIT NEEDS.—In applying clause (iii), the Director shall consider the savings association's record of meeting community credit needs.

"(vi) ELIGIBLE AMOUNT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the 'eligible amount' of a savings association's investments in and extensions of credit to a subsidiary is the sum of—

"(I) the savings association's investments in and extensions of credit that were made to the subsidiary on or before April 12, 1989; and

"(II) the savings association's investments in and extensions of credit to the subsidiary expended after April 12, 1989, that were necessary to complete projects initiated before April 12, 1989."

SEC. 307. EXTENSION OF CIVIL STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

(a) RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION.—Section 11(d)(14) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1821(d)(14)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting "except as provided in subparagraph (B)," before "in the case of";

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

"(B) TORT ACTIONS BROUGHT BY THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION.—The applicable statute of limitations with regard to any action in tort brought by the Resolution Trust Corporation in its capacity as conservator or receiver of a failed savings association shall be the longer of—

"(i) the 5-year period beginning on the date the claim accrues; or

"(ii) the period applicable under State law."; and

(4) in subparagraph (C), as redesignated—

(A) by striking "subparagraph (A)" and inserting "subparagraphs (A) and (B)"; and

(B) by striking "such subparagraph" and inserting "such subparagraphs".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; TERMINATION; FDIC AS SUCCESSOR.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be construed to have the same effective date as section 212 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989.

(2) TERMINATION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall remain in effect only until the termination of the Resolution Trust Corporation.

(3) FDIC AS SUCCESSOR TO THE RTC.—The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, as successor to the Resolution Trust Corporation, shall have the right to pursue any tort action that was properly brought by the Resolution Trust Corporation prior to the termination of the Resolution Trust Corporation.

SEC. 308. DIRECTORS NOT LIABLE FOR ACQUISITION IN CONSERVATORSHIP, RECEIVERSHIP, OR SUPERVISORY ACQUISITION OR COMBINATION.

(a) LIABILITY.—During the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on December 19, 1992, the members of the board of directors of an insured depository institution shall not be liable to the institution's shareholders or creditors for acquiescing in or consenting in good faith to—

(1) the appointment of the Resolution Trust Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as conservator or receiver for that institution; or

(2) the acquisition of the institution by a depository institution holding company, or the combination of the institution with another insured depository institution if the appropriate Federal banking agency has—

(A) requested the institution, in writing, to be acquired or to combine; and

(B) notified the institution that 1 or more grounds exist for appointing a conservator or receiver for the institution.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms "appropriate Federal banking agency", "depository institution holding company", and "insured depository institu-

tion" have the same meanings as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

SEC. 309. REAL ESTATE APPRAISAL AMENDMENT.

Section 1112 of the Financial Institution Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (12 U.S.C. 3341) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "Each Federal"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) **THRESHOLD LEVEL.**—Notwithstanding sections 1113 and 1114, each Federal financial institutions regulatory agency and the Resolution Trust Corporation may establish a level below which a certified or licensed appraiser is not required to perform appraisals in connection with federally related transactions, if such agency determines that such level is in the public interest."

SEC. 310. SET-ASIDE OF FUNDS FOR ASSISTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Before transferring an insured depository institution to the Resolution Trust Corporation, the Director of the Office of Thrift Supervision shall consider whether providing assistance to the institution under section 13(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)) or under section 13(k)(5) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(k)(5)) would be a more cost-effective manner of resolving the institution than transferring the institution to the Resolution Trust Corporation.

(b) **SET ASIDE TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.**—Of the total amount appropriated by this Act, \$1,850,000,000 shall be set aside to provide assistance under sections 13(c) and 13(k)(5) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to carry out the purposes of this section with respect to insured savings associations.

SEC. 311. ADDITION OF FLORIDA TO LIST OF DISTRESSED AREAS.

Section 21A(b)(11)(E)(iii) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a(b)(11)(E)(iii)) is amended by inserting "Florida," immediately after "Colorado,".

SEC. 312. GUARANTEE OF LOANS TO PURCHASE RTC PROPERTY.

Section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1441a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(w) **LOAN GUARANTEES TO PURCHASE RTC PROPERTY.**—

"(1) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of this subsection are—

"(A) to help sell property held by the Resolution Trust Corporation at prices that prevail for similar property in local markets;

"(B) to help relieve the depressive effect of sales of property held by the Resolution Trust Corporation on prices of real estate in such markets;

"(C) to make financing for the sale of property held by the Resolution Trust Corporation more available to buyers;

"(D) to decrease the cost to the taxpayer of maintaining Resolution Trust Corporation properties; and

"(E) to provide an avenue for safe investment of surplus bank capital.

"(2) **DEFINITION OF 'QUALIFIED LENDER.'**—As used in this subsection, the term "qualified lender" means—

"(A) a bank or savings association the deposits or accounts of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; or

"(B) any person engaged in the business of making commercial loans.

"(3) **GUARANTEE AUTHORITY.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to any other authority provided by law, the Corporation is authorized to guarantee, and make commitments to guarantee, the timely payment

of principal and interest on loans made by qualified lenders to finance the purchase of commercial and residential property held by the Corporation.

"(B) **AMOUNT OF GUARANTEE.**—The aggregate obligation of the Corporation or the United States under any guarantee under this subsection may not exceed 85 percent of the outstanding undivided principal amount of the loan.

"(4) **ELIGIBILITY.**—A loan may be guaranteed under paragraph (3) only if—

"(A) the chief executive officer of the Corporation determines—

"(i) that there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(ii) that the qualified lender is responsible; and

"(iii) that adequate provision is made for servicing the loan on reasonable terms;

"(B) the amount of the loan does not exceed 85 percent of the fair market value of the property at the time of the application for the guarantee;

"(C) the borrower has made a down payment, in cash or its equivalent, of not less than 15 percent of the fair market value of the property;

"(D) the qualified lender has entered into agreement to assume the initial 15 percent of any loss incurred in connection with the loan; and

"(E) the chief executive officer of the Corporation—

"(i) establishes criteria to determine if the guarantee of a loan under this subsection is the most efficient way to meet the Corporation's objectives on a borrower-by-borrower basis;

"(ii) promulgates regulations that provide for the complete amortization of each guaranteed loan, not to exceed the useful life of the property purchased with the loan; and

"(iii) prescribes explicit standards to periodically assess the credit risk of new and existing guaranteed loans.

"(5) **FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.**—The full faith and credit of the United States is pledged to the payment of all amounts which may be required to be paid pursuant to a guarantee under this subsection in accordance with subsection (j)(3).

"(6) **SUBROGATION.**—The holder of a guarantee under this subsection shall notify the Corporation of any default in the payment of any loan guaranteed under this subsection. Upon receipt of such notice, the Corporation shall—

"(A) pay to such holder the amount of the guarantee not in excess of the pro rata portion of the amount originally guaranteed; and

"(B) be subrogated to the rights of the holder of the guarantee to the extent of the amount of the guarantee.

"(7) **REGULATIONS; FEES.**—

"(A) **REGULATIONS.**—Upon the appropriation provided for in paragraph (8), the Corporation shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out this subsection in compliance with applicable Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Treasury executive orders and circulars.

"(B) **FEES.**—The Corporation is authorized to prescribe and collect a fee to cover the administrative costs it incurs in providing guarantees under this subsection in compliance with appropriate Office of Management and Budget and Department of the Treasury executive orders and circulars.

"(8) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection."

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS RELATING TO STANDARDS ON RISK-BASED CAPITAL.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) there were fewer housing starts in the United States in 1991 than in any of the previous 40 years;

(2) it is in the interest of the United States that good quality, affordable housing be available to all Americans;

(3) risk-based capital standards create an incentive for banks and thrifts to make lower-risk loans;

(4) Federal regulators of depository institutions have limited the favorable treatment of housing loans to loans for single-family residences; and

(5) Federal banking regulators have not adopted an interest rate risk component to the risk-based standards and have thereby encouraged banks to purchase Government-backed securities instead of making loans.

(b) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that regulators of depository institutions should consider making changes in risk-based capital standards by accelerating their implementation of an interest rate risk component and by reviewing the standards that apply to loans for the purchase or construction of housing, especially for loans that finance low- and moderate-income housing.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING TERMINATION OF THE RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the life of the Resolution Trust Corporation shall not be extended beyond the termination date of December 31, 1996, as established under section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act; and

(2) the Resolution Trust Corporation shall not receive any additional failed savings and loans after September 30, 1993, in accordance with the Resolution Trust Corporation Refinancing, Restructuring, and Improvement Act of 1991.

TITLE IV—BANK AND THRIFT DISCLOSURE ACT

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Bank and Thrift Disclosure Act of 1992".

SEC. 402. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF EXAMINATION INFORMATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Each appropriate banking agency shall make available to the public copies of reports of all examinations of each failed depository institution that received funds, as defined in section 406, or of a holding company of such institution, that was performed by that banking agency or its predecessor, during the 5-year period preceding the transfer, failure, or receipt of funds. Each appropriate banking agency other than the National Credit Union Administration Board shall consult with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Resolution Trust Corporation prior to making such reports available to the public.

(b) **DELAY OF PUBLICATION.**—

(1) **THREATS TO SAFETY OR SOUNDNESS OF INSTITUTION.**—If the appropriate banking agency makes a determination in writing that release of an examination report would seriously threaten the safety or soundness of an insured depository institution, such agency may initially delay release of the examination report for a reasonable period of time, not to exceed 12 months from the date of the transfer, failure, or receipt of funds described in section 406. Such determination may be renewed on an annual basis.

(2) **ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS.**—If the appropriate banking agency or the Resolution

Trust Corporation determines in writing that release of a portion of an examination report would hinder an ongoing investigation of alleged negligence, or of other activity that would give rise to either administrative or civil proceedings, the portion of the examination report directly pertaining to the alleged negligence or other activity, may be withheld from release during the investigation, until a notice of charges is issued, a complaint is filed, or for a period not to exceed 24 months from the date of the transfer, failure, or receipt of funds described in section 406, whichever is earlier.

(3) **DELAY PENDING CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION.**—If the appropriate banking agency and the Attorney General of the United States or the attorney general of a State, in the case of a State-chartered depository institution, jointly determine that release of a portion of an examination report would hinder an ongoing investigation of alleged criminal activity, the portion of the examination report directly pertaining to the alleged crime may be withheld from release until the termination of such investigation, the issuance of an indictment, or for a period of not to exceed 5 years from the date of the transfer, failure or receipt of funds described in section 406, whichever is earlier. The Attorney General of the United States or the Attorney General of a State shall provide the Comptroller General of the United States with access to information regarding any such criminal investigation, and shall identify any law enforcement agencies or resources assigned to the investigation.

(c) **EXCLUSION OF OPEN INSTITUTIONS.**—

(1) **OPEN INSTITUTIONS.**—This section shall not apply to any open insured depository institution and shall not be construed to require disclosure to the public of any report of examination of any open insured depository institution.

(2) **AFFILIATED SOLVENT INSTITUTIONS.**—In connection with the release of an examination report of a holding company of a failed institution, nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the release of any examination report information regarding any solvent depository institution that is also a subsidiary of such holding company.

SEC. 403. PROHIBITION OF CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, all agreements or settlements of claims between the Resolution Trust Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and any other party, where such agreement or claim relates to an institution described in section 406 shall be made available to the public.

SEC. 404. APPLICABILITY.

The requirements of section 402 shall apply—

(1) to any insured depository institution that has had its assets or liabilities, or any part thereof, transferred to the FSLIC Resolution Fund or the Resolution Trust Corporation;

(2) to any member of the Bank Insurance Fund that has failed and received funds, if during either the fiscal year in which the institution failed or the fiscal year in which the institution received funds, as defined in section 406, the Bank Insurance Fund—

(A) had outstanding loans, or had otherwise received funds, from the Department of the Treasury, the Federal Financing Bank, or any Federal Reserve bank; or

(B) had a negative fund balance;

(3) to any member of the Savings Association Insurance Fund that has failed and re-

ceived funds, if during either the fiscal year in which the institution failed or the fiscal year in which the institution received funds, as defined in section 406, the Savings Association Insurance Fund—

(A) had outstanding loans, or had otherwise received funds, from the Department of the Treasury, the Federal Financing Bank, or any Federal Reserve bank; or

(B) had a negative fund balance; and

(4) to any insured credit union that has failed and received funds, if during either the fiscal year in which the credit union failed or the fiscal year in which the credit union received funds, as defined in section 406, the National Credit Union Share Insurance Fund—

(A) had outstanding loans, or had otherwise received funds, from the Department of the Treasury, the Federal Financing Bank, or any Federal Reserve Bank; or

(B) had a negative fund balance.

SEC. 405. REMOVAL OF CUSTOMER INFORMATION FROM EXAMINATION REPORTS.

In making available reports of examinations under section 402, each appropriate Federal banking agency shall excise the following information:

(1) **NONINSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTIES.**—The names and all other identifying information for all persons who are not institution-affiliated parties of an insured depository institution.

(2) **INSTITUTION-AFFILIATED PARTIES.**—The names and any information related to an institution-affiliated party that is not relevant to the relationship between the insured depository institution and the institution-affiliated party.

(3) **OPEN INSTITUTIONS.**—The names and all other identifying information pertaining to open insured depository institutions.

(4) **EXAMINERS.**—Any reference to the examiners and other banking agency employees involved in the examination of the insured depository institution.

(5) **WHISTLEBLOWERS.**—All references to persons or entities that have provided information in confidence to a banking agency which may be utilized to pursue a civil or criminal action.

SEC. 406. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this section—

(1) an insured depository institution has "failed" if the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Resolution Trust Corporation, or National Credit Union Administration Board—

(A) has been appointed as receiver or liquidator for such institution; or

(B) has exercised the power to provide assistance under section 13(c)(2) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act or the analogous powers under section 21A of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act.

(2) an insured depository institution has "received funds" if the institution, its holding company, or an acquiring institution receives cash or other valuable consideration from the National Credit Union Administration Board, the Resolution Trust Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or any Federal Reserve bank that lends for more than 30 days while the insured depository institution is critically undercapitalized within the 1-year period prior to the failure of the insured depository institution whether in the form of a loan, a payment to depositors or other creditors, the assumption of liabilities, or otherwise;

(3) the term "insured depository institution" has the same meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, except that such term includes an insured credit

union, as defined in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act; and

(4) the term "appropriate banking agency" means the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Office of Thrift Supervision, or the National Credit Union Administration Board, and, in the case of a State-chartered depository institution, the appropriate State depository institution regulatory agency.

SEC. 407. ADDITIONAL DISCLOSURES BY FDIC, NCUA, AND RTC.

(a) **BORROWERS.**—Not later than 6 months after being appointed receiver or liquidator for any failed institution that received funds, as defined in section 406, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, or the Resolution Trust Corporation, as appropriate, shall make available to the public the name and loan balance of any borrower who—

(1) was an executive officer, director, or principal shareholder of the institution, or a related interest of any such person, as such terms are defined in section 22(h) of the Federal Reserve Act; and

(2) at the time that the receiver was appointed, was more than 90 days delinquent on a loan.

(b) **TRANSACTIONS.**—Not later than 12 months after being appointed receiver or liquidator for any failed institution that received funds, as defined in section 406, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration Board, or the Resolution Trust Corporation shall make available, and update periodically thereafter, a list of pending and settled lawsuits brought by such agency involving transactions (other than those listed in subsection (a)) that caused a material loss to such institution or to the deposit insurance fund.

SEC. 408. GAO AUDITS.

The Comptroller General shall selectively audit examination reports made available to the public by the appropriate Federal banking agencies under section 402, and disclosures made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Credit Union Administration, and Resolution Trust Corporation under section 407, to assess compliance with the requirements of those sections. The Comptroller General shall determine the nature, scope, terms, and conditions of audits conducted under this section.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2402. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in a special message transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 10, 1992, in accordance with Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2403. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the

President on March 20, 1992, in accordance with Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2404. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 10, 1992, and on March 20, 1992, in accordance with Title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN:

S. 2405. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on ciprofloxacin hydrochloride, ciprofloxacin, and nimodipine; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2406. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on nimodipine granulated blend and tablets, and acarbose; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SEYMOUR:

S. 2407. A bill to amend the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 to establish a program for radio broadcasting to the peoples of Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DECONCINI:

S. 2408. A bill to limit plea agreements and cooperative agreements that promise reduced sentences or other benefits in exchange for cooperation by drug kingpins and others charged with extremely serious offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. KASTEN):

S. 2409. A bill to amend the provisions of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 with respect to the enforcement of machine tool import arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARN:

S. 2410. A bill to authorize and request the President to advance Major Ronald Tiffany on the retired list of the United States Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MACK):

S. 2411. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 2412. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2413. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Con-

gress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2414. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2415. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2416. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2417. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2418. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2419. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2420. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2421. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11,

1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2422. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2423. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2424. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2425. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2426. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2427. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2428. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

S. 2429. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

tions, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, with instructions that the Budget Committee be authorized to report its views to the Appropriations Committee, and that the latter alone be authorized to report the bill.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. REID):

S. 2481. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize appropriations for Indian health programs, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

S. 2482. A bill to provide funding for the Resolution Trust Corporation, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2483. A bill to provide assistance to Department of Energy management and operating contract employees at defense nuclear facilities who are significantly and adversely affected as a result of a significant reduction or modification in Department programs and to provide assistance to communities significantly affected by those reductions or modifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S.J. Res. 279. A joint resolution designating April 14, 1992, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DODD, Mr. EXON, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. PELL, Mr. REID, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. WARNER):

S.J. Res. 280. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April, 1992, as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. STEVENS):

S. Con. Res. 102. A concurrent resolution to provide for a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies; considered and agreed to.

S. Con. Res. 103. A concurrent resolution authorizing the rotunda of the United States Capitol to be used on January 20, 1993, in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2402. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in a special message transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 10, 1992, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 as amended; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified on April 11, 1975; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on the Budget.

S. 2403. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 20, 1992, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 as amended; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified on April 11, 1986; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on the Budget.

S. 2404. A bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 10, 1992, and on March 20, 1992, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 as amended; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified on April 11, 1986; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on the Budget.

RESCISSION OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last Friday, the President announced that he was sending to Congress a series of additional measures to cut Federal spending. The President stated that the line-item rescissions identified so far in his package totaled about \$4 billion in unnecessary spending.

We received this package of rescissions on March 20. There are 68 rescissions in this package totaling \$3,588,973,100 in budget authority. Of that amount, \$2.8 billion is a rescission of funding for the Seawolf submarine. Another \$189 million is for what is called other Navy procurement. The remaining 66 items are domestic discretionary rescissions totaling \$633,673,100, and of that amount a \$547.7 million rescission is requested from the appropriations for new construction of public housing. The remaining 65 items total \$86,014,000.

Mr. President, the press has treated these rescissions as something new, something that has been little used. The fact is, Mr. President, rescission authority has been in place since the enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

In fact, on March 10 of this year, Congress received a package of rescissions totaling \$2,073,855,000 from the President. Most of these items were for rescissions of defense funding; however,

there were five rescissions of domestic discretionary funds totaling \$87,185,000.

Despite statements to the contrary, in the press and here on the floor and elsewhere, rescission requests by Presidents since 1974 have been given careful scrutiny by Congress, and a substantial number of those Presidential rescission requests have been enacted. That is nothing new. We have had Presidential rescission requests before, in almost every year, including and since 1974.

In addition, during the period from 1974 to March 20, 1992, Congress has, on its own, initiated and enacted a large number of rescissions that were not requested by Presidents.

Now, this will come as news to a good many in the fourth estate and may come as news to a good many Members in this body. We have had these rescission requests from Presidents all the way from, and including, 1974, as I said.

I have here a table of all rescissions requested by Presidents from 1974 to March 20, 1992, as well as those initiated by Congress. When I complete my remarks, I shall ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD this table.

This table shows that over this period, 1974 to March 20, 1992, Presidents have requested 947 rescissions totaling \$63,482,829,000. And of that total, Congress enacted 324 rescissions requested by Presidents totaling \$19,557,337,366.

And in addition, and this is often overlooked—and I am sure my good friend from the State of New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, is well aware of this, he having been the chairman of the Budget Committee in the Senate in the past, and being the ranking member still, being also a very influential member on the Senate Committee on Appropriations—over the same period of time, 1974 to March 20, 1992, Congress initiated and enacted 351 additional rescissions totaling \$36,210,728,246.

Now, where has the press been? Where have our other Members been who are obviously not aware that we have been receiving and disposing of Presidential rescissions, and making rescissions of our own in addition thereto, for a good many years?

Therefore, if we combine rescissions enacted by Congress which were requested by Presidents, \$19,557,337,366, and rescissions enacted and initiated by Congress, \$36,210,728,246, we get a total of \$55,768,065,612 in rescissions over the period 1974 to March 20, 1992.

So, Mr. President, contrary to the conventional wisdom which is so often wrong in this city, Congress has a good record on rescissions. And, Mr. President, we will take the latest Presidential rescission requests very seriously.

Today, I am introducing rescission bills that include all of the President's March 10 and March 20 rescissions. These bills will be referred to the Appropriations Committee, to the Budget

Committee, and to authorizing committees when and if contract and borrowing authority is involved.

The Appropriations Committee, which I chair, will carefully examine each of these items and, where appropriate, we will agree with the President.

In addition, as has been the case in other years, the Appropriations Committee will likely make its own recommendations as to other rescissions which have not been requested by the President.

I am sure that there are items in the executive branch budget which are unnecessary and wasteful. Frankly, the word "pork" gets bandied around far too much in this town. It is a buzzword used normally to tar the Congress by

the columnists, the editors, the commentators, the media—bandied around a great deal, in almost all cases when it is used to tar the Congress. It is a label that is pinned on almost all congressional projects. If it is a project that is added by Congress, it is called "pork." If it is a project that is added by the House, it is "pork." If it is added by the Senate, it is "pork." There is plenty of "pork", however, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Let me assure you, Mr. President, let me assure my colleagues, that each appropriations subcommittee will take these Presidential requests very seriously. There are some items among the President's rescission requests that undoubtedly can be justified and that ought to be agreed to.

The appropriations subcommittees will scrutinize all 1992 appropriations for all departments and agencies of the Government. Then the full committee will markup a rescissions bill or bills that will incorporate not only those rescissions requested by the President—certainly we will include some of them—and on which the committee can agree, but as I have said the committee will also include its own rescission amendments as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the table to which I earlier referred—a table that was provided by the General Accounting Office—at this point in the RECORD.

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

Fiscal year:	Number of rescissions proposed by President	Total amount proposed by President for rescission	Number of proposals accepted by Congress	Total amount of proposals enacted by Congress	Number of rescissions initiated by Congress	Total amount of rescissions initiated by Congress
1992	31	2,090,555,000	0	0	25	1,382,377,000
1991	30	4,859,251,000	0	0	22	1,332,955,000
1990	11	554,258,000	78	513,302,000	68	2,322,145,000
1989	6	143,100,000	1	2,053,000	9	212,313,000
1988	0	0	0	0	61	3,860,653,067
1987	73	5,835,800,000	2	36,000,000	50	5,699,509,675
1986	83	10,126,900,000	4	143,210,000	5	6,668,450,000
1985	244	1,854,800,000	98	173,699,000	11	5,451,074,000
1984	9	636,400,000	3	55,375,000	8	2,181,515,000
1983	21	1,569,000,000	0	0	10	280,605,100
1982	32	7,907,400,000	5	4,365,486,000	3	16,927,000
1981	166	15,361,900,000	101	10,899,935,550	43	3,678,590,600
1980	59	1,618,100,000	34	777,696,446	30	3,003,950,100
1979	11	908,700,000	9	723,609,000	1	47,500,000
1978	12	1,290,100,000	3	55,255,000	2	61,964,000
1977	20	1,926,950,000	11	1,277,090,000	2	5,200,000
1976	50	3,582,000,000	7	148,331,000	0	0
1975	87	2,722,000,000	38	386,295,370	1	4,999,704
1974	2	495,635,000	0	0	0	0
Grand total 1974-1992	947	63,482,829,000	324	19,557,337,366	351	36,210,728,246

¹ As of Mar. 20, 1992.
² The Military Construction Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1991, approved most of the rescissions proposed by the President 41 days after the funds were released for obligation under the Impoundment Control Act. The following individual projects were not approved for rescission: Central District Center, Phase III, Red River, Texas \$39,000,000 in proposed rescission R90-4; Addition to flight simulator, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona \$1,900,000 in proposed rescission R90-5; Installation of Fireplaces in SOQ, WPAFB, Ohio \$56,000 in proposed rescission R90-10.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I introduce and send to the desk three bills to which I have already alluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2402

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following rescissions of budget authority are made, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-140, R92-2, \$21,425,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-3,

\$92,850,000 are rescinded; of which \$4,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Airborne and Special Operations Museum Foundation; \$4,000,000 was made available for the National D-Day Museum Foundation; \$2,000,000 was made available for the procurement of intermediate cold-wet weather boots; \$22,000,000 was made available for the grant to the Silver Valley Unified School District, Yermo, California; \$10,000,000 was made available for the grant to the Cumberland County School Board, Fayetteville, North Carolina; \$6,800,000 was made available for the refurbishment and modernization at existing railyard facilities at Fort Riley, Kansas; and \$250,000 was made available for the conduct of a study on the need for and feasibility of a joint military and civilian airport at Manhattan, Kansas.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-4, \$104,650,000 are rescinded; of which \$1,600,000 was made available for the Museum of Science and Industry; and \$78,000,000 was made available for shipyard modernization projects. The following proviso under this heading in Public Law 102-172 is repealed: "That funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be obligated and expended to restore and maintain the facilities, activities and personnel levels, including specifically the medical facilities, activities and personnel levels, at the Memphis Naval Com-

plex, Millington, Tennessee, to the fiscal year 1984 levels."

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-5, \$22,000,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-6, \$4,500,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES (RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-7, \$20,200,000 are rescinded; of which \$15,000,000 was made available for the continued implementation of the Legacy Resource Management Program and only for use in implementing cooperative agreements to identify, document, and maintain biological diversity on military installations; \$600,000 was made available for two Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Treatment Centers, one to be located in the State of Hawaii, and one to be located in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, for the purpose of treating military personnel, dependents, and other personnel in post-traumatic stress disorders; and \$750,000 was the amount made available for the conduct and preparation of an inventory of all the real property in the State of Hawaii that is owned or controlled

by the United States Department of Defense and its components.

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED
COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-9, \$110,000,000 are rescinded.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-10, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-11, \$262,000,000 are rescinded.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in subdivision "Other Missile Programs" in Public Law 102-172, R92-12, \$13,200,000 are rescinded.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in subdivision "LCAC landing craft air cushion program" in Public Law 102-172, R92-13, \$238,100,000 are rescinded.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-14, \$41,300,000 are rescinded.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-15, \$40,200,000 are rescinded.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-16, \$154,800,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-18, \$102,200,000 are rescinded; of which not less than \$6,300,000 was made available for the Vectored Thrust Combat Agility Demonstrator flight test program and not less than \$10,000,000 was made available as a grant to the Louisiana State University for the Neuroscience Center of Excellence.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-19, \$140,600,000 are rescinded, of which \$10,000,000 was made available for the Submarine Laser Communications project.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-20, \$127,100,000 are rescinded, of which \$10,000,000 was made available as a grant to Marywood College, Pennsylvania, for laboratory and

other efforts associated with research, development and other programs of major importance to the Department of Defense; \$10,000,000 was made available for the modernization and upgrade of the Poker Flat Rocket Range and \$19,500,000 was made available to establish an image information processing center, co-located with the Air Force Maui Optical Station and the Maui Optical Tracking Facility; and \$30,000,000 was made available for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-21, \$375,900,000 are rescinded; of which \$6,000,000 was made available for a grant to the University of Texas at Austin; \$6,000,000 was made available for a grant to the North-eastern University; \$5,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies; \$7,700,000 was made available as a grant to the Kansas State University; \$1,600,000 was made available for a grant to the University of Wisconsin; \$29,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Boston University; \$250,000 was made available for a grant to the Medical College of Ohio; \$500,000 was made available for a grant to the University of South Carolina; \$750,000 was made available for a grant to the George Mason University; \$2,300,000 was made available as a grant to the Monmouth College; \$10,000,000 was made available as a grant to the University of Minnesota; \$500,000 was made available as a grant to the University of Saint Thomas in Saint Paul, Minnesota; \$2,000,000 was made available as a grant to the Brandeis University; \$3,000,000 was made available as a grant to the New Mexico State University; not less than \$10,000,000 of the funds was made available for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (ESPCOR); and \$12,500,000 was made available for the development of superconducting multi-chip modules: *Provided*, That section 8125 of Public Law 102-172 is repealed: *Provided further*, That section 253, the amendments made by section 825 to 10 U.S.C. 2196 and 2197, and section 827 of Public Law 102-190 are repealed.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-22, \$9,050,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-23, \$17,400,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-24, \$6,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-25, \$48,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL
GUARD
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-26, \$16,565,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL
GUARD

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-27, \$306,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-28, \$2,749,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-29, \$36,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-170, R92-30, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

HOUSING PROGRAMS

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-31, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-32, \$5,880,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

LOCAL RAIL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-143, R92-33, \$9,880,000 are rescinded.

S. 2403

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following rescissions of budget authority are made, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION

SERVICE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-35, \$100,000 is rescinded.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-36, \$250,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-37, \$500,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-38, \$500,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-39, \$2,710,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-40, \$375,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-41, \$3,050,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-42, \$225,000 is rescinded.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-43, \$225,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-44, \$750,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-45, \$94,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-46, \$39,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-47, \$387,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-48, \$85,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-49, \$49,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-50, \$125,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-51, \$185,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-52, \$120,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-53, \$134,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-54, \$100,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-55, \$46,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-56, \$200,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-57, \$250,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-58, \$50,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-59, \$187,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-60, \$140,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-61, \$76,000 is rescinded.

EXTENSION SERVICE
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-62, \$647,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-63, \$150,000 is rescinded.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE LIBRARY
BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-64, \$500,000 is rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED
HOUSING
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-65, \$547,659,100 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the second proviso, the amount \$573,883,000 for the development or acquisition cost of public housing shall be reduced by \$547,659,100.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-66, \$1,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the Alliance of Residence Theatres of New York, New York, for acquisition and renovation of theater space.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-67, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the Atlantic Economic Development Corp. for the Sweet Auburn Curb Market project.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-68, \$2,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$2,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for economic development in the downtown areas of Davenport, Iowa.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-69, \$150,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$150,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for a new government center in Warren, Rhode Island.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-70, \$100,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$100,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for improvements to the West Side Community Center in Asbury Park, New Jersey.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-71, \$1,200,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,200,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for infrastructure development of Hawaiian home lands.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-72, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for infrastructure improvements for the Town of Clinton, Tennessee.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-73, \$1,300,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,300,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for job retention of agricultural workers at two

sugarcane mills on Hawaii's Hilo-Hamakua coast.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-74, \$3,900,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$3,900,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for land acquisition, construction, public improvements, and other purposes in Bay City, Michigan.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-75, \$2,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$2,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the North Miami Center for Contemporary Art, Florida.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-76, \$1,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for a municipal center in Bloomfield, New Mexico.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-77, \$500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the North Dakota Business Marketing Alliance for a revolving fund for rural, home-based micro businesses.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-78, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the Oxbow Corporation for construction of the Oxbow project in Castlewood and Saint Paul, Virginia.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-79, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for a parking garage in Ashland, Kentucky.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-80, \$505,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$505,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the North Miami Beach, Florida, Performing Arts Cultural Center.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-81, \$65,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$65,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for improvement of recreational facilities in Biscayne Park, Florida.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-82, \$101,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$101,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to improve recreational facilities in the Borough of Myersdale, Pennsylvania.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-83, \$1,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to improve the community recreational facilities in three communities, Portage Borough, Portage Township, and the City of Greensburg, Pennsylvania.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-84, \$700,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$700,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to refurbish the Cresson Street tressel in Manayunk, Pennsylvania.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-85, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to rehabilitate the Pease Auditorium, a historic building in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-86, \$800,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$800,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the development of a waste supply system for the City of Crawford, Nebraska.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-87, \$400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That none of these funds are available for the State of Hawaii Real Estate Commission for a nationwide study to be conducted by the Hawaii Real Estate Research and Educational Center to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of reforming the Internal Code to qualify residential ground lease financing for deductions or tax credits.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-88, \$8,593,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-89, \$7,700,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-90, \$1,975,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title I of Public Law 102-104, R92-91, \$3,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the language of title I of Public Law 102-104 directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to undertake

in fiscal year 1992, the Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, \$3,000,000 is repealed.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title I of Public Law 102-104, R92-92, \$1,350,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the language of title I of Public Law 102-104 directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with \$1,500,000 to alleviate bank erosion and related problems associated with reservoir releases along the Missouri River below Fort Peck Dam is repealed.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-93, \$1,250,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-94, \$390,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-95, \$70,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-96, \$1,450,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-97, \$20,000,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-98, \$116,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-99, \$3,400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That all of the funds made available for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Networks (CIRESIN) are rescinded.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-100, \$750,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY
PROCUREMENT

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds provided under this heading in the subdivision "SSN-21 attack submarine program" in Public Law 101-511, \$1,075,700,000 are rescinded; and of the funds provided under this heading in the subdivision "SSN-21 attack submarine program" in Public Law 102-172, \$1,690,200,000 are rescinded.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds provided under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-102, \$189,400,000 are rescinded.

S. 2404

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following rescissions of budget authority are made, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES,
PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-140, R92-2, \$21,425,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-3, \$92,850,000 are rescinded; of which \$4,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Airborne and Special Operations Museum Foundation; \$4,000,000 was made available for the National D-Day Museum Foundation; \$2,000,000 was made available for the procurement of intermediate cold-wet weather boots; \$22,000,000 was made available for the grant to the Silver Valley Unified School District, Yermo, California; \$10,000,000 was made available for the grant to the Cumberland County School Board, Fayetteville, North Carolina; \$6,800,000 was made available for the refurbishment and modernization at existing railyard facilities at Fort Riley, Kansas; and \$250,000 was made available for the conduct of a study on the need for and feasibility of a joint military and civilian airport at Manhattan, Kansas.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-4, \$104,650,000 are rescinded; of which \$1,600,000 was made available for the Museum of Science and Industry; and \$78,000,000 was made available for shipyard modernization projects. The following proviso under this heading in Public Law 102-172 is repealed: "That funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be obligated and expended to restore and maintain the facilities, activities and personnel levels, including specifically the medical facilities, activities and personnel levels, at the Memphis Naval Complex, Millington, Tennessee, to the fiscal year 1984 levels."

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-5, \$22,000,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-6, \$4,500,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE
AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-7, \$20,200,000 are rescinded; of which \$15,000,000 was made available for the continued implementation of the Legacy Resource Management Program and only for use in implementing cooperative agreements to identify, document, and maintain biological diversity on military installations; \$600,000 was made available for two Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Treatment Centers, one to be located in the State of Hawaii, and one to be located in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, for the purpose of treating military personnel, dependents,

and other personnel in post-traumatic stress disorders; and \$750,000 was the amount made available for the conduct and preparation of an inventory of all the real property in the State of Hawaii that is owned or controlled by the United States Department of Defense and its components.

**PROCUREMENT
PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED
COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-9, \$110,000,000 are rescinded.

**PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-10, \$1,000,000 are rescinded.

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-11, \$262,000,000 are rescinded.

**WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in subdivision "Other Missile Programs" in Public Law 102-172, R92-12, \$13,200,000 are rescinded.

**SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in subdivision "LCAC landing craft air cushion program" in Public Law 102-172, R92-13, \$238,100,000 are rescinded.

**OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-14, \$41,300,000 are rescinded.

**PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-15, \$40,200,000 are rescinded.

**PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-16, \$154,800,000 are rescinded.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION**

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, ARMY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-18, \$102,200,000 are rescinded; of which not less than \$6,300,000 was made available for the Vectored Thrust Combat Agility Demonstrator flight test program and not less than \$10,000,000 was made available as a grant to the Louisiana State University for the Neuroscience Center of Excellence.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-19, \$140,600,000 are rescinded, of which \$10,000,000 was made available for the Submarine Laser Communications project.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-20,

\$127,100,000 are rescinded, of which \$10,000,000 was made available as a grant to Marywood College, Pennsylvania, for laboratory and other efforts associated with research, development and other programs of major importance to the Department of Defense; \$10,000,000 was made available for the modernization and upgrade of the Poker Flat Rocket Range and \$19,500,000 was made available to establish an image information processing center, co-located with the Air Force Maui Optical Station and the Maui Optical Tracking Facility; and \$30,000,000 was made available for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND
EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-21, \$375,900,000 are rescinded; of which \$6,000,000 was made available for a grant to the University of Texas at Austin; \$6,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Northeastern University; \$5,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Texas Regional Institute for Environmental Studies; \$7,700,000 was made available as a grant to the Kansas State University; \$1,600,000 was made available for a grant to the University of Wisconsin; \$29,000,000 was made available for a grant to the Boston University; \$250,000 was made available for a grant to the Medical College of Ohio; \$500,000 was made available for a grant to the University of South Carolina; \$750,000 was made available for a grant to the George Mason University; \$2,300,000 was made available as a grant to the Monmouth College; \$10,000,000 was made available as a grant to the University of Minnesota; \$500,000 was made available as a grant to the University of Saint Thomas in Saint Paul, Minnesota; \$2,000,000 was made available as a grant to the Brandeis University; \$3,000,000 was made available as a grant to the New Mexico State University; not less than \$10,000,000 of the funds was made available for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (ESPCOR); and \$12,500,000 was made available for the development of superconducting multi-chip modules: *Provided*, That section 8125 of Public Law 102-172 is repealed: *Provided further*, That section 253, the amendments made by section 825 to 10 U.S.C. 2196 and 2197, and section 827 of Public Law 102-190 are repealed.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY**

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-22, \$9,050,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-23, \$17,400,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-24, \$6,000,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE AGENCIES
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-25, \$48,000,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL
GUARD**

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-26, \$16,565,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL
GUARD**

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-27, \$306,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-28, \$2,749,000 are rescinded.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-136, R92-29, \$36,000,000 are rescinded.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN
SERVICES**

**HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION**

**HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-170, R92-30, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT**

HOUSING PROGRAMS

**FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-31, \$25,000,000 are rescinded.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-32, \$5,880,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

**LOCAL RAIL FREIGHT ASSISTANCE
(RESCISSION)**

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-143, R92-33, \$9,880,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

**ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION
SERVICE**

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-35, \$100,000 is rescinded.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-36, \$250,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-37, \$500,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-38, \$500,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-39, \$2,710,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-40, \$375,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-41, \$3,050,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-42, \$225,000 is rescinded.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-43, \$225,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-44, \$750,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-45, \$94,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-46, \$39,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-47, \$387,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-48, \$85,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-49, \$49,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-50, \$125,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-51, \$185,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-52, \$120,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-53, \$134,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-54, \$100,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-55, \$46,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-56, \$200,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-57, \$250,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-58, \$50,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-59, \$187,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-60, \$140,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-61, \$76,000 is rescinded.

EXTENSION SERVICE
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-62, \$647,000 is rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-63, \$150,000 is rescinded.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE LIBRARY
BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES
(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-142, R92-64, \$500,000 is rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR ASSISTED
HOUSING
(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-65, \$547,659,100 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the second proviso, the amount \$573,883,000 for the development or acquisition cost of public housing shall be reduced by \$547,659,100.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-66, \$1,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the Alliance of Residence Theatres of New York, New York, for acquisition and renovation of theater space.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-67, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the Atlantic Economic Development Corp. for the Sweet Auburn Curb Market project.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-68, \$2,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$2,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for economic development in the downtown areas of Davenport, Iowa.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-69, \$150,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$150,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for a new government center in Warren, Rhode Island.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-70, \$100,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$100,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for improvements to the West Side Community Center in Asbury Park, New Jersey.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-71, \$1,200,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,200,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for infrastructure development of Hawaiian home lands.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-72, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for infrastructure improvements for the Town of Clinton, Tennessee.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-73, \$1,300,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,300,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for job retention of agricultural workers at two

sugarcane mills on Hawaii's Hilo-Hamakua coast.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-74, \$3,900,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$3,900,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for land acquisition, construction, public improvements, and other purposes in Bay City, Michigan.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-75, \$2,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$2,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the North Miami Center for Contemporary Art, Florida.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-76, \$1,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for a municipal center in Bloomfield, New Mexico.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-77, \$500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the North Dakota Business Marketing Alliance for a revolving fund for rural, home-based micro businesses.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-78, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the Oxbow Corporation for construction of the Oxbow project in Castletown and Saint Paul, Virginia.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-79, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for a parking garage in Ashland, Kentucky.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-80, \$505,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$505,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the North Miami Beach, Florida, Performing Arts Cultural Center.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-81, \$65,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$65,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for improvement of recreational facilities in Biscayne Park, Florida.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-82, \$101,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$101,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to improve recreational facilities in the Borough of Myersdale, Pennsylvania.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-83, \$1,500,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,500,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to improve the community recreational facilities in three communities, Portage Borough, Portage Township, and the City of Greensburg, Pennsylvania.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-84, \$700,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$700,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to refurbish the Cresson Street tressel in Manayunk, Pennsylvania.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-85, \$1,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available to rehabilitate the Pease Auditorium, a historic building in Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-86, \$800,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That in the fourteenth proviso, the amount \$150,000,000 for special purpose grants shall be reduced by \$800,000: *Provided further*, That none of these funds for such grants are available for the development of a waste supply system for the City of Crawford, Nebraska.

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-87, \$400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That none of these funds are available for the State of Hawaii Real Estate Commission for a nationwide study to be conducted by the Hawaii Real Estate Research and Educational Center to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of reforming the Internal Code to qualify residential ground lease financing for deductions or tax credits.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-88, \$8,593,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-89, \$7,700,000 are rescinded.

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading in Public Law 102-154, R92-90, \$1,975,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title I of Public Law 102-104, R92-91, \$3,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the language of title I of Public Law 102-104 directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to undertake

in fiscal year 1992, the Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, \$3,000,000 is repealed.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in title I of Public Law 102-104, R92-92, \$1,350,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That the language of title I of Public Law 102-104 directing the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, with \$1,500,000 to alleviate bank erosion and related problems associated with reservoir releases along the Missouri River below Fort Peck Dam is repealed.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

(RESCISSIONS)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-93, \$1,250,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-94, \$390,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-95, \$70,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-96, \$1,450,000 are rescinded.

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-97, \$20,000,000 are rescinded.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-98, \$116,000 are rescinded.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-99, \$3,400,000 are rescinded: *Provided*, That all of the funds made available for the Consortium for International Earth Science Information Networks (CIESIN) are rescinded.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 102-139, R92-100, \$750,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

PROCUREMENT

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds provided under this heading in the subdivision "SSN-21 attack submarine program" in Public Law 101-511, \$1,075,700,000 are rescinded; and of the funds provided under this heading in the subdivision "SSN-21 attack submarine program" in Public Law 102-172, \$1,690,200,000 are rescinded.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds provided under this heading in Public Law 102-172, R92-102, \$189,400,000 are rescinded.

By Mr. SEYMOUR:

S. 2407. A bill to amend the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 to establish a program for radio broadcasting to the peoples of Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RADIO FREE ASIA ACT

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise this morning to introduce the Radio

Free Asia Act of 1992 to begin the process of establishing a comprehensive surrogate broadcast system for the 80 million people who still live under Communist rule in Southeast Asia.

My legislation would authorize the U.S. Board for International Broadcasting to divert \$10 million in existing funds from the Radio Free Europe and Liberty programs for the purpose of starting this critically needed service.

I am pleased to note that Congresswoman HELEN BENTLEY of Maryland has already introduced a companion bill to this effect in the House of Representatives.

Almost every hero of the struggle against imperial communism, Mr. President, has testified to the effectiveness of Radio Free Europe in moving the citizens of the Soviet block to break the chains of tyranny that had gripped their nations for more than 40 years.

The crackling airwaves of Budapest, Warsaw, and Prague carried information that demolished the economic lies of socialism and exposed its moral sins against the people of Eastern Europe.

In almost every one of these countries, Radio Free Europe flooded the airwaves as the only alternative to the government-controlled media as a source of news about developments behind the Iron Curtain.

The requirement for this type of broadcast service in Southeast Asia has never been more evident. Vietnam, for example, still has a constitution guaranteeing the permanent rule of the Communist Party. It still has slave labor or reeducation camps in each of its 40 provinces. It still has a government that preaches the eternal nature of Marxism-Leninism.

And most tragically, Mr. President, it still has a population that tries to escape from the country even at the risk of death.

Yet despite the evident need for a Radio Free Asia, the United States continues to misdirect its international broadcasting resources.

The voice of America currently broadcasts into Vietnam only 17 hours a week. But as late as 2 years ago—after the toppling of the Berlin Wall—we maintained cold war levels of broadcasting into Poland at the rate of 137 hours a week and into Hungary at the rate of 126 hours per week.

It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy has urged the State Department to reduce significantly its radio programs for Eastern Europe.

We can further understand the value of Radio Free Asia by distinguishing its purpose from the existing mission of the Voice of America. The VOA concentrates on informing the citizens of other nations about developments in the United States. Yet Radio Free Asia, like Radio Free Europe, would de-

vote itself to providing accurate news about events intrinsic to the country of the listening audience.

To their credit, VOA officials have publicly acknowledged this broadcasting shortfall and have openly lamented the lack of an extended airwave service for the people of China and Southeast Asia.

If we begin with the humble investment authorized by this bill, Mr. President, the long-term dividend paid by our cultivation of motivated and democratically active citizens throughout the tormented lands of Asia would be high. International military tensions would go down. Trade and investment opportunities for American businesses would go up. And we would have the moral satisfaction of hastening the birth of new societies characterized by freedom and prosperity.

As a result, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support the passage of the Radio Free Asia Act of 1992.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2407

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 "Radio Free Asia Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. RADIO BROADCASTING TO ASIA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2871, et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"RADIO BROADCASTING TO ASIA

"SEC. 15. Funds made available to RFE/RL, Incorporated, under this Act may be used for radio broadcasting to the peoples of Asia, particularly the people of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. Such broadcasts shall be designated "Radio Free Asia".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2(5) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2871(5)) is amended by inserting "Asia," after "Eastern Europe."

SEC. 3. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING.

(a) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—Section 3(b)(1) of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2872(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "ten" and inserting "twelve";

(2) in the second sentence, by striking "nine" and inserting "eleven"; and

(3) in the third sentence, by striking "five" and inserting "six".

(b) TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENTIALLY APPOINTED MEMBERS.—Section 3(b)(3) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2872(b)(3)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term of office of the individuals initially appointed as the two additional voting members of the Board who are provided for by the amendments made by section 3(a) of the Radio Free Asia Act of 1992 shall be two or three years (as designated by the President at the time of their appointment)."

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 8 of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (22 U.S.C. 2877) is

amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to such amounts as are authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out section 15 of this Act for fiscal year 1993."

SEC. 5. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT REGARDING GEOGRAPHIC EXPANSION OF BROADCASTS.—Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this Act, the Board for International Broadcasting shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report concerning the desirability of the geographic expansion of broadcasts funded through the Board, particularly to the peoples of Africa, the Middle East, and North Korea.

(b) REPORT REGARDING BROADCASTING TO ASIA.—(1) Not later than 180 days after the effective date of this Act, the Board for International Broadcasting shall prepare and submit to the Congress a comprehensive report concerning implementation of section 15 of the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 (relating to radio broadcasting to Asia).

(2) In preparing such report, the Board for International Broadcasting—

(A) shall consider the feasibility of constructing a Radio Free Asia transmitting facility in any State, territory, or possession of the United States, or state in free association with the United States, located in the Pacific Ocean;

(B) shall take into account the environmental impact of such potential site; and

(C) shall include a discussion of the considerations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) in such report.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on October 1, 1992.●

By Mr. DECONCINI:

S. 2408. A bill to limit plea agreements and cooperative agreements that promise reduced sentences or other benefits in exchange for cooperation by drug kingpins and others charged with extremely serious offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF PLEA AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH RESPECT TO DRUG KINGPINS AND OTHERS

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, due to a technical error in the plea bargaining legislation that I introduced earlier this month, I rise today to introduce a new bill incorporating the corrections.

Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which hopefully will put an end to this administration's misguided policy in prosecuting drug kingpins. Simply put, this bill precludes Federal prosecutors from giving sweetheart deals to drug kingpins for information to prosecute an individual charged with a lesser offense.

Recently, in the criminal trial of Gen. Manuel Noriega, the Bush administration cut deals with some of the most notorious drug kingpins ever apprehended or convicted in this country. Its fear of losing this trial led the administration to breach its own prior announced policy of prosecuting drug traffickers to the fullest extent under the law. This reckless and misguided policy must stop.

Specifically, this bill prohibits the Government from entering into any agreement with criminals charged with or convicted of the following crimes subject to life sentences:

Crimes using guns in the act of manufacturing, distributing or selling drugs;

Crimes of murder or attempted murder of drug enforcement agents or other Federal agents;

Crimes of kidnaping drug enforcement agents or other Federal agents; and

Crimes involving a continuing criminal enterprise, an essential statute in prosecuting drug kingpins.

This legislation is very limited in its scope but very broad in its message. The message to this administration is that bargaining with drug kingpins will not be tolerated. And in those instances where plea agreements are entered, the Justice Department will be accountable to the American people.

This legislation will not tie the hands of Federal prosecutors in entering plea agreements. In fact, my bill would not prohibit the Justice Department from entering into an agreement with a major drug kingpin for information against another drug kingpin being charged with the same offense. The Justice Department should have the flexibility to make that policy decision. Yet, because of the enormous policy ramifications of giving a break to a major drug kingpin, this legislation would require the Attorney General to personally approve such an agreement. My hope is that this is the current policy at Justice. However, in view of the confusion and delays surrounding my requests for information regarding the plea agreements entered into during the Noriega trial, I believe it is imperative that the Attorney General be required to account personally for such an important policy decision.

Mr. President, it has been the stated policy of this administration to prosecute drug traffickers to the fullest extent under the law. Unfortunately, the actions of this administration during the Noriega trial contravene that prior policy.

As a former prosecutor, I recognize the importance of and flexibility that plea agreements provide the criminal justice system. However, entering a plea agreement with the likes of a notorious drug kingpin such as Carlos Lehder has tremendous ramifications beyond the benefit it would provide to another criminal prosecution. Such actions undermine the credibility of our Government, justice system, and commitment to the war on drugs around the world.

In its own national drug strategy released in January 1992, the administration declared that one of its principal objectives in the war on drugs would be to continue to urge the Andean Nations such as Colombia, to strengthen

their laws and increase their prosecution against major drug traffickers. In addition, this administration has continued to press Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia to extradite its drug kingpins for prosecution in the United States.

How can we expect any cooperation from these countries when we are so willing to breach our own commitment?

Congress has a right to be notified when the administration is entering a plea agreement with tremendous policy ramifications. Under my legislation, before the administration enters a plea agreement like those dealt out in the Noriega trial, the Attorney General is required to personally approve such an agreement and must notify Congress 10 days before the agreement is finalized.

At a time when Congress is providing the administration with the prosecutorial tools to convict drug traffickers, the administration has chosen a more lenient path. Indeed, it is a rather disturbing that at the same time the administration is cutting sweetheart deals with the likes of Carlos Lehder, President Bush is threatening to veto a crime bill under which Mr. Lehder would receive the death penalty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD as well as a copy of the floor statement that I gave 2 weeks ago on the administration's plea agreement policy for drug kingpins.

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

S. 2408

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

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON PLEA AGREEMENTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH DRUG KINGPINS AND OTHERS CHARGED WITH EXTREMELY SERIOUS OFFENSES.

Section 3582 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) LIMITATION ON PLEA AGREEMENTS AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH DRUG KINGPINS AND OTHERS CHARGED WITH EXTREMELY SERIOUS OFFENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an offender who is charged with, could be charged with, could have been charged with, or has been convicted of an offense described in paragraph (2), the court shall not approve a plea agreement, cooperative agreement, or other form of agreement between the Government and the offender under which—

“(A) the Government agrees to, or agrees not to contest, a request for a sentence of any particular length or for a reduction in sentence; or

“(B) any other benefit is to be made available to the offender,

in exchange for the cooperation of the offender in providing information or evidence that may lead to the conviction of another person of an offense other than an offense described in paragraph (2).

“(2) OFFENSES.—An offense is described in this paragraph if it is punishable by a term of life imprisonment under—

“(A) section 924(c) or (e), 1114, 1117 (in a case involving a conspiracy to violate section 1114), 1201(a)(5), or 1201(c) (in a case involving a conspiracy to violate section 1201(a)(5)) of this title; or

“(B) section 406 (in a case involving a conspiracy to violate section 408) or 408 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 846 and 848).

“(3) APPROVAL OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL; NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Attorney General shall—

“(A) personally review and approve any agreement described in paragraph (1) with an offender under an offense described in paragraph (2) in exchange for the cooperation of the offender in providing information or evidence that may lead to the conviction of another person of an offense described in paragraph (2); and

“(B) not later than 10 days before any such agreement is entered into, provide to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives notice of the proposed agreement, which notice shall include the name of the offender with whom the agreement is to be made.”.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, today President Bush and Drug Czar Martinez are in San Antonio for a 2-day drug summit with the leaders of six Latin American nations. The White House claims that this summit will highlight the progress in the drug war.

I came to the Senate floor today to denounce in the strongest terms possible a misguided policy of the Bush administration, which I am willing to bet will not be highlighted by President Bush at this summit.

In its effort to convict Gen. Manuel Noriega, the Bush administration adopted a policy of handing out a cascade of plea agreements to a host of notorious convicted drug kingpins.

Convicted drug traffickers and their lawyers anxiously awaited—and sometimes sought out—an invitation from the Justice Department to testify against Noriega. As the poster here illustrates, and these are but a few examples, what drug kingpin would not jump at the opportunity to testify in this trial?

The group the prosecution assembled in the Noriega trial reads like a list of “who’s who of drug kingpins” in the Federal prison system.

Let me tell you about Col. Del Cid. The former Noriega bagman faced 70 years in jail on four counts of drug trafficking and racketeering. Noriega prosecutors dropped three counts and recommended a maximum of 19 years on his remaining count. They have also promised not to deport him when he is released.

If you think this is bad it only gets worse. This is what Daniel Miranda’s lawyer said when he went in to cut a deal with prosecutors for his client’s testimony against Noriega.

We made them a list of demands and they basically agreed to all of them.

Miranda flew cocaine shipments for Colombian drug lords. The prosecutors have also agreed to ask INS to give Mi-

randa legal entry into the United States and for the FAA to restore his commercial license. This sweetheart deal is for a witness who had never even met Noriega.

Ricardo Bilonick had been hunted for years by U.S. law enforcement officials for a 2,100-pound shipment of cocaine seized in 1984. Bilonick should have served 60 years in prison. Yet, with parole, he will be out in 7 years and maybe less. And shockingly, our Government has promised to urge other countries not to prosecute this drug kingpin.

Nevertheless, the biggest travesty of all is the sweetheart deal handed to Carlos Lehder by the Bush administration. Lehder, one of the founding members of the Colombian drug cartel and an admirer of Adolf Hitler, is the most notorious cocaine trafficker ever apprehended.

More than any individual, Carlos Lehder was responsible for the development, growth, and supplying of the cocaine market in the United States. At one time Lehder was responsible for 80 percent of the cocaine that entered the United States.

He is a vicious criminal who is responsible for thousands of deaths in Colombia. The tens of thousands of pounds of cocaine that he smuggled into this country has caused unprecedented violence and murder on the streets of America. It has created millions of drug addicts and crack babies.

In what was considered the most important drug trafficking trial in history, Lehder was convicted in 1988 to a sentence of life plus 135 years.

So how did this narcoterrorist end up testifying for the Government? Lehder, himself, was lobbying for a spot in the Noriega trial less than a month after Noriega’s arrest. He sent out letters and sought interviews after more than 1 year of silence.

Did he do it out of his love for the United States? I don’t think so. His disdain for America is reknowned. The prosecutor in his trial stated that Lehder was motivated by his hatred of the United States. He considered cocaine a “revolutionary weapon against North America imperialism.” At the Noriega trial, Lehder, himself, stated that he was testifying in the hopes of winning a reduced sentence that would allow him to return to Colombia.

I still don’t know the extent of the Lehder plea agreement. I wrote a letter last December to Attorney General Barr requesting a detailed explanation of it. However, it took 2 months for a response that was as vague as I have ever received.

I do know that in return for testifying against Noriega, Lehder was transferred out of our country’s highest security prison—the Federal prison in Marion, IL. The Justice Department claims that he was moved for his own personal safety.

How can moving him out of the most secure prison in the United States improve the safety of this convicted drug kingpin?

We also know that the administration went along with Mr. Lehder's wishes and brought eight members of Lehder's family to the United States to live under Federal protection. I wonder how much of this cost is being footed by the American taxpayer?

The Justice Department claims that Lehder is paying for this himself. My question is with what? Lehder can only be paying for these services with his drug profits.

Lehder, who was fined a paltry \$350,000 when he was convicted, has acknowledged that he still has \$8 million in property and assets throughout the world. These assets are from drug profits that he continues to earn interest on which his family can benefit from.

This is disturbing in light of the fact that Lehder owes \$98 million to the United States in taxes on his drug profits. And he has paid none of it.

At one time the motto of Colombian drug lords was "we prefer a grave in Columbia to a jail in the United States. With the new Bush policy on plea agreements, Colombian drug traffickers are requesting deals that will land them in the United States.

Colombian drug lord Pablo Escobar, who surrendered to the Colombian Government in June, is now sitting in his private, luxurious prison outside his home town. He continues to run his cocaine empire from prison and orders assassinations of his enemies.

In late December Escobar proposed his own deal to the U.S. Government. Escobar wants to provide evidence against Noriega in exchange for handing over all evidence we have against Escobar.

It was once the stated policy of this administration to prosecute drug kingpins to the fullest extent possible. Clearly, that policy has been replaced by a misguided policy that caters to the most notorious drug traffickers in the world. And this week, while the President will be attempting to extract demands from Andean nations to fight the war on drugs, the U.S. Government must defend its get soft policy on drug kingpins.

Mr. President, this policy, plain and simple, is wrong. It is indefensible. And it is detrimental to our relationships with our allies in the war on drugs.

We are sending the wrong message when we bargain with the likes of Carlos Lehder. Last November, we listened to President Bush threaten to veto a comprehensive crime bill that emerged from a House-Senate conference. Yet, under that bill there would be no opportunity to bargain with the likes of Carlos Lehder and Pablo Escobar. Instead, they would receive the death penalty. That is the message we should be sending our allies.

Mr. President, I plan to introduce legislation that will put an end to this plea agreement practice for drug kingpins. In the meantime, I call on the President to renounce this misguided policy this week at the drug summit. ●

By Mr. D'AMATO (for himself and Mr. KASTEN):

S. 2409. A bill to amend the provisions of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 with respect to the enforcement of machine tool import arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

MACHINE TOOL IMPORT ARRANGEMENTS

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation with my colleague, Senator KASTEN. Our legislation expands executive branch authority where foreign imports threaten our national security. It allows the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury to ensure the attainment of the objectives of the President's decision of December 27, 1991, which limited, for national security reasons, the import of foreign machine tools for the next 2 years.

I have been a leader, along with Senator KASTEN, Senator GRASSLEY, and others, in supporting the extension of a voluntary restraint arrangement for our domestic machine tool industry. Last year, over 190 Members of the Senate and the House supported 5-year extension in order to continue to protect national security and ensure industrial competitiveness.

This industry represents a skilled work force of 70,000 people nationwide. New York-based Strippit, Inc., and Hardinge Bros., Inc., represent close to 1,500 of these jobs. Strippit, Hardinge, and the rest of the U.S. machine tool producers played a vital role in the success of our military operation in Desert Storm. U.S. machine tool technology made possible such sophisticated U.S. weapon systems as the Patriot missile system, stealth fighter, and the Bradley fighting vehicle.

While we were delighted when the President agreed to extend the machine tool voluntary restraint arrangement we had hoped for more than a 2-year extension. Due to the short timeframe of the extension, our commitment to the American machine tool industry is more important than ever. It is a core industry and its health and viability are not only critical to our national security but to retaining and creating new jobs nationwide.

Under the President's December 27, 1991, order, extension of the voluntary restraint arrangements were to have been completed by January 31, 1992. It is our hope that these negotiations conclude shortly and with a positive outcome. In the meantime, it is absolutely essential that the administration, in the absence of an agreement, have the authority to guard against unrestrained imports that could jeopardize the national security of our Nation.

ardize the national security of our Nation.

I ask my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of this legislation and ward off potential intransigence during the negotiating process.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2409

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

SECTION 1. MACHINE TOOL IMPORT ARRANGEMENTS.

Section 1501(c) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to request the Secretary of the Treasury to" in the first sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting "The Secretary of the Treasury shall, at the request of the Secretary of Commerce,";

(2) by inserting after the first sentence in paragraph (1) the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, until bilateral agreements are negotiated with Japan and Taiwan pursuant to the President's December 27, 1991, decision, the Secretary of the Treasury shall enforce the quantitative limitations and other provisions of bilateral arrangements negotiated with Japan and Taiwan in effect on December 31, 1991, pursuant to the President's machine tool decision of May 20, 1986,"; and

(3) by inserting ", and December 27, 1991" after "May 20, 1986" each place it appears. ●

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, the legislation that Senator D'AMATO and I are introducing today will, in very simple terms, protect jobs, jobs, jobs.

On December 27, 1991, President Bush directed the U.S. Trade Representative to negotiate a limited extension of the voluntary restraint agreements [VRA's] with Japan and Taiwan on machine tools. These VRA's were negotiated in 1986 for national security reasons, and were scheduled to expire on December 31, 1991.

The President directed that import restrictions on machining centers, computer controlled lathes, computer controlled punching and shearing machine tools and computer controlled milling machine tools will be removed over a 2-year period, beginning in January 1992.

I am disappointed to inform my colleagues that the President's directives have not been met. It is, therefore, imperative that the administration have legislative authority to guard against unrestrained imports that could jeopardize the national security of our Nation and American jobs. That is why the legislation that Senator D'AMATO and I are introducing today is so important.

Machine tools have been described as "the semiconductors of the manufacturing world." They are high-tech machines that are used to manufacture everything from medical equipment to

missile components. Every weapon used in the gulf war was made on a machine tool.

The single largest machine tool manufacturer in America is Giddings & Lewis in Fond du Lac, WI. This legislation could save some 3,000 jobs in Wisconsin alone.

Our economic future depends on the survival and success of the machine tool industry. I hope my colleagues will join us in cosponsoring this legislation.●

By Mr. GARN:

S. 2410. A bill to authorize and request the President to advance Maj. Ronald Tiffany on the retired list of the U.S. Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. RONALD TIFFANY

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill for the relief of Maj. Ronald R. Tiffany, U.S. Army Reserve, retired.

Maj. Ronald R. Tiffany served in the Army on active duty for over 20 years. In the fall of 1977 the major submitted his records to the promotion board for consideration to be advanced to the rank of lieutenant colonel. He was not on the promotion list when it was published. As a result, since he had previously been informed that unless he had a service obligation due to promotion he would be released from active duty in 1978, he initiated voluntary retirement processing.

When Major Tiffany checked into the reasons he was not selected for promotion he discovered that the board had never received his file and therefore had never considered him for promotion. It took the intervention of the base inspector general to locate the file and forward it to the next promotion board for review. In late February 1978 as Major Tiffany was outprocessing he was informed he was on the lieutenant colonel's promotion list. However, in order to receive this promotion he needed to remain in the Reserve until August 1978 without benefits for his family. At this point, Ron had already made arrangements to move his family, had found another job which had the insurance benefits he needed to protect his family and had made commitments he did not feel he could break. He felt he had no choice but to continue with his retirement.

Major Tiffany has appealed twice to the Army Board for Correction of Military Records to promote him and correct a mistake made by the Army. Each time, while the board acknowledges the facts in the case his request has been denied. In his second appeal Major Tiffany requested the promotion without any financial remuneration. This, too, was denied.

The bill I introduce today provides no additional benefits for the major. It does, however, allow him to use the title—lieutenant colonel, retired—

which he earned through years of dedicated service with an exemplary record.●

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MACK):

S. 2411. A bill to approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified on April 11, 1986; referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the Committee on the Budget.

APPROVAL OF THE RESCISSION OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce legislation today that will approve the President's rescission proposals submitted to the Congress on March 20, 1992. It is time for the Congress to eliminate wasteful spending.

I would prefer that the President exercise his authority to line item veto these items, and let the Supreme Court decide the constitutional question that divides many legal scholars. At the very least, the constitutional challenge will focus public attention on the real problem in Washington, the big spenders in Congress.

While I would have preferred that the President had used his line item veto authority, under current law, the only other process available to reduce wasteful spending is the rescission process. That is why I am introducing this legislation today.

Mr. President, today we begin the process to rescind the wasteful spending included in the President's 67 special messages. The process of reducing the deficit should have begun years ago by the Congress. But, Congress has been infatuated with budget summits that raise taxes, increase spending, and balloon the deficit to new and obscene levels.

This is a first small step for fiscal sanity, but a giant step toward focusing the debate on deficit reduction—not tax increases. With the deficit projected to surpass \$400 billion this year and the public debt approaching \$4 trillion, we must try small steps first. If we are unable to take small steps, I fear for the future of our children—suffocating under mountains of debt.

When will the deficits end? I hope soon. Though this legislation clearly will not balance the budget, enactment will provide the Congress with a precedent for cutting spending—a rate event in Washington.

Mr. President, we are at a fiscal crossroad in our history. With our public debt expected to surpass our annual output in the next decade, we have the opportunity now to take small steps in the right direction. If we are unable to take small steps, we will not be able to take the big steps necessary to close a \$400 billion annual deficit nor eliminate \$4 trillion of accumulated debt.

The legislation I am introducing is a modest step in the direction of fiscal sanity. We cannot tax and spend our way to prosperity. We must begin making the tough decisions to eliminate wasteful spending.

Mr. President, I encourage all Senators to give serious consideration to this legislation. If we cannot cut the port, we will never address the real issue of runaway spending. I hope all Members vote in favor of deficit reduction, and support this legislation when it comes before the Senate for a vote.

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. REID):

S. 2481. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to authorize appropriations for Indian health programs, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

INDIAN HEALTH CARE AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1992

● Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that is perhaps the most important legislation for the native people of this Nation, the reauthorization of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

This bill was crafted with bipartisan support in the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, and in conjunction with the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Perhaps more than any other legislative initiative, this bill seeks to define in terms of authorizations, the commitment this Government makes to the health of the native American people.

The statistics regarding the status of the health of native people are appalling. Native people continue to rank at the bottom of almost every health indicator. Just this week, a report entitled "The State of Native American Youth Health," drawn from a survey of 14,000 Indian youth, reported that suicide has emerged as a way for native youth to deal with the emotional distress and hopelessness that persists throughout many of their lives.

The report further found that regular use of tobacco and heavy use of substances, particularly alcohol and marijuana, is linked to every single risk behavior found in the survey. In addition, the survey found that 20 percent of the youth felt their health is only fair to poor. Clearly, these dismal conditions must change.

Great strides have been realized largely because of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act and the Comprehensive Health Care Program it au-

thorizes. Yet all acknowledge that much remains to be done.

Diabetes, heart disease, hypertension, infant mortality, alcohol, drug abuse, high rates of premature deaths and suicide continue to increase in proportions which far outpace the incidence of those problems in the general population, while funding for Indian health care is wrapped up in domestic spending cuts that mask the damage that is being done, every day, to the potentially healthy lives that native American people could enjoy.

As members of a government that made solemn commitments to this country's native people—commitments that envisioned a long and productive future for the Nation's first Americans—we cannot allow this deterioration in the health of Indian people to continue.

They deserve more—we have promised them more. I introduce this bill today to assure that our promises will be kept.

The bill I introduce today is similar to a bill introduced by Representative MILLER, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which has broad bipartisan support in Congress, as well the support of the native community.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expediting Senate action on this important legislation. The honor of this Nation's word to its native people is at stake. But more importantly, the literal survival of native Americans must be assured by our action.

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I rise today to support this bipartisan effort to improve the health status of native Americans—American Indians, Alaska Natives, and native Hawaiians. The Alaska Natives I represent have expressed concern that some measures of health statistics in Alaska are comparable to those found in Third World countries.

For many of us, it is difficult to comprehend the magnitude of the problems that take their toll on Alaska Natives—alcoholism, drug abuse, suicide, teen pregnancy, sexually transmitted disease, domestic violence, child neglect, sexual abuse, injuries, cancer, heart disease, and diabetes. The Alaska Native Health Board, in recent Appropriations Committee testimony, has advocated a number of health promotion/disease prevention strategies which they believe would be effective in combatting these problems.

I look forward to working with Senator INOUE and the Select Committee on Indian Affairs on these issues, and will work closely with the senior Senator from Hawaii as we receive comments from the Alaska Native Health Board, the State of Alaska, and our villages and others during this process.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2483. A bill to provide assistance to Department of Energy management

and operating contract employees at defense nuclear facilities who are significantly and adversely affected as a result of a significant reduction of modification in Department programs and to provide assistance to communities significantly affected by those reductions or modifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANT ACT

• Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill which will reduce the impact of the transition of our Nation's nuclear weapons facilities on neighboring communities. Such facilities are converting from defense production to cleanup activities.

I, like many of my colleagues, have a nuclear weapons facility in my home State of Colorado. The Rocky Flats plant, located 16 miles northwest of Denver, became operational in 1952. At the time the facility was built, it was located in a deserted area on the plains. Today, the nearby suburban towns completely surround it. The close proximity of the residential communities coupled with the deterioration of the facility have led the Department of Energy [DOE] to slate the functions of the plant for relocation under the recently released complex reconfiguration study.

While I share the Department's feeling that it is inappropriate to continue the production of nuclear weapons components so close to a major metropolitan area, I remain concerned about the impacts of the closure of the plant on the workers, the neighboring communities and the economy of the State.

Since I know many of my colleagues share similar concerns about their own communities, I have introduced a bill which I believe will ease the effects of the transition process on our work force and economies. My bill would require environmental contractors at DOE defense nuclear facilities to—

Offer to retrain affected employees;
Give qualified affected employees hiring preference; and

Provide the hired affected employees compensation, benefits, and pensions comparable to the management and operating contractors.

In addition, DOE would be required, at least 60 days before a significant reduction or modification in DOE programs takes effect at a DOE defense nuclear facility, to develop and make public a transition plan that minimizes layoffs and aids: First, affected employees; and second, directly and significantly affected communities.

By requiring DOE to develop a transition plan before a reduction or modification in the mission of a facility takes place, we can minimize or avoid large layoffs and ease the economic burden on our communities.

The bill also includes assistance for communities affected by plant closures

or modifications and intimately involves local officials in the development of transition plans.

In Colorado, the Jefferson County Board of Commissioners has formed the Rocky Flats impacts initiative which has worked to define the impacts of the change in mission at Rocky Flats. To address problems associated with this change, the group will meet to formulate mitigation measures such as worker retraining, worker health insurance, economic assistance for local businesses, tax relief for local governments, development of technology transfer, and future use of the site. This group has been working with DOE to ensure a smooth transition in mission at Rocky Flats. I am pleased to announce today that DOE has agreed to provide the impacts initiative with \$240,000—\$140,000 plus \$100,000 in in-kind services—to begin to formulate a transition plan.

The Rocky Flats impact initiative is an excellent example of how our local communities can work successfully with DOE to address the severe impact the closure of a nuclear weapons facility can have on our communities. It is my hope, Mr. President, that the DOE Defense Facilities Adjustment Act will further mitigate the impact of the reconfiguration of our nuclear weapons complex on our States.

By Mr. BIDEN:

S.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution designating April 14, 1992, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDUCATION AND SHARING DAY, U.S.A.

• Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a joint resolution requesting the President to designate April 14, 1992, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A." This joint resolution is a companion measure to House Joint Resolution 410, introduced in the House of Representatives by Majority Leader GEPHARDT and Representative LEWIS of California and supported by over 200 Members of the House.

Mr. President, our Nation was built on, and is committed to, the principles of education and strong ethical values. This resolution will mark the importance of education to the whole Nation.

This joint resolution is supported by the Lubavitch movement which actively promotes education programs throughout the country. In addition, April 14, will be the 90th birthday of the renowned leader of the movement, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson.

Mr. President, education is a cornerstone of our Nation and I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this measure.

By Mr. BRADLEY (for himself,
Mr. ADAMS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr.
BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr.
BUMPERS, Mr. BURDICK, Mr.
CONRAD, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr.

DASCHLE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DODD, Mr. EXON, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. METZENBAUM, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. PELL, Mr. REID, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DURENBERGER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. WARNER:

S.J. Res. 280. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April 1992 as "National Arbor Day;" to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL ARBOR DAY

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, many times in the past, Congress has legislated and the President has proclaimed the last Friday in April as National Arbor Day. For the past 5 years, the Senate has passed legislation commemorating National Arbor Day, with more than 51 Senators cosponsoring the legislation. Today, I am introducing legislation which will once again recognize this important day. I'm pleased to announce that 50 of my colleagues have joined me today in sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. President, trees are one of our Nation's most important and beautiful natural resources. They not only provide the raw materials for some of our basic industries, they cleanse our environment and add natural grace and beauty to our lives. The establishment of a National Arbor Day acts as a modest reminder to all our citizens to appreciate and protect this vitally important natural resource.

We cannot take our trees and forests for granted. Scientists have observed declines, serious damage, and death of a number of species of trees in large areas of Europe and the United States. Damage to forests has ranged from decline in growth of several species of pine in southern New Jersey to widespread damage to the ponderosa pine in southern California. A number of other coniferous species have experienced growth decline in an 11-State region extending from Maine to Alabama. Last Congress, we passed a Clean Air Act to help reverse these sad trends.

Because we are concerned about our forests and trees, we annually designate National Arbor Day to take special note of the importance of trees in our lives. I urge the Senate again to pass this important resolution. I ask unanimous consent to have the joint resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 280

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the last Friday of April 1992 as "National Arbor Day" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 567

At the request of Mr. SANFORD, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for a gradual period of transition (under a new alternative formula with respect to such transition) to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security Amendments of 1977 as such changes apply to workers born in years after 1916 and before 1927 (and related beneficiaries) and to provide for increases in such workers' benefits accordingly, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that certain activities of a charitable organization in operating an amateur athletic event do not constitute unrelated trade or business activities.

S. 1087

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1087, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

S. 1245

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1245, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that customer base, market share, and other similar intangible items are amortizable.

S. 1357

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SANFORD], and the Senator from California [Mr. SEYMOUR] were added as cosponsors of S. 1357, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the treatment of certain qualified small issue bonds.

S. 1574

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] and the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON] were added as cosponsors of S. 1574, a bill to ensure proper and full implementation by the Department of Health and Human Services of

medicaid coverage for certain low-income medicare beneficiaries.

S. 1887

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1887, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Center for Nursing Research as a National Institute, and for other purposes.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 1996, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for uniform coverage of anticancer drugs under the Medicare Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2100

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] were added as cosponsors of S. 2100, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the development of renewable energy and the conservation of energy, and for other purposes.

S. 2117

At the request of Mr. SASSER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2117, a bill to ensure proper service to the public by the Social Security Administration by providing for proper budgetary treatment of Social Security administrative expenses.

S. 2204

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2204, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to repeal the provisions relating to penalties with respect to grants to States for safety belt and motorcycle helmet traffic safety programs.

S. 2232

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2232, a bill to make available to consumers certain information regarding automobiles.

S. 2327

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the names of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 2327, a bill to suspend certain compliance and accountability measures under the National School Lunch Act.

S. 2367

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and the Senator

from Nebraska [Mr. EXON] were added as cosponsors of S. 2367, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to remove the requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture charge a loan origination for a crop of oilseeds, and for other purposes.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and title III of the Public Health Service Act to protect and improve the availability and quality of health care in rural areas.

S. 2399

At the request of Mr. GORE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2399, a bill to allow rational choice between defense and domestic discretionary spending.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 166

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 166, a joint resolution designating the week of October 6 through 12, 1991, as "National Customer Service Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 230

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 230, a joint resolution providing for the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the Women's Army Corps.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 248

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 248, a joint resolution designating August 7, 1992, as "Battle of Guadalcanal Remembrance Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain regulations of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 91

At the request of Mr. PRESSLER, the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 91, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China should be appointed expeditiously, and make its recommendations and propose a plan to the Administration and Congress no later than 365 days after enactment of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 (P.L. 102-138).

SENATE RESOLUTION 270

At the request of Mr. DECONCINI, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 270, a resolution concerning the conflict of Nagorno-Karabakh in the territory of Azerbaijan.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 102—RELATIVE TO A JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. STEVENS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 102

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1993.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 103—AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL ROTUNDA

Mr. FORD (for himself and Mr. STEVENS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the rotunda of the United States Capitol is hereby authorized to be used on January 20, 1993, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States. Such Committee is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between such Committee and the heads of such departments and agencies, in connection with such proceedings and ceremonies.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 1992, at 10 a.m. for a hearing on OSHA Regulatory Policy.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TOXIC SUBSTANCES, ENVIRONMENTAL OVERSIGHT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sub-

committee on Toxic Substances, Environmental Oversight, Research and Development, Committee on Environment and Public Works, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, beginning at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing to consider issues relating to the Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA].

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SERVICES, POST OFFICE, AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Federal Services, Post Office, and Civil Service, Committee on Governmental Affairs, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 1992, at 9:30 a.m., on procurement irregularities associated with the Department of Defense's Airborne-Self-Protection Jammer Program.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 1992, at 10 a.m., to conduct a roundtable hearing on distressed public housing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, March 25, 1992, at 9 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the personnel programs of the military services associated with the amended defense authorization request for fiscal year 1993.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation/National Ocean Policy Study, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 1992, at 9:30 a.m. on the reauthorization of the Marine Sanctuaries Act.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on March 25, 1992, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in 485 Russell Senate Office Building, to consider for report to the Senate S. 1607, the Northern Cheyenne reserved water rights; and,

recommendations to the Appropriations Committee on the funding of Indian programs for fiscal year 1993.

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

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 1992, at 9:30 a.m., in SR-332, to hold a hearing on oversight of the Market Promotion Program.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ELECTION MONITORING IN ROMANIAN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

• Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, it has just come to my attention that the Government of Romania is proposing a draft election law which would prevent domestic nongovernmental organizations from monitoring the national elections expected to be held in May.

This is extremely disturbing and surprising in light of the cooperation the Romanian Government gave to election observers during the local elections in February. Chairman HOYER and I sent a Helsinki Commission staffer to Romania for these elections who reported to us that the Government was very cooperative.

If this draft law passes it will signal how seriously out of step Romania is with the other emerging democracies of the region. From Albania to Tartarstan, election observing has become a standard practice. Its importance is recognized in the CSCE Copenhagen document.

I urge the Romanian Government to fully embrace the democratic process of free elections and accountability to an electorate. To disallow election observing will only invite suspicion about the integrity of the Government's intentions during the upcoming elections.

The Congress is currently considering whether or not to grant MFN status to Romania—a status which was withheld because of human rights violations under the old Communist regime. It is important that the current Government demonstrate its determination to break completely with the past and uphold all of its Helsinki commitments.

The International Human Rights Law Group has recently written Romanian Prime Minister Stolojan expressing concern about this draft law. I ask that their letter be placed in the RECORD at this time.

The letter follows:

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS

LAW GROUP,

Washington, DC, March 23, 1992.

His Excellency THEODOR STOLOJAN,
Prime Minister of Romania, Victory Palace, Bucharest, Romania.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: The International Human Rights Law Group, a nongovernmental organization in consultative status with the United Nations, is concerned about the lack of adequate safeguards in the national election law now being debated in the Romanian Parliament. In particular, the Law Group respectfully notes that the draft law effectively prevents domestic nongovernmental organizations from monitoring the national elections. The Law Group commends the Romanian Government for cooperating with domestic observers monitoring the local elections in February. The effect of the currently debated law, if passed, would represent a serious step backward in Romania's commitment to human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

As you are aware, President Ion Iliescu signed the Charter of Paris for a New Europe in 1990, making clear the link between human rights, democracy and the rule of law. The Charter of Paris provides: "Democracy, with its representative and pluralist character, entails accountability to the electorate." In addition, Romania has signed the Copenhagen Document of the CSCE which recognizes, in Article 8, the importance of domestic election observers and invites appropriate private institutions to observe the elections of participating States.

The Law Group considers the presence of domestic observers from Romanian human rights groups to have been essential to ensuring the fairness of the local elections. Domestic observers were especially useful in aiding election officials to better understand and interpret the procedural requirements for conducting the elections. Further, the participation of domestic observers ensured public confidence in the fairness of the elections.

For the foregoing reasons, the Law Group respectfully urges your government, consistent with international standards, to allow observers from domestic, nonpartisan, nongovernmental organizations to monitor the national elections. We would very much appreciate receiving your response to the concerns we have raised.

Sincerely,

ROBERTA COHEN,
Acting Executive Director. •

TRIBUTE TO C.M. SGT. ROY L. ADAMS

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of an American patriot and an inspirational Kentuckian, C.M. Sgt. Roy L. Adams.

Roy Adams has proudly served over 40 years in the Kentucky Air National Guard. Through efficient communication and high-level performance, his exemplary career is marked by his dedication to the timely accomplishment of mission assignments. Chief Adams serves as an outstanding model for all military personnel and duly receives the respect and support of his peers.

Mr. President, Roy's impeccable service is further highlighted by his role as

the U.S. Kentucky Air National Guard senior enlisted advisor to the adjutant general of Kentucky during Operations Desert Shield and Storm. His enthusiasm and attention to detail inspired the 123d Tactical Airlift Wing to achieve over 90 percent ratings for personnel retention and reenlistment, and over 100 percent for manning. In addition, the Chief Inspector for the Headquarters Military Airlift Command stated that the 123d was "the best seen to date."

During Operation Desert Storm, Chief Adams recognized the physical and emotional hardship faced by the families of our service men and women. In response to this great need, he assisted in the establishment of a family support program which allowed deployed members of the Kentucky Air National Guard to correspond with their loved ones here at home.

Communication and positive self-image are the primary tenets of Chief Adams' personnel management philosophy. Through his direct efforts, substantial improvements have been made in many service award programs, the physical fitness and weight management program, the military communication systems administered by the Kentucky Air National Guard, NCO and the airman advisory panel, and the outstanding Kentucky Guardsman of the Year program.

C.M. Sgt. Roy L. Adams has given his country the fullest benefit of his talents and innovative mind. His firm belief in high-quality service and comprehensive perspective represents the can-do spirit that define the American traditions of patriotism and national pride.

I am certain my colleagues join me in extending a hearty thanks to Roy Adams for his service to America. •

U.S.S. "PITTSBURGH"

• Mr. MACK. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the involvement of the United States in World War II. The history of this war is replete with untold acts of individual heroism as well as the equally heroic acts of whole units and ships. Indeed, both DOD and Navy established unit and ship citations during World War II. In 1955, it was determined that such recommendations be submitted within 3 years and the award made within 5 years. I am told that there have been no exceptions to this policy since its establishment. Notwithstanding this long accepted rule, there are certain feats which deserve to be officially recognized. Accordingly, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the unprecedented action of the U.S.S. *Pittsburgh* as told by Hon. H. Lawrence Garrett III, Secretary of the Navy:

Pittsburgh was called into action in February 1945 and quickly set sail to help the United States Fleet fight the battle in the

Pacific. This proud ship was first tasked to support operations for the occupation of Iwo Jima. Then, in an unselfish and outstanding feat of seamanship, *Pittsburgh* dashed to the rescue of the wounded carrier *Franklin*, took her under tow, and successfully fought off the enemy air attacks determined to finish the carrier. When her bow was torn off by a raging typhoon, the masterful seamanship of the *Pittsburgh* then saved this ship. Still fighting the storm and maneuvering to avoid being rammed by her own drifting bow structure, "The Mighty Bull of the Pacific" was held quarters-on to the seas by engine manipulations while the forward bulkhead was shored. Backing into friendly port on her own power, *Pittsburgh* was repaired to later see action in the Korean Conflict.

The crew of the *Pittsburgh* brought great distinction upon themselves and their ship. They served their country proudly, and dared to challenge the unknown in their unprecedented feat of towing another capital ship. Though the time limit for recognizing this act with a citation has long since passed, this in no way diminishes the magnitude of their action. And so, with the acknowledgement of the Navy, I recognize *Pittsburgh's* achievement and commend her crew for their heroic action while under fire. ●

TRIBUTE TO LEXMARK, INC.

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize an outstanding company which is the largest private employer in Lexington, KY. International Business Machines became Lexmark International, Inc., last year, and since then, the company has only gotten better.

The Lexington factory has been producing IBM typewriters for more than 35 years. The typewriters are still being made at Lexmark, but several things did change with the name. The company now boasts new and revamped products, aggressive marketing strategies, expanded distribution, improved financial performance, better customer service, and a collection of industry awards. Lexmark recently celebrated its first anniversary and a very successful first year.

Lexmark officials are now looking to meet the challenges facing what is essentially a new company. A top priority for Lexmark will be making the company as identifiable as its predecessor, IBM. Company executives hope to not only do that, but to also maintain an even better reputation at Lexmark for the quality of products. With those priorities in mind, Lexmark has built a worldwide marketing operation and has launched an advertising campaign to get the company name out. Lexmark has also expanded the number of dealers and wholesalers, increasing product availability.

Lexmark also enjoyed a profitable first year. Although CEO Marvin Mann won't discuss specifics, he alludes to a lucrative 1991. Mr. Mann says the company exceeded profit plans, came in

under expense plans, paid less interest than expected and ended up in less debt than planned. The future also looks very bright. Lexmark's plans include a continued emphasis on developing new products and creating marketing plans to support them. Those efforts will add 120 new employees to the Lexington plant, which already provides jobs for some 3,000 Kentuckians.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to have a company as successful and innovative as Lexmark International, Inc. located in my home State of Kentucky. Please enter the following article from the Lexington Herald-Leader into the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Lexington (KY) Herald-Leader, Mar. 22, 1992]

LEXMARK'S GOAL: RECOGNITION

(By Liz Caras Petros)

Much is the same since the factory at 740 New Circle Road started pumping out IBM typewriters more than 35 years ago.

The typewriters are still being made. And the company remains Lexington's largest private employer.

But more than the name changed when the International Business Machines division became Lexmark International Inc. last year.

There are new and revamped products, industry awards, aggressive marketing strategies, expanded distribution, improved financial performance and better customer service. Company officials say those achievements make Lexmark's first anniversary Friday truly a cause for celebration.

"We have done a lot of things right," Marvin L. Mann, chairman and chief executive officer, said in a telephone interview from the company's headquarters in Greenwich, Conn.

When it comes to some of those things, Mann acknowledges that performance has been "better than we would have anticipated."

For others, however, such as making inroads against laser printer giant Hewlett-Packard Co., Lexmark will have to wait.

A LEXMARK GENERATION

Mann said the biggest challenge Lexmark has faced in the last year continues: making Lexmark as identifiable as its predecessor, with an even better reputation for the products it makes.

Gaining that reputation among users is "by far their hardest task," said Rob Auster, group director of electronic printing with BIS Strategic Decisions Inc., a research and consulting firm in Norwell, Mass.

What Lexmark needs, Auster said, is a marketing strategy like the one that catapulted Pepsi-Cola into a name brand alongside Coca-Cola, which dominated the industry for years.

"They've got to create a Lexmark generation somehow," Auster said.

Toward that end, Lexmark has "built almost from the ground up a worldwide marketing operation," Mann said.

The company has launched an advertising campaign designed to get the name out.

And it has expanded the number of dealers and wholesalers, making its products available through a network of authorized resellers, its own sales force and through IBM's direct sales force.

The tactic is working, albeit slowly. "The momentum of our product volumes is building month by month," Mann said.

For now, however, the generation is dedicated to Hewlett-Packard, which has a majority market share in most categories.

"If there's anybody in the market that can turn this thing around—HP's dominance—it's Lexmark," said Auster, citing the company's technical prowess and emphasis on marketing.

Even Japanese companies cannot compete, Auster said, because they cannot get their products to the American marketplace as fast or as inexpensively as U.S. companies that own their factories, such as Lexmark.

Auster said Lexmark has even more flexibility than its predecessor to "move on the dime and change" because in a smaller company there is less bureaucracy between the time an idea is born and the time it is put into effect.

PRINTER PRODUCTION

When the IBM sign was out front, the focus was on larger-ticket items such as mainframe computers. Since breaking from IBM, Lexmark has gotten what some industry analysts say it needed most: attention.

Much of that attention has resulted in new products.

During the last year, Lexmark has expanded its family of straight paper path IBM printers and introduced new dot matrix printers, four new models of the IBM LaserPrinter 4029 Series and the new IBM PTS-386SX integrated typing work station.

"Under Lexmark, printers have been promoted from singers in the IBM chorus to stars of their own musical," PCToday said in a February article.

Other industry publications have had similar reactions.

This year, PC Magazine gave its 1991 technical excellence award to the IBM LaserPrinter, and editor's choice awards to three of its printers and the IBM Enhanced 101 Key Keyboard.

PC User, a London-based magazine, named Lexmark one of 10 companies to watch in 1992.

Experts say that in most categories of printers, Lexmark's offerings are equal to or better than Hewlett-Packard's.

"Basically HP doesn't do anything a whole lot better," said Bill Howard, executive editor of PC Magazine. "They just got there first and got lucky."

CATEGORICAL SUCCESS

Aside from its technical achievements, Lexmark has had other successes during the last year.

Mann declined to release specific financial information, but painted a rosy balance sheet for 1991.

"We exceeded our profit plans, came in well under our expense plans, paid less interest than planned and had less debt than we planned," he said. "We did well in every category."

In its second year and beyond, Lexmark plans to continue its emphasis on developing new products and creating marketing plans to support them, said Mann.

Those efforts will mean 120 new employees in Lexington this year, about as many as were hired in 1991, he said.

Bill Gott, program director in printer industry research at InfoCorp, said he expects Lexmark to introduce new printers for the midrange market, more products that can be used with Apple Macintosh products, and color printers. ●

SUPPORT NAMIBIA ON ITS SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

● Mr. DeCONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support and encour-

agement to the Government of Namibia and its people on the second anniversary of their independence from South Africa. This is a significant milestone, not only for Namibians and their neighbors, but for all African people and leaders now debating the future in the new world order. Namibia represents a model of hope across the continent to those who want democratic systems with human rights, but who also face serious economic and political obstacles.

The settlement that allowed Namibia to achieve independence on March 21, 1990 was a very significant one for Africa. During a visit last year to seven African nations including Namibia, I saw excerpts of the Namibian Constitution hung on the walls of human rights organizations in Kenya and Nigeria. Namibia is being closely watched as democratic movements are transforming countries across the continent.

Namibia's transition, from apartheid and 23 years of guerrilla war to an independent and relatively stable democracy has been difficult, yet substantial progress has been made. Gross domestic product for 1991 almost doubled the 1990 output. And with each passing month, democratic institutions are becoming more entrenched and accepted. Presently, a multiethnic, multiparty government openly debates national policies. Human rights organizations, such as the Civil Liberties Organization, function openly—monitoring actions of the Government, protesting, providing human rights training to security forces and teaching Namibians about their constitutional rights.

With Namibia's notable successes, however, have come increasingly serious problems which threaten to undermine the foundations of democracy. Endemic poverty, inflation and falling mining exports have brought refugees and crime to the capital, Windhoek. And while the Government may be democratic, the Namibian bureaucracy is still often less than efficient. In the wake of the changes in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Western and other potential donor nations are paying even less attention to Africa, and foreign investment in Namibia has been minimal.

Mr. President, given Namibia's importance as a model of democratic development and its delicate first steps down the path of democracy, I urge this Congress not to forget the Namibian people. And as our Government sets its new foreign policy agenda, we must not fail to support Africans struggling to establish democratic systems. Such struggles are underway in more than a dozen nations including South Africa, Zaire, Kenya and Mali. The peoples of Africa have much to contribute to the brightening global horizons of the 21st century. We must offer our friendship and support to help ensure their integration into the community of democratic nations. ●

TRIBUTE TO MOREHEAD

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the town of Morehead situated in the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains.

Morehead is a growing and thriving community. The townspeople describe it as being the most progressive town in eastern Kentucky. Interstate 64 runs through northern Morehead, in Rowan County, where all types of businesses cater to I-64 travelers. A primary employer in Morehead is Morehead State University, employing over 1,000 people. Morehead is also the largest producer and exporter of veneer wood in the State, and the fourth largest in the Nation.

Cave Run Lake is the primary tourist attraction in Morehead, and the fifth largest lake in the State. An economic development team is in the process of revitalizing the area surrounding Cave Run Lake to include a large lodge and an 18-hole golf course.

Morehead was named after former Kentucky Governor James T. Morehead. Rowan County, formed in 1856 from parts of Fleming and Morgan County, was named for John Rowan, a former U.S. Senator.

Morehead has a robust economy that will continue to prosper for many years. The citizens are determined to bring new industry to their region. They are proud of their community and enthusiastic to see it grow.

Mr. President, I would like to submit the following article from the Louisville Courier-Journal into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal Feb. 3, 1992]

MOREHEAD: A TOWN SHAPED BY HILLS, HISTORY, AND A SCHOOL (By Jay Blanton)

When Claire Louise Caudill graduated from medical school in 1946, she could have begun her career in many places with better medical facilities than her native Morehead.

But Caudill belonged at home. "Just look at the hills," she said recently.

Morehead is surrounded by the beauty of the Appalachian foothills. On a snowy day, the mountainous ridges appear to be nothing more than a distant, luminous dream.

They are more than dreams in the life of Morehead, however. In nearly every respect, they are the reality of what Morehead is, and what this bustling Rowan County seat hopes to be.

The hills dictate the ebb and flow of life in Morehead. The rough terrain determines what businesses locate here, and more often than not, what businesses choose not to come.

But people like Caudill, now 79 and still practicing medicine, have chosen to stay here, and in the process have made Morehead special. Many people point to two institutions—the St. Claire Medical Center and Morehead State University—as pivotal to the emergence of Morehead as a regional hub for education, health and retail business. And Caudill, in a way, personifies the relationship between the two institutions.

It was Caudill's efforts in the early 1960s that resulted in the building of the medical

center named for her. St. Claire is now a regional medical center, with about 800 employees and a number of medical specialists who offer the region's residents medical attention close to home, so they don't have to drive to Huntington, Ashland or Lexington.

And it was a fierce Rowan County feud between distant relatives of Caudill's, the Tolliver family, and another family, the Martins, that in no small way resulted in the founding of the teachers' college that has become Morehead State University. The feud—dubbed the "Rowan County War"—received national attention and prompted many residents to leave the area.

Today, Morehead residents are proud of their town and eager to talk about the changes that have occurred here.

"We are probably the most progressive town in Eastern Kentucky in the way of growth and what we have going for us," said Morehead Mayor Larry Breeze.

It was that progress that prompted Cornell University professor James McConkey to write a book about Morehead and Rowan County. "Rowan's Progress," published by Pantheon Books, traces the community's evolution from violence to vibrance.

"I came back after many years," said McConkey, who taught English at Morehead State in the 1950s. "I was just really astounded by what had happened there."

Much of the change was prompted by construction in the 1960s of Interstate 64, which crosses the county just north of Morehead. The interstate has made the city's outskirts a natural place for fast-food restaurants and shopping centers.

But Main Street suffers chronic congestion, too. Cars never go more than few miles an hour, and they are bumper-to-bumper during rush hour. Stopping somewhere to shop can be an exercise in creativity.

"Right now if you were driving through Morehead and wanted to stop at one of the local businesses, you're afraid to get out of traffic, afraid you can't get back in," said car dealer Larry Fannin, president of the Morehead-Rowan County Chamber of Commerce.

Much of that congestion should be eased by the building of a three-lane, 1.6-mile bypass.

Part of the traffic, however, is undoubtedly due to the university—the town's "No. 1 industry," said C. Roger Lewis, who owns one of the community's largest real-estate agencies.

"It's the main blood. . . . That's the reason that this town's not up and down as much as some of the other places around," he said.

Morehead State has developed into a vibrant educational institution, known for much more than as the place where New York Giants quarterback Phil Simms played football. Enrollment dropped during much of the 1980s, when the school was immersed in a controversy that prompted two presidents to depart. But in the last six years under President C. Nelson Grote, enrollment grew to nearly 9,000 students.

The school, employs nearly 1,000 faculty and staff, making it the county's largest employer. The students also have an economic impact, and in turn draw other people—parents and friends—to town.

"They come here and go shopping," Grote said. They go out to Wal-Mart and they go to the Holiday Inn or to Shoney's or to Ponderosa . . . and have a meal and they like that. They're treated well and they come back."

The establishment of the St. Claire Medical Center in 1963 gave Morehead another vital institution lacked by other communities in the region.

After returning to Morehead in the late 1940s. Caudill built a clinic to serve the area, but it was obvious that more was needed. Caudill convinced community leaders and the Sisters of Notre Dame to build a hospital. Today St. Claire is sprawling medical clinic with 159 beds, and there are plans for a \$20 million expansion.

Morehead is somewhat protected from recessions by the stable employment offered by the university and medical center, other state offices and the lack of large industry, community leaders say. Yet many say that other businesses need to be encouraged, in particular, wood products.

Morehead is the biggest producer and exporter of veneer wood in the state, and the fourth largest in the nation, said Tom Calvert, executive director of the Morehead-Rowan County Economic Development Council.

"If nothing else, you've got to look at that and say 'Wow, that's big time,'" Calvert said. But more must be done to encourage the local production of finished wood products such as furniture, he said.

Late last year, area leaders formed the council to try to attract more industry. Morehead leaders also hope the region can capitalize on nearby Cave Run Lake, the state's fifth largest, to promote tourism. Tentative plans exist for a large lodge and golf course.

Calvert noted that Cincinnati "has the fifth highest boater registration in the nation, and they don't have a lake to put it on." People from Ohio, he said, are down at the lake every weekend. The key is to make the lake a vacation spot, rather than just a place to spend the weekend.

For most people in Morehead, the city is the only place they would ever want to be. You can drive through town and note the number of businesses that have been handed down from father to son, some for more than two generations.

Alpha Hutchinson, chairman and chief operating officer of Morehead's Citizens Bank, has traveled extensively throughout the nation and Europe, but he says he wouldn't live anywhere else.

"I like to travel abroad—Europe, Africa, Hawaii, England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, all over Europe," Hutchinson said. But when "I get back to the hills, I'm anxious to get my cornbread, my soup beans. . . . I get back down to normal."

In all likelihood, it is the dream-like but unyielding hills that have fostered the resiliency and devotion in Morehead's residents. It has made them endure, and in many instances, prosper.

It was a dream that brought McConkey, the Cornell professor, back to Morehead. A few years ago, he said, he dreamed about the time his young son cut his lip badly while playing with the family puppy. Caudill prepared to stitch the cut, but she was exhausted after returning from the hills, where she had been caring for patients and going days without sleep.

Caudill asked McConkey's wife to hold her hand so it wouldn't shake.

Recalling that episode, McConkey said, made him realize after the dream how much Caudill had given of herself to the people and the region.

"It just struck me (that) we spend so much of our time bawling the limitations of what people can do and wondering if there is such a thing as good in the world," he said.

Around Morehead, Caudill is known as the "baby doctor," or simply "Dr. Louise." She is something of a household name, having de-

livered an estimated 8,000 babies in her more than 40 years in the area.

Although Caudill's modesty during an interview does little to drive home the point, few residents have played such an integral role in the community's development.

Early in his book, McConkey recounts a conversation with Caudill as he departed Morehead for Cornell, the Ivy League school in Ithaca, NY.

Caudill said: "I always figured you'd leave."

"Why did you think that?" McConkey asked.

"Because you're too good for this place," she said, with a sweep of her arm large enough to include everything—the surrounding hills as well as the town itself.

Years later, McConkey said, "If I truly were good, Louise, I'd stay here, as you do."*

THE 171ST ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

* Mr. DODD. Mr. President, 171 years ago today, on March 25, 1821, the Greek people took up arms against four centuries of Ottoman rule, setting off the Greek War of Independence. They did so in order to achieve freedom from foreign domination. It is that brave and valiant struggle for human dignity and self-determination that we recognize each year on this date.

Greek Independence Day has special significance for all freedom loving Americans. It was the Ancient Greeks who formulated the concept of democracy that our Founding Fathers came to draw on so heavily when crafting our American system of government. A major reason we celebrate today is to reaffirm that common democratic heritage.

The concept of democracy is but one of the many contributions that Greeks have made to the development of Western civilization. Through this important anniversary, we not only have the opportunity to commemorate the historic friendship between the American and Greek peoples, but to salute our own Greek-American community for their contributions to our great Nation. Greek immigrants in coming to America have further solidified that friendship between our countries and have added immeasurably to our Nation's rich diversity.

The remarkable unfolding of events of the last 3 years, during which we have witnessed the toppling of dictatorships and the transformation of the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, once again illustrate the enduring power of the democratic ideals that first bore fruit in ancient Greece.

So Mr. President, on this day it is particularly fitting that all Americans look back and remember the tremendous contributions to freedom and human dignity that the people of Greece and those of Greek ancestry have made to our Nation and to the world.*

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY WEBB

• Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Johnny Webb, the newly elected mayor of Bowling Green, KY. Mr. Webb, a salesman, says that he would love the opportunity to sell Bowling Green. In my opinion, Mr. Webb is the best man for the job; he is dedicated and highly motivated.

There are other higher paying jobs that he would easily be qualified for, but Mr. Webb is dedicated to his town. He has chosen one of the most demanding jobs with a paycheck that is far less than what is deserved. It is not the money, nor the political stature that Johnny Webb is seeking; he just wants the best for his town.

Mr. Webb does not have a highly industrial vision of Bowling Green. Instead, he sees a town without power lines and roadside signs. He sees a town with rehabilitated buildings and strict zoning ordinances. He envisions a town which combines the best knowledge of the future along with the beauty of the past.

He knows that his task will not be effortless. Throughout his term as mayor, Johnny Webb will be seeking to bring some midsized, if not Fortune 500, companies to Bowling Green. He realizes this venture will not be simple, as businesses will not come to Bowling Green on their own. Yet, he is determined to be the driving force behind the forward movement of the city.

Mr. Webb says he would not be opposed to the city spending money, to make community improvements but prefers to see individual property owners take the lead. I have no doubt that Mr. Webb will be the primary source of leadership and motivation for this project, and Bowling Green is fortunate to have a man of such quality.

Although Mr. Webb will have to spend the first few months of his term learning the financial condition of the city, it will not be long before he begins to implement his plan for Bowling Green. Not only will he be a guiding force behind city improvements, he will also play a strong role in the fund-raising.

Johnny Webb is a professional, exactly what Bowling Green needs to move with the pace of a growing city on a day to day basis. Mr. President, Johnny Webb is an asset to Bowling Green and to all of Kentucky. I congratulate him on his election and wish him the best for a successful future.

Mr. President, please enter the following article from the Bowling Green Daily News into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

MAYOR-ELECT WEBB SAYS HE'S READY AND WILLING TO BRING VISION TO FRUITION

(By Robyn L. Minor)

One of the top priorities of Bowling Green's mayor-elect will be to recruit business and industry for the city.

"I'm a salesman and I'd love the opportunity to sell Bowling Green," said Johnny Webb, who won a landslide victory in Tuesday's election. "There are very few jobs you'd say are bad jobs, but if you had a choice you would probably pick the ones with more higher paying jobs—possibly headquarters type."

"It's not beyond the realm of possibility that we can convince headquarters to come here—maybe not the Fortune 500 companies, but some mid-size," Webb said. "I'm a member of a (Bowling Green-Warren County) Chamber of Commerce committee that's working on this right now."

But no business will come here without hard work by the city's leaders, he said.

Promoting Bowling Green could mean trips overseas and making use of the city's new relationship with its sister city, Kawanishi, Japan.

"I met with the mayor when he was here," Webb said. "He asked me to write him if I was elected and invited me over there. It would be a fun trip personally and could be good for Bowling Green."

Bowling Green will need to clean up its act before some of these headquarters would be willing to take the venture, Webb said.

"That means rehabilitating buildings and putting utilities underground," he said. "I realize I'm saying a mouthful when I talk about utilities because we are talking about a lot of money."

"It's possible if we plan for it, though," he said.

"I have a vision for Bowling Green. I see it being a little different than it is now," Webb said. "It's hard for me to paint a picture of it. But I don't see any power lines or tacky signs along the road. I see a lot of green space and plants and flowers."

"There has got to be more strict zoning ordinances regarding what kind of buildings can be constructed," Webb said.

The highway entrances to Bowling Green also need to look better, he said.

Webb said he wouldn't be opposed to the city spending money on the effort, but he'd prefer that individual property owners take the lead.

"I'd like to be involved in the Beautification Commission," Webb said. "The chamber wants to do something similar, and we need to coordinate these efforts."

The Landmark Association, which is facing severe financial problems, has contributed greatly to improving the look of downtown, Webb said.

"It's a worthy organization, and I'd like to see it continue," Webb said. "But I just don't know if the money is there. It may have to operate on a small scale. It could possibly be manned with all volunteers."

"There are a lot of agencies that are going to have to do a better job of raising funds on their own," he said.

The first few months of Webb's four-year term will be spent learning more about the city's financial condition and working, throughout his term, to give voters reason to believe they made the right decision.

If more revenues are needed to continue services, Webb said raising taxes will be a last option.

Major capital improvements such as building a police station are nearly out of the question.

"I don't know where the money would come from to start that type of project," Webb said. "We usually think about getting help from Washington, but I think we are running out of that help."

A new police station is on the agenda, but not nearly as high up as maintaining a qualified group of officers.

A report has suggested 22 more officers are needed for the police department to function properly.

"I'd like to have the case made to me," Webb said. "Protective services do have to have priority over some other departments."

Webb has already set up meetings with current leaders to learn more about the job he will take over Jan. 1.

"I've set up meetings with (Mayor) Patsy Sloan and City Manager Charles Coates," Webb said. "The commission also will be spending time with department heads."

Webb said he will be as involved in city affairs as he can be but is glad the job is not full-time.

"I think it's necessary that a city this size have a professional to run it on a day-to-day basis," Webb said. "That doesn't mean that I'll simply rubber stamp every recommendation that Coates makes. The people who elected us thought we had good judgment and want us to use it."•

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced into the RECORD the sanitized version of Department of Defense Office of Inspector General's report: "Audit of Contractor Accounting Practice Changes for C-17 Engineering Costs." Today I want to focus on press reports dealing with that report.

Stories in the Los Angeles Times, "United States Had Plan for McDonnell Baitout"; the Orange County Register, "Douglas Payments Criticized"; and Defense Week, "Pentagon Policy to Buttress McDonnell Douglas?" clearly indicate that a bailout was actively pursued by the Air Force. It is also clear that McDonnell Douglas was not the innocent beneficiary of a financial windfall, but had, in fact, played hardball with the Pentagon in an effort to stave off ruin. I will ask that these articles be inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Having successfully twisted the arm of the Air Force, one can't help but wonder if similar pressure tactics were applied to the Navy. The Navy is currently negotiating with McDonnell Douglas and General Dynamics over the recovery of \$1.35 billion in progress payments associated with the A-12 that were provided for work either not undertaken or not completed. Here again, progress payments inappropriately made are at the center of a program plagued by cost overruns and schedule delays. No one has blinked at similar cost overruns hounding the T-45, overruns all the more remarkable when one considers that the program is a simple modification of an inservice aircraft. A more ambitious upgrade program, the F/A-18E/F, also has been dogged by skyrocketing cost increases, and the aircraft hasn't even left the drawing board. The distinct outline of a pattern emerges.

Surprisingly, the usually diligent bean counters at the Pentagon have

been strangely silent regarding these programs. Isn't it odd that an organization that can begrudge \$0.4 million in meals ready to eat for the Navy has nothing to say about billions poured into the sinkhole in St. Louis. Friends, a political decision appears to have been made by people who face no electorate: McDonnell Douglas is too big to fail. The same bureaucrats who cavalierly put the tank and submarine industrial bases to the sword have proven a knight in shining armor to the maiden on the Mississippi. Why?

I find this outrageous. Show me a defense contractor, any defense contractor, who would not benefit from the largesse shown McDonnell Douglas. The unique treatment this company has received, particularly when so many others are being shoved through death's door, deserves greater congressional scrutiny. As much as it is in my power to do so, it will get that scrutiny.

I ask that the material referred to earlier be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 23, 1992]

UNITED STATES HAD PLAN FOR McDONNELL BAILOUT

(By Ralph Vartabedian)

In what amounted to a plan to bail out the nation's largest defense contractor, the Pentagon had a secret program to "fix" McDonnell Douglas Corp.'s severe financial problems late in 1990, according to a confidential audit by the Defense Department's inspector general.

Auditors found that the plan—which would have been undertaken with public funding but without any public debate—included six options, many of which were "pursued in some form" to increase the amount of Pentagon cash paid to the St. Louis-based aerospace firm at a time when its business was in crisis.

McDonnell received two questionable payments in late 1990—one for \$148 million and another for \$72 million, according to the audit. But the report does not give a full accounting of what other actions may have benefited the company.

The payments and the overall plan "involved significant noncompliance with requirements" of federal defense procurement law, according to the audit. The report was issued last month, but findings about the bailout were deleted. The Times obtained the confidential sections about the bailout.

Although McDonnell recovered from its immediate cash problems by mid-1991, a government debate is continuing about the firm's financial condition and its need for a \$2-billion foreign investment into its commercial aircraft business.

A company spokesman declined to comment Sunday. Senior defense officials have stated in congressional hearings that there was no bailout of the firm. Other defense officials who asked not be quoted by name also denied in interviews that a bailout was intended. Clearly, not all of the Pentagon's actions have benefited McDonnell.

The findings of the audit raise important public policy questions about how the Defense Department will deal with troubled contractors as the industry shrinks in the aftermath of the Cold War.

The audit does not address whether the secret fix-it plan was legal. Past government

ballouts of major corporations—including those of Lockheed Corp. in 1971 and Chrysler Corp. in 1979—were debated and approved by Congress.

Rep. John Conyers Jr. (D-Mich.) asked the Pentagon's inspector general in a recent letter to investigate the alleged bailout plan, including a complete accounting of how much was funneled to McDonnell and who authorized the plan. Those questions were not addressed in the recent audit, which focuses mainly on the two payments and refers to the bailout plan in a few passages.

The House Government Operations Committee, which Conyers chairs, is conducting an investigation of all of McDonnell's programs to determine if the military services have provided other types of relief to the company since 1990. A hearing is scheduled for next month.

The Pentagon's alleged actions in 1990 to help McDonnell came against a backdrop in which the government was virtually backed into a corner by the contractor's problems. The company was suffering from huge cost overruns on many of its major military programs and losing money on its commercial aircraft business.

During an extraordinary teleconference involving the Pentagon's highest civilian and military procurement officials in October, 1990, McDonnell Douglas Chairman John McDonnell threatened to stop the C-17 cargo jet program if he were not provided with about \$500 million in special payments, according to a participant in the teleconference and congressional investigators probing the plan.

The teleconference involved John Betti, then the Pentagon's undersecretary for acquisition; John Welch, assistant Air Force secretary; then-Brig. Gen. Michael Butchko, at the time the Air Force's program manager for the C-17, and John McDonnell, among others. At one point, the Navy's representative walked out of the meeting because he wanted no part in the plan, according to two sources knowledgeable about the meeting.

At least one of the senior officials at the teleconference told McDonnell that the best he could do in terms of providing financial assistance was \$250 million to \$300 million by speeding up contract payments on the C-17, according to key sources.

The audit does not directly cite that meeting, but it does refer to a "Finance Condition Review Team" that included representatives from all of the military services, the Defense Department and McDonnell—many of the same players involved in the teleconference.

According to the audit, the bailout plan was "documented" in a briefing provided to the review team in September and October of 1990. It encompassed three options that would not require approval outside the Defense Department and three options that would require outside approval.

The internal options were to allow some shifting of costs in the firm's contracts, to make unusual contract payments and to direct advances on contracts. The external options included transferring funds to increase the size of McDonnell's contracts and "extraordinary financial relief" under public law.

The audit found that McDonnell received a \$148-million payment on the C-17 cargo jet program in 1990 because the Air Force allowed the firm to shift development costs to its aircraft production contract, which had the effect of accelerating payments to the firm. That assertion about the C-17, which McDonnell builds in Long Beach, was previously made by Pentagon auditors in congressional hearings last year.

In addition, the public portions of the audit released last month found that in October of 1990, another payment to McDonnell was made that appeared improper because the firm's progress on the C-17 was not adequate to justify the money.

But a memorandum by a Defense Department contracting officer stressed the importance of approving the payment based on an "urgent and pressing financial need of McDonnell Douglas and potential adverse impact to the C-17 program," the audit said. That \$81-million payment was \$72 million more than the firm deserved, the public report states.

Other Pentagon actions involving McDonnell are coming under scrutiny.

Congressional sources said they were examining the Navy's termination of the A-12 Stealth attack jet program in early 1991, to determine whether that was part of the bailout plan. The Pentagon deferred its demand for a repayment of \$1.35 billion by McDonnell and its partner, General Dynamics.

The Navy's current plan to update its F-18 jet fighter at a development cost of about \$4 billion is prompting some in Congress to question why an update should be so expensive when the entire A-12 development contract only cost \$4.7 billion, a staffer said.

He also called into question why the auditor's assertions about a documented plan were not made public earlier. The public audit deletes passages about the plan, saying in a footnote that they contain "contractor confidential or proprietary data." But the congressional staffer said it appeared to him that the finding was "just embarrassing."

[From the Orange County Register, Feb. 14, 1992]

DOUGLAS PAYMENTS CRITICIZED

(By David J. Lynch)

Douglas Aircraft Co. received \$148 million in Pentagon payments on the C-17 program several months early after Air Force officials bent the rules to help the company through a cash crunch, according to a new report by the Defense Department inspector general.

"Douglas did not properly charge development and production costs. . . . At least \$148 million was disbursed that would not have otherwise been available," the report said.

The report noted that Douglas received no money to which it was not entitled. But the company did receive substantial accelerated payments in late 1990 and 1991 thanks to an accounting change in the way it billed the government, the audit concluded.

The company's relief of accelerated payments was acknowledged by the Air Force in congressional testimony last November. Some lawmakers have said the payments amounted to an unpublicized Pentagon bailout of cash-strapped McDonnell Douglas Corp., the nation's No. 1 weapons maker.

The amount of the payments is greater than officials indicated at that hearing, according to the report, which provides new details on events surrounding the controversy.

A copy of the unreleased inspector general's report dated Feb. 13 was obtained by The Orange County Register.

At issue is an Oct. 11, 1990, request by Douglas for a change in the accounting rules that governed payments for its C-17 work. The company is developing and building the first six cargo jets under a \$6.6 billion contract, which includes separate funding for development and production expenses.

By July 1990, Douglas had exhausted all the development funding available for that fiscal year. Unless it were allowed to shift

some development expenses to the contract's production account, Douglas would have been forced to eat tens of millions of dollars in unpaid bills, the report said.

At the same time, corporate parent McDonnell Douglas also faced severe financial pressures. Saddled with a \$2.97 billion aerospace debt, McDonnell was viewed by government analysts as financially weak.

Air Force officials approved the company's proposal Nov. 1, shifting \$172 million in development costs to the production account. Of that amount, Douglas ultimately was paid \$148 million several months early.

Douglas already had been receiving special treatment, according to the report. The Long Beach aircraft maker was being paid 99 percent of its submitted costs rather than the industry standard of 80 percent.

The audit led to a reduction in the payment rate to 97 percent beginning in November 1991, the report said.

The Pentagon's top auditor criticized Douglas for maintaining an unreasonably low estimate of the C-17 contract cost by "artificially" capping some labor costs and failing to submit the documentation required to support the accounting change.

Douglas spokesman Jim Ramsey referred inquiries to the Air Force.

But the report's strongest language was reserved for the Air Force officials overseeing the program, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, and the military's representative at Douglas. The report said they failed to coordinate their policies and did not determine how the change would affect the government.

"The Air Force doesn't believe we did anything wrong regarding progress payments," said Maj. Bob Perry, an Air Force spokesman in Washington.

Col. Kenneth Tollefson, the military representative at Douglas, declined comment, saying he had not seen the report.

[From Defense Week, Feb. 24, 1992]

PENTAGON POLICY TO BUTTRESS McDONNELL DOUGLAS?

(By Eric Rosenberg and Tony Capaccio)

Pentagon officials organized a plan "to provide additional funding," possibly millions of dollars, to a cash-starved and debt-ridden Douglas Aircraft Co. in late 1990, according to censored sections of a recent Inspector General report on the C-17 transport.

While a sanitized, publicly-released report assesses the acceleration of \$148 million in progress payments to the Long Beach, Calif., firm, it makes no mention of what appears to be a Pentagon-wide policy to improve the firm's financial health at a time when its parent was staggering under record-breaking debt and massive projected overruns on a Navy attack jet and training aircraft.

But according to the previously withheld sections made available to Defense Week, the actions surrounding the accelerated progress payments "were part of a common effort to improve the cash flow position of Douglas." The sections were deleted from the publicly released IG report because they were marked "contractor confidential."

Both versions state that, though the payments were accelerated in an inappropriate fashion, the firm was entitled to the money, albeit at a slower pace.

The sanitized version claims Douglas received Pentagon payments for the transport several months early after the Air Force bent the rules. "Douglas did not properly charge development and production costs. . . . At least \$148 million was disbursed that would not have otherwise been available," the report said.

But the "business sensitive" version states the reason behind the accelerated payments lay in "an overall plan to provide additional funding to McDonnell Douglas. The plan was documented in a briefing on the results of a review of McDonnell Douglas contract performance, problems, financial condition, etc."

Jim Ramsey, a spokesman for Douglas said: "It doesn't sound to me like there's anything new. Douglas received no special treatment on the C-17 in any way. In fact, the progress payments were reduced in the beginning of 1991 and reduced again at the beginning of this year."

Air Force spokesman Capt. George Sillia steered inquiries to the Defense Contract Management Command, saying senior service officials are not involved in issuing payments to contractors.●

KENTUCKY ROLL CALL— CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, my home State benefits from the insightful and comprehensive coverage of government and politics by Kentucky Roll Call, a respected newsletter. Amidst a heated debate over campaign finance reform in the general assembly, Kentucky Roll Call recently published an article by editor Lowell Reese, which was highly critical of taxpayer financing and spending limits, the principal elements of the reform bill under consideration.

Taxpayer financing and spending limits are also the main components of the Democrats' campaign finance reform proposals passed in the Senate and House last year. I will not go into the myriad reasons those provisions would lock in incumbents and corrupt the political process. The Kentucky Roll Call article I am about to insert into the RECORD will cover those subjects.

Mr. President, last week the majority leader appointed conferees to try and salvage something from the campaign bills the Senate and House passed last year. As we begin that process I urge my colleagues to review this article from Kentucky Roll Call. It explains why taxpayer financing and spending limits are not reform. In fact, they are roadblocks to reform.

Taxpayer financing and spending limits have been a \$500 million disaster in the Presidential system—more if you figure in all the accountants and lawyers that system has required. They are a formula for failure—in Kentucky and in congressional elections.

If my colleagues across the aisle like the status quo in campaign finance, then insistence on taxpayer financing and spending limits is the ticket. Because so long as those provisions are in the final bill there will be no campaign finance reform.

Mr. President, I ask that an article from Kentucky Roll Call be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Kentucky Roll Call, Mar. 6, 1992]

SHOULD ALL TAXPAYERS FUND GUBERNATORIAL CAMPAIGNS?

Who should pay for gubernatorial candidates to get elected? The rich, the middle class or even minimum wage employees? All of them would, if a bill passed by the state Senate yesterday to provide public financing of gubernatorial campaigns were adopted.

SB 221 would provide partial public financing for candidates for governor and lieutenant governor, and require them to run as a team . . . slated together like the president and vice president on the national ticket. If a slate voluntarily agreed to limit spending . . . to \$1.8 million per election, it would receive government money to the tune of \$1.2 million. The threshold to qualify is \$600,000. It's \$2 for \$1 matching.

That is, if a slate raises \$600,000 from private donors . . . the government would pitch in twice that amount—thus, the \$1.8 million limit. This could be repeated in the fall. So the limit for a campaign would be \$3.6 million . . . which is about what Congressman Larry Hopkins raised last year during his unsuccessful race for governor.

There is a runoff provision in the Senate bill, meaning if no slate in the primary received at least 40 percent of the vote . . . a runoff election would be held between the top two slates. And each slate would get \$300,000 in government money, specifically for the runoff (there would be no private funds involved).

Proponents of public financing say it's an "incentive" to encourage candidates for governor to voluntarily accept spending limits. They say this would make campaigns for governor less expensive, diminish dependency on private donations and take the "for sale" sign off the Capitol. But opponents say it won't work that way. While they generally acknowledge that campaigns are too expensive and invite corruption . . . the remedy offered by public financing will only make matters worse.

Secretary of State Bob Babbage, who plans to run for governor in '95, favors public financing. He told a legislative committee last week that "the middle class need not apply" as candidates for governor, unless public financing passes suggesting that the current system heavily favors the rich, and public financing would give anyone a competitive chance to be governor.

But some observers point out another view. Instead of public financing expanding the pool of candidates, it may have the opposite affect . . . and make it easier, for insiders such as Babbage and Lt. Gov. Paul Patton, to get elected. A limit on spending would significantly reduce paid TV ads, and therefore, handicap a newcomer's ability to build name recognition.

In contrast, it would aid the professional politicians who have spent eight to 12 years positioning themselves to be governor. It would make the lesser constitutional offices greater stepping stones than they have been in the past.

And if basketball celebrity Dan Issel (secretary of the Tourism Cabinet) decides to run for governor in '95, this is a dream bill. He has name recognition . . . that spending limits would make very difficult for a fresh face in politics to match. This would be a built-in advantage for all future celebrities who might aspire to be governor.

The public financing bill does provide an option. Candidates wouldn't be forced to accept the government money. They could run their campaigns on private donations. But the bill would cap contributions at \$100 for

states refusing public money—making it nearly impossible to compete, for anyone except the rich. (States that accept government money could accept contributions up to \$500. This part of the bill, and other provisions that penalize those who don't accept government money is considered by some to be unconstitutional and is almost sure to be tested in court.)

Kentucky has not seen "independent expenditure" campaigns before. But get ready for them if this bill passes. They will become a major feature of all future campaigns for governor. And there are no limits on what special interest groups, single issue groups and rich relatives can spend to support (or attack) a candidate . . . all legal, as long as the candidate is not in any way a knowing participant.

One of the best examples of this was in the 1988 presidential race . . . George Bush's campaign never paid to put Willie Horton's face on TV; that was all done by an independent expenditure group. If public financing passes in Kentucky, independent expenditure activities will proliferate like mushrooms in a wet meadow.

Public financing is a slap in the face to the American private enterprise system. Candidates should be given the chance to prove their worth . . . and contributions will follow accordingly just as the dollar always chases value. The way to reduce corruption in gubernatorial politics is not through giving the candidates government money. It's by limiting contributions to some reasonable amount and reducing the influence that a governor has over contributors.

Public financing, among all of its other ills, will increase the amount of cash floating around on election day in the streets of Louisville and hollows of Eastern Kentucky underground currency will be east in a more important role than ever before.●

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator AKAKA be recognized to address the Senate, and that upon the completion of his remarks, the Senate stand adjourned, as under the order.

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

Pursuant to the order, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] is recognized.

IN MEMORY OF MORRNAH NALAMAKU SIMEONA

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me to take the floor of the Senate to speak in memory of Mornnah Nalamaku Simeona who passed away on February 11, 1992, and for whom commemorative services will be held in Hawaii on April 5. I do so with a heavy heart and deep sense of loss.

I join her daughter, Karen Piilani Simeona, and other members of her family and friends, to mourn the untimely passing of her mother. We shall all miss her quiet but strong presence and leadership, her friendship, and most of all her understanding and compassion. We take solace though that she has departed from this world and is going home to life eternal.

Morrnah was deeply committed to ho'oponopono which she taught and practiced to bring about a spiritual relationship between self and the divinity, the way to self-identity. In this way, Morrnah brought understanding, peace of mind and happiness to the many, many people she touched over the years. Her good works continue through the Foundation of "I," Freedom of the Cosmos, which she founded.

Morrnah gave freely of her spirituality to others throughout her life, and for this she received many unsolicited honors. She has been recognized as a living treasure by the Hawaii State Legislature and the Honpa Hongwanji Mission. Among the other high honors that were bestowed on her was recognition by the United States Jaycees and the International Register of Profiles in Cambridge, England, for her contributions to society.

She left Hawaii in 1980 in a peripatetic mission to share her gift with the world. She conducted seminars in nearly a dozen States and many countries as well. She went to New York, California, Washington, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Virginia, Arizona, Maryland, New Mexico, Florida, and Washington, DC. She went to Denmark, Sweden, Italy, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, France, Yugoslavia, Russia, and Greece. Her updated process of ho'oponopono has been translated into Danish, Flemish, French, German, Greek, Italian, Polish, Russian, and Spanish. I cite this litany of States and

countries, and translations, only to impress on one and all that Morrnah was indeed a universal authority on "ho'oponopono."

And when she visited Washington, DC, and learned that the original model of the Statue of Freedom from which the mold of the statue which stands on top of our Capitol dome was made lay in ignominious storage, she was inspired to refurbish and restore the statue for display in a place of honor. She shared her intentions with me, and as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I amended the Legislative Committee on Appropriations bill to permit the Architect of the U.S. Capitol to receive private funds for this purpose. Morrnah then raised \$25,000 which she donated to the Architect of the U.S. Capitol. The U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission accepted the gift and approved the proposal to display the statue in the Russell Rotunda. This will be done by the end of this year. The model of the Statue of Freedom in the Russell Rotunda will serve as an eternal remembrance of Morrnah Nalamaku Simeona.

Mr. President, my wife, Millie, and I join all the people of Hawaii, our Nation and the world to bid Morrnah Nalamaku Simeona, aloha and a peaceful journey home. We are the better today for having known her, and the world a better place for her having passed through.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9 a.m., Thursday, March 26; that on Thursday, following the prayer, the Journal of Proceedings be deemed to have been approved to date; that the call of the calendar be waived; and no motions or resolutions come over under the rule; and that the morning hour be deemed to have expired; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 11:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each; with Senator BRADLEY recognized for up to 40 minutes; that there be 30 minutes under the control of Senator CRANSTON or his designee; and that Senators KASTEN, WALLOP, KASSEBAUM and SMITH be recognized for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in adjournment until the hour of 9 a.m., Thursday, March 26.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:10 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 26, 1992, at 9 a.m.

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

[Faint, mostly illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 25, 1992

The House met at 2 p.m.

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

We pray for guidance, O God, for we wish to know the way; we pray for wisdom, O God, for we wish to know the truth; we pray for enlightenment, O God, because we wish to experience the fullness of life. With all the pressures of duty and responsibility, we offer this our prayer that our very hearts, souls, and minds will be open to the presence of Your spirit, a spirit that points to the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. NAGLE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2398. An act to clarify the provisions relating to the construction of additional court space in Brooklyn, New York, and to make a technical correction.

CONGRESS SUPPORTS MIDDLE CLASS, PRESIDENT PROTECTS THE WEALTHY

(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, later today we will have an opportunity to vote on whether or not to override the President's veto of the recently passed tax bill.

This is not a complicated issue. Congress voted to provide needed tax relief for the middle class. The President ve-

toed the bill because it raises taxes on the rich. Congress is for the middle class. The President wants to protect the wealthiest in our society.

When I entered Congress in 1979, the top rate was 70 percent. Since that time, the wealthiest Americans have had their tax rate cut in half. Let me say that again: The top rate for our richest citizens is half of what it was 13 years ago.

And yet our President wants to man the barricades and prevent the wealthy from paying even 1 or 2 percent more in taxes.

It is hard to believe that the President of the United States is so out of touch with the country. Last time someone sent the people a message of "let them eat cake" she lost her head. This President will not lose his head, but he should lose his job.

TRIM THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are getting to that time of year when we begin to look at the legislative budget and what we are going to spend to run this place around here. I think the first bill that comes before us will be the budget for the research staff. I understand that the committee is recommending that we do something over 4 percent on that budget.

I think we need to be reminded that since 1947, the number of people working in different sections of the Federal Government has gone up by the following amounts: Civilian employees: 45 percent; Executive Office of the President: 59 percent; Representatives' personal staffs: 526 percent; Senators' personal staffs: 650 percent; House committee staffs: 1,189 percent; Senate committee staffs: 437 percent.

Since 1947, the amount of money needed to run the legislative branch of government has risen at a pace six times faster than the increases in the Consumer Price Index.

Mr. Speaker, people do not want business as usual. They are not going to put up with us continually raising the cost of running the Congress of the United States.

WITH VETO, PRESIDENT HAS ABANDONED MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, with his veto of the tax cut bill, the President abandoned the middle-class family.

He would rather do nothing than to give middle-class families a tax cut, \$600 to \$800 over a period of 2 years.

He would rather do nothing than give middle-class families an IRA.

He would rather do nothing than get us out of this Republican recession that is now almost 2 years old.

His motto is: "Don't do something, just stand there."

The President is at his old tricks again. He just wants to protect his wealthy friends. He needs to forget about the country club and start thinking about the country.

CAMPUS SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS

(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, later today the House is expected to begin consideration of H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. I want to alert my colleagues to an important amendment Ms. MOLINARI and I will introduce to protect campus sexual assault victims.

This amendment would require colleges and universities to adopt meaningful sexual assault policies.

A recent study showed that one out of four college women in America is the victim of either attempted rape or rape during her 4-year college career.

Mr. Speaker, too many college administrators are slow in realizing that date rape is rape. Victims and parents throughout the country are angry that less than 1 percent of campus rapists are ever prosecuted.

Worse yet, too many campus rape victims are traumatized a second time when their rape allegations are mishandled by campus officials.

With less than 40 percent of campus rapes resulting in any institutional penalty whatsoever, is it any wonder that many college women across the country have taken to posting the names of their attackers on bathroom stalls in order to protect their classmates from future attacks?

Mr. Speaker, the Ramstad-Molinari amendment would require colleges and universities to adopt meaningful sexual assault policies. Say "no" to campus rape by voting "yes" on the Ramstad-Molinari amendment.

□ 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.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT: THE ROAD TO SUCCESS

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

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4471, a bill to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965. This is a very important piece of legislation, for it is through the Higher Education Act that the dream of access and opportunity for a college education becomes a reality.

With the end of the cold war, the national strength and status of the United States as a great power now depends on our ability to compete economically. The productivity of our citizens is linked to our willingness to invest in their education and training. Unfortunately, working and middle-class families, the traditional source of productive workers, are seeing the dreams of higher education for their children slip away as our standard of living declines and as our support for Federal education programs decline.

In the last decade those with incomes below the top 20 percent saw their incomes either stagnate or decline when adjusted for inflation. Meanwhile costs at public and private colleges have increased two to three times faster than the growth in median family income. Many working families can no longer afford to finance their children's education. For example, an 18- to 24-year-old from a family with an income between \$15,000 and \$30,000 is less than half likely to be in college as an 18- to 24-year-old from a family with an income above \$50,000.

Working class families can also no longer call on their traditional financial reserve, sending mom to work, to meet the cost of a college education for their children. Mom has already gone to work for the families fortunate enough to have two wage earners. These dual incomes are now becoming barely sufficient to maintain their current standard of living.

Since the Federal Government provides 75 percent of total financial aid available to students, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act is an opportunity to improve our current structure in order to give more students the chance to pursue a college education and achieve their full potential.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1992, provides this response. For hard-pressed middle income families, H.R. 4471 brings Federal aid once again within their reach.

One million new borrowers would be eligible for guaranteed student loans, with 900,000 of the new borrowers from middle income families.

In the first year, an estimated 5 million students would be eligible for an

increased grant or would be newly eligible to receive a Pell grant; 1 million of these newly eligible Pell grant recipients would be from middle income families.

Provides a simplified need analysis to determine eligibility for all Federal financial aid. By removing the consideration of farm and home equity for families with incomes of less than \$50,000, middle income families will once again have access to Pell grants, guaranteed loans, and campus-based aid.

In Nebraska, nearly 22,000 high school graduates attend the University of Nebraska in Lincoln, our largest education institution. For the 1990 school year, resident tuition room and board averaged \$4,800 per student. Of a total of 24,453 students attending the university, almost 50 percent rely on financial aid in some form. I want to ensure that not one of these students is denied the opportunity to attend the university.

One of the hallmarks of the American dream is that education is the door to opportunity. Not only does education bring opportunity, it is a good investment for our Nation. For every dollar that students receive in student aid, they return about \$4.30 to the Federal Government in taxes. Our true economic wealth depends on the development of the skills and insights of our citizens. H.R. 4471 goes a long way in assuring that the education needs of our citizens is met.

THE BRUTAL REGIME OF FIDEL CASTRO

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every month there is another report from a reputable human rights organization citing Fidel Castro's horrid record on freedom and liberty. Here is the report of the Department of State, of Amnesty International, of the America Watch, Freedom House, and there are many others which clearly point out that Castro fails miserably in every aspect examined, in respect for human rights or political rights or workers' rights, in fair and public trials, in noninterference with the privacy of family life or correspondence, in freedom of speech and of the press, in freedom of peaceful assembly or movement, in freedom of religion, and the list goes on and on.

These reports accurately depict the ongoing nightmare that is a reality for the Cuban people.

How many reports such as these must be reported out of international groups before the entire world wakes up to the fact and realizes that Castro's reign must end and that freedom and democracy must be restored to my native

homeland. I am optimistic that by strengthening the economic embargo, the United States will send a real and meaningful message to Castro that his brutal regime is in its last days.

□ 1410

HOUSE CONSIDERS VETO OVERRIDE OF MIDDLE-CLASS RELIEF AND ECONOMIC GROWTH BILL

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, today the House takes up the veto of the economic growth bill. I am dumbstruck that the President vetoed a bill which contains numerous items he requested in his State of the Union Message.

This bill stimulates our economy by putting money in the hands of middle-class consumers. It allows penalty-free withdrawals from IRA's for the unemployed, first-time home buyers and others; it would restore deductibility of IRA's for all and create a special IRA.

It extends the health insurance deduction for the self-employed. It eliminates capital gains taxes for people in the 15-percent bracket, and cuts them in half for those in the 28-percent bracket.

It provides strong incentives to businesses, including an investment tax allowance, increased expensing, enterprise zones and passive loss relief. It also simplifies the code and strengthens the taxpayer's bill of rights.

The President vetoed the bill before he even saw it, claiming it's a tax increase. For a few he is right; it raises taxes on the richest 1 million Americans, who did very well in the 1980's, to pay for tax relief for the 78 million middle-class families who are still waiting for trickle down to reach them.

Unlike the President's proposal, which would add to the red ink, this bill will reduce the deficit over 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, the President now says he wants us to do nothing. Doing nothing may be OK with the country club crowd, but it is not OK with millions of Americans who fear their slice of the pie will keep shrinking and maybe even disappear. Let us override this veto and get our economy moving again. It is the right thing to do.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT JOBS, NOT HERSHEY BARS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] just said he was dumbfounded because he could not understand why the President vetoed that—that tax increase. Well, I

will tell you why the President vetoed it. It is a \$93 billion tax increase on the backs of the American people that is going to hurt the economy.

Mr. Speaker, we are already in a recession. Why? Because 2 years ago the Democrats forced through a \$181 billion tax increase.

So what are they going to do now? They are coming back with a \$93 billion tax increase which is supposed to solve the economic problems of this country.

What are they giving in exchange for it? They say they are going to help the middle class. Mr. Speaker, this Hershey bar costs 50 cents. The tax rebate they are going to give to the American middle class is 41 cents a day. You cannot even buy a Hershey bar for that.

What are they going to do? Raise the taxes \$93 billion and give you less than a Hershey bar if you are a middle-class taxpayer.

That is going to solve the economic problems? Give me a break, give me a break. The American people want this economy to start moving again. They want jobs. They do not want a Hershey bar, they want jobs and not a tax increase.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Our guests in the gallery are reminded that we are delighted to have them with us but they are not to respond, positively or negatively, to any statements made on the floor.

CURTAIN CAMPAIGN BUNDLING

(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, when we talk today about bundling, we are not referring to the quaint colonial custom wherein unmarried couples would lie fully clothed in bed, divided by a wooden partition, and court. We are talking today about a system in which an intermediary collects, or bundles, campaign checks and then forward them en masse to a particular candidate.

About the only relation between the two is that in each case one person is trying to impress another person.

But certainly campaign bundling is not a good practice. It is severely limited in both of the bills which are pending in the conference committee dealing with campaign election reform.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no single thing that would help this Congress more quickly regain some portion of the esteem and faith and the honor of the American people than to pass solid, strict campaign reform legislation which includes limiting or restricting campaign bundling.

ENACT THE CONGRESSIONAL PERQUISITE REFORM ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the image of Congress has been severely damaged by controversy surrounding the House bank. My perception of the public's concern is not so much with the overdrafts, but that the bank offered services to Members of Congress that were not otherwise available to the average citizen. In other words, the bank was a congressional perk that was a hotbutton setting off alarms in our constituents' minds that Congress feels it deserves special treatment.

Clearly Congress needs to take measures to regain its credibility with the American people. The leadership has raised the fees of the Members-only House gymnasium, eliminated the free drug prescription service, and voted to close the House bank, but in my opinion these actions did not go far enough. So I am introducing the Congressional Perquisite Reform Act of 1992. My bill is designed to make sure that Members of Congress do not receive privileges that are not otherwise justified by the requirements of our job. Specifically, my proposal calls upon the GAO to review the administrative benefits now available to Congress to determine the fair market value of these benefits and provide us with a report immediately so we can take it up in 102d Congress, how taxpayers dollars can be most effectively used to run our in-house operations.

It is my intention that the GAO would look into, but not limit itself to, such services now available to Members as free health care, the House gymnasium, parking, fixing parking tickets, the in-house barber shop and hair salon, and limousines.

I hope that the leadership will take up my bill without delay to restore not only the dignity of this once august institution but also the faith of the American people in its representatives.

JAPAN GETS SPONGE—AMERICAN WORKERS GET SQUEEZE

(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, in 1990 the Pentagon said only type A titanium sponge would be bought for the national defense stockpile. Type A sponge meant that no American companies and no American sponge would qualify, which meant, that is right, that all of the titanium sponge bought for the defense stockpile was bought from Japan, Japanese companies, who 2 years before that were convicted of dumping titanium in the American

marketplace below the production costs, thus destroying the American domestic titanium industry.

Now think about it: Japan gets the sponge, American workers get the squeeze; Japan gets the money, American workers get the boot; American taxpayers and workers pay the bills so they could buy titanium for the stockpile, the Pentagon buys it from Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I say this is un-American and unconstitutional, and the people who are handling trade in America should be sent to Taiwan, the EPA should be sent to Korea, and maybe our country will get back on its feet.

DALLAS AND EIGHT OTHER U.S. CITIES PICKED AS SITES OF WORLD CUP GAMES

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the people of Dallas, TX—and eight other U.S. cities—for their role in this week's site selections for the 1994 World Cup Games.

For the first time in history, the United States will be hosting the championship soccer match—and for 1 month, more than 1.5 billion people from around the world will be watching these American cities.

This will give our country an unprecedented opportunity to spread good will and American hospitality—not to mention, the economic boost the event will bring to local communities.

So, congratulations again to the people of Dallas, our ex-colleague, Mayor Steve Bartlett, and all Americans who worked—and will continue to work—to make the 1994 World Cup Games a great success, and put America first in the eyes of the world.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT RESCIND FUNDS FOR THE RED RIVER POLLUTION ABATEMENT PROJECT

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

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, in order to be an effective Member of this body you must have a vision, you must be able to dream.

In order to be an effective President you must have a vision for the future to try to make this country a better place for our children than what we see today.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that with the tremendous deficit spending that we are now having today, we are giving the future generations not much hope. But the President has given us a rescission package, a list of things in the budget that he thinks we ought to cut.

One of those items in that package, it is clear that the President has lost his vision; and that is the project for the funding of the Red River chloride project which cleans up the water in the Red River for the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, to clean up the pollution that we have in that water.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my district the cities of Vernon, Crowell, and Quanah, which will run out of water in 12 years. No drinking water for those communities.

The President feels like that is an area we ought to cut. Here on the one hand he asks me to vote to forgive a debt that the country of Egypt owes us, at \$6.7 billion; and on the other hand he asks me to vote to eliminate the future for those communities.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to look closely at that rescission list.

□ 1420

IS HONDA AN ALL-AMERICAN CAR?

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, we all know about real estate rollups; now we are learning about rollups in the automobile industry.

Hondas assembled in Canada lacked the minimum 50 percent North American content necessary for them to enter the United States duty free. To analogize from Kafka's metamorphosis, Japanese components went to bed in a Canadian plant, dreamt of being an American car and lo and behold came to life singing "Born Free" as a duty-free American car.

According to Business Week, Under Secretary of Commerce, J. Michael Farren called the efforts of Japanese auto companies to use American-owned suppliers a sham. The article quoted another American official concerned about the double standard of buying parts from Japanese suppliers as "a strategic exercise for Japan to totally dominate the worldwide car market."

Rollups is certainly the right name for this practice by Honda. We allow transplants in the United States, and their rolled-up foreign parts have rolled right past American jobs in the automobile industry. It is time for us to get wise and roll down the economic wall to these illegal imports.

DON'T BARGAIN WITH THE LUXURY TAX

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, a large, energetic crowd gathered on the Capitol

steps yesterday to oppose the so-called luxury tax. I did not see any millionaires in the protest crowd, just hundreds of boat workers who are worried about their future and the future of their families. Their message: "Stop using the luxury tax as a political bargaining chip, and repeal the tax."

This message has been echoing ever since the 1990 budget agreement when Congress took its big swing at the rich, and only managed to punch out thousands of middle-class jobs. Still, Congress has not heard, or worse, has not bothered to listen.

Instead of a serious attempt at repeal, the luxury tax is being held hostage in the war over tax policy by those legislators more interested in trading political shots than helping the economy. It is time that the leadership inside these thick walls finally got the message that is coming in so clearly from outside. Let us stop worrying about political points and get down to the long overdue business of repeal and getting our boat builders back to work. They want the jobs—they need the jobs.

OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the President gave Congress until March 20 to deliver an economic budget package that would put America back to work.

We did our part.

He didn't do his.

The President vetoed our bill the same day we sent it to him. He showed us what he thought of working middle-class families. Once again, he protected the wealthy at the expense of the middle class. Our bill provided tax relief to working families and incentives to businesses to help get our economy moving.

It included: Up to \$300 in tax credits for all working families in 1992 and 1993; a permanent \$300 tax credit per child for middle-income families beginning in 1994; a decrease in the capital gains tax based on income; an allowance for all taxpayers to make deductible contributions to IRA's; new tax rules to encourage investments in small business; and it also would have made permanent the low-income housing tax credit.

It has now been 6 days since the President rejected our package. He never even read it. But we have yet to see his economic plan. His answer is: Do nothing. Last week he tried to strike at Congress by rejecting our bill, but he missed his target because he ended up striking at the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto today.

THE IMPACT OF WETLANDS REGULATION ON AMERICA'S PRIVATE PROPERTY

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, by now we are all aware of the important action announced by our President in his State of the Union Address putting a 90-day moratorium on new Federal regulations. This action is critical to lowering the almost \$4,000 per year that every American family pays for Federal regulation.

But this Nation has much more fundamental liberty at stake if we do not check the excesses of a bureaucracy out of control. I speak quite simply of our cherished right of private property. If you need an example of a bureaucracy trampling on people's property rights you need only look at our wetlands system under section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

At a time when the former Soviet Union is desperately trying to have private land our Federal bureaucracy is trying to use section 404 to take land from private property owners for a public purpose. What is even more outrageous is that they aren't willing to pay for what they are taking.

The current wetlands system is totally the creation of the bureaucracy. The only statutory basis refers to placement of fill in the waters of the United States. We now have a system where we have cactus growing in the waters of the United States.

If the regulation did not have such a dire impact on the property owners who happen to own 75 percent of the wetlands in this country, the current system would be funny. Unfortunately, it destroys people's property values and prevents them from achieving their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, the 90-day regulatory moratorium is too late to prevent the abuses of the current wetlands regime but hopefully it will prevent further abuse.

THE UNITED STATES MUST ACCEPT POLLUTION LIMITS

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

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, as I rode the train this morning from Philadelphia to Washington, I could hardly believe the headline on the front page that read "U.S. Rejects Limits on Pollution." It seems that the administration has rejected the idea of establishing targets and timetables for carbon dioxide reduction efforts, is inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, as U.N. negotiators from nearly 150 countries have been attempting to draft a worldwide treaty

to set specific limits on the emission of carbon dioxide, the President's position should be viewed as most troubling, especially to those, like myself and my constituents who are concerned about facing a future of increased and all too rapid global warming.

I do not need to stand here and recite to my colleagues the fact that carbon dioxide pollutants account for more than half of all of the greenhouse gas emissions, that threaten the fragile ecology of our planet more and more each year. I know full well that our President is aware of these facts as well, but for the time being, it seems that this vital information has been disregarded.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, as do many of my colleagues, the fragile link that exists between environmental protection, and the concerns of industry in respect to our ailing economy. We cannot use this link however, as a means to reject a worldwide, concentrated effort aimed at curbing the outrageous amounts of carbon dioxide being emitted into our skies every day.

I am embarrassed to report, Mr. Speaker, that the United States stands alone on this issue. At a time when we have the opportunity to once again stand out as an example for the world to follow, we have descended into a pitfall, where the world can scoff at our callous actions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to rethink our Nation's environmental strategy, and realign our priorities so we can secure a clean, healthy environment for our children.

I further urge President Bush to find the time to attend the World Environmental Conference in Brazil this June. The time has come for us to handle this matter with the seriousness it deserves.

CBS SHOULD REEXAMINE ITS COMMITMENT TO FAIRNESS

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the television show "60 Minutes" ran a story about an organization that recruits and supports Democratic women candidates for elective office. The story lasted several minutes and included interviews with the organization's leaders and several candidates. It was a good story about a timely topic. There was just one problem, the fact that the Republicans have a similar organization to recruit women candidates which received a one-sentence message, no interviews, no picture, just a one-sentence mention.

Mr. Speaker, if this were an isolated incident, I would not raise it, but at CBS it is not an isolated incident. Last week on the "CBS Evening News", Dan

Rather reported that the White House was considering an election year attack on Iraq. Why did Mr. Rather feel it necessary to mention that it was an election year? What did that have to do with the story? When we were engaged in Operation Desert Storm, Mr. Rather did not say that it was a nonelection year attack.

Mr. Speaker, I believe strongly in freedom of the news media. I believe just as strongly that the media have an obligation to be fair and impartial. I would encourage CBS News to reexamine its commitment to fairness and interview the organization called The Wish List which supports Republican women candidates for higher office.

□ 1430

NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTING MUST COME TO A STOP

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

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, today at 8 a.m. Pacific standard time, the Department of Energy is scheduled to detonate another nuclear bomb in Nevada. The United States has tested 730 nuclear weapons in Nevada. Thirty of these tests released radioactive fallout into the atmosphere.

Why are we testing nuclear bombs today when we are asking other countries such as India, North Korea, Iran, and other countries to get out of the nuclear business? At a time when we are spending American taxpayer dollars to dismantle nuclear weapons in what was the Soviet Union, it is time for a new direction and new leadership in this country on this issue.

Let us not test our nuclear weapons as long as nobody else is testing theirs. There is legislation in the Congress, H.R. 3636, which imposes this kind of moratorium. It saves the taxpayers billions of dollars. It brings back sanity to the world.

Mr. Speaker, let us make today's test the last test ever of nuclear bombs in this world.

JAPANESE COMPANIES AVOID BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN TAXES THROUGH TRANSFER PRICING

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

Mr. SCHULZE. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years ago, the Oversight Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee documented that foreign corporations operating in America were avoiding paying taxes to the U.S. Government. Has anything really changed since our discovery? Probably not.

According to a March 22 article in the Sunday Times of London, the prac-

tice of using a technique called transfer pricing is also robbing the British treasury of billions. The Times reports that Japanese corporations, including Sony, Hitachi, and Toshiba, are paying little or no tax to the British Government, despite record sales.

Former Sony executives have disclosed that Sony is intentionally avoiding paying British tax. Our oversight subcommittee documented this same practice in the United States last year. While Sony paid tax at a rate of 1.4 percent of total sales in Britain, United States-based Kodak paid at a rate of 5.3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, despite having almost 2 years to eliminate transfer pricing in America and save U.S. taxpayers almost \$30 billion per year, Congress has again ignored abuse under its jurisdiction. The American taxpayers deserve better. A border adjustable uniform business tax is the solution.

SUPPORT URGED FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDING FOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

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

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to make partnerships between local governments and institutions of higher education eligible for community development block grant funding. Colleges and universities represent a great resource of information, talent, and energy and can play a great role in the development of our communities.

My bill will encourage more involvement by our colleges and universities in our cities and our communities to help expand jobs, improve our neighborhoods, and spur more community development. My bill will tap the existing resources of our colleges and universities as added partners for improvements in our cities.

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

OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO PROPOSAL FOR NAMING OF HOUSE ADMINISTRATOR

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

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely inconceivable and unthinkable to me that any single Member of the House of Representatives, be he or she a Republican or a Democrat, would support the initiative that is being publicly discussed regarding the appointment of a House administrator, somehow a new office to oversee the administration of the nonpolitical institutions that are very much a part of this great institution of Congress.

The House administrator is nothing but a political fig leaf. It is superficial. It brings to this institution no real reform.

There is an enormous erosion of confidence and credibility, not only among individual Members but within the country as it looks to the Congress of the United States, and unless we are very serious about true fundamental, bipartisan reform going to the very core of how this institution operates, then that very first important step of true bipartisan reform that will bring back and restore some of the credibility that this institution and its Members deserve will fail. A House administrator will not do it.

An inspector general, with an independent auditing and investigative function, is part of the solution, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to look for true bipartisan reform, including an independent agency or entity that has independent auditing and investigative function—the inspector general.

HELPING MIDDLE INCOME AMERICANS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. America's students no longer compete with just their fellow classmates for jobs after graduation. The world has become a global stage and students from every country now are the players. What can we do to assist our future scientists, educators, doctors, philosophers, and business men and women? The answer is not what they can do for us in years to come, but more appropriately what we can do for them now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Higher Education Act because this bill reaffirms and improves the Federal Government's commitment to the support of postsecondary education. In this bill 97 percent of the fiscal year 1992 appropriations is for student financial aid programs. This legislation expands student aid to serve students from working and middle-income families.

The bill provides: that students from middle-class families of four will be eligible for the minimum Pell grant; that home, farm, and small business equity will not be considered in determining eligibility for financial assistance; and provides greater access to guaranteed student loans by middle-class Americans regardless of family income.

Mr. Speaker, it use to be that all students regardless of their financial means could go to college. There was always a way, if there was the will. That is not the case today. However, this bill brings the dream of attending college more attainable.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this legislation. It is the very least we can do for our young people.

CONGRESS MAY MISS DEADLINE ON EDUCATIONAL REFORM BILL

(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, exactly one week from today this Congress is about to miss another deadline. This is a deadline not set by the President but a deadline set by the Congress upon itself, for last year, when we passed the 1992 appropriations bill for health and education programs, we said that if the Congress had not passed an educational reform act by April 1, we would lose \$100 million committed to begin funding from the Federal perspective educational reform in this country.

Many people are well aware that the President and the Nation's Governors in a bipartisan effort developed a set of national goals for educational reform. We in this Congress last year funded year one of that Federal commitment to educational reform. Unfortunately, the Senate has passed its educational reform bill. The Committee on Education and Labor of the House moved it out of committee weeks ago, and yet that bill has not been scheduled by the Democratic leadership here on the House floor. I say to the leadership, you have one week to do so. I encourage you to get your work done.

THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY SURVIVING POLITICAL ONSLAUGHTS

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

Mr. APPLGATE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard over the past few weeks a number of our Members who have come to the microphone and who threaten to tear this great country of ours down, tear its institutions down to serve their own political purposes, using checks and perks as the reasons.

This Nation has survived the onslaughts of people like this for over 200 years, but like the Energizer Rabbit, it just keeps going and going and going. So to those who try to impregnate the minds of the people with hate and with new concepts of government, I say there is nothing wrong with our system which has been defended by millions and millions of our veterans.

□ 1440

America's great architects drew well when they devised our plan, and American democracy will continue to live if it is allowed.

But remember this, that it is the people, not the politicians, that will make that decision, and God help us if we fail to recognize the difference.

CALVIN COLLEGE KNIGHTS: 1992 NCAA DIVISION III NATIONAL MEN'S BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1992, the Calvin College Knights completed their journey to the top by capturing the NCAA Division III men's basketball title, the first in the school's rich history. Supported by a large and loyal following, the Calvin Knights put on an awesome display of teamwork and coordination defeating the 1990 national champions to win the 1992 title. This phenomenal display of teamwork put the cap on a near perfect season and was a dream come true for the players and coaches alike.

According to their coach, appearing in the final four was the year's ultimate challenge and the Knights' intention has been to not only pursue but to capture the championship. Calvin College is an outstanding institution of higher learning and takes great pride in its well established and nationally recognized tradition of academic excellence. The players responsible for this excellent season and the capture of this national title pursue scholastic achievement as actively as they pursue athletic victories. Calvin College enjoys widespread support from the community as well as a proud and loyal alumni, and I continue to be proud of my association with this fine institution.

Mr. Speaker, each and every member of the team contributed in his own special way to successes enjoyed over the 1991-92 basketball season. It gives me great pleasure to honor each of the following players, fine coaching staff, and team managers; Matt Harrison, Mike LeFebre and Brian Westra, graduating seniors, Mark Lodewyk, Matt Rottman, player-manager, Mike Langeland, Steve Honderd, Mark Hofman, Ryan Stevens, Steve Scholler, Rob Orange, Chris Knoester, Brad Capel, Jon Vander Hill, Todd Dokter; coach: Ed Douma; assistant coaches: Gregg Afman and Jim Timmer.

Winning the championship takes hard work, determination, spirit and ability but most importantly a cooperative team effort. Putting forth their highest level of effort, the Calvin Knights succeeded in reaching the pinnacle. To quote Coach Douma "It takes lots of desire, lots of heart and outstanding players. This team is special. They had courage, desire and they knew when to rise to the occasion."

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join with me in expressing heartfelt congratulations to the 1992 NCAA Division III National Champions—the Calvin College Knights.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the University of Massachusetts basketball team. Even before their success in the NCAA regionals last week, this team has had a very exciting and successful year.

As a former teacher at the University of Massachusetts, I am very proud of our basketball team and the national recognition that this university deserves. The New York Times described the University of Massachusetts style as an "intelligent and unselfish brand of basketball." Well said.

The University of Massachusetts system has been under severe financial pressures, facing State funding cuts and dramatic increase in tuition. While the University of Massachusetts is often overshadowed by the State's world renowned universities like Harvard and MIT, they have earned their moment in the national spotlight.

The University of Massachusetts Minutemen have been a source of great pride and joy in western Massachusetts. While we in New England have experienced some difficult economic times, this past weekend, I witnessed the strength and spirit of our community. First we had University of Massachusetts' victory over Fordham and the overtime thriller against Syracuse, then we had thousands of families participating in the great city of Holyoke's St. Patrick's Day parade. Our communities have shown tremendous resilience.

Tomorrow, our Minutemen meet the University of Massachusetts alumnus Rick Pitino's Kentucky team in the Sweet 16. While we wish success to all our alumni, we are very confident that Coach Cal's Minutemen will be up to the task. "Go!, Go U!, Go UMass."

INVESTIGATE THE SAVINGS AND LOAN SCANDAL IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop the juvenile nonsense focusing on perks. I think this Congress should refuse to cooperate with the trivializing of Congress. I think there is a banking scandal in Washington, and the American people should be focused on the real banking scandal.

Mr. Speaker, \$25 billion more has been proposed for the S&L bailout, \$25 billion more, on top of what has already been appropriated. The most conservative estimate says that the American taxpayers will have to cough up

\$500 billion to pay for the savings and loan bailout before it is over.

This is the scandal we should focus on. Mr. Speaker, you should appoint immediately a select committee to investigate the administration of the Resolution Trust Corporation and to investigate the Justice Department's lack of prosecution of those who are guilty of conspiracy and theft of S&L association funds.

Mr. Speaker, this is the real scandal. This is what the American taxpayers have to pay for. No matter whose son is involved, the investigation should go forward.

We have failed to do our duty, and therefore we have become the defendants. The real crooks are free. Congress never let the voters see what true justice should be. Let us investigate the real banking scandal here in Washington.

OVERRIDE PRESIDENT'S VETO ON H.R. 4210

(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, the President has vetoed H.R. 4210, the Middle Income Tax Relief and Economic Growth Incentive Act. By vetoing H.R. 4210, the President has vetoed liberalized rules for equipment depreciation that will help businesses modernize and give a boost to our manufacturing industry;

The President has vetoed a more progressive capital gains system that will promote long term, steady investment and investment in new small businesses;

The President has vetoed restoration of the passive loss deduction for real estate professionals, which would have given a shot in the arm to our sagging real estate industry;

The President has vetoed low-income housing credits which would have provided people with better housing and help spur a new construction boom;

The President has vetoed deductions on student loan interest and tax free employer provided continuing education;

The President has vetoed relief from the high cost of health insurance for millions of self-employed Americans; and,

The President has vetoed employer provided mass transit subsidies which would have made our highways less crowded and our air cleaner.

In short, the President has vetoed the very measures we need to invest in our people and our infrastructure, and to get this economy moving again.

The President said he vetoed this bill because it included a tax increase. Frankly, I see nothing wrong with making the ultrarich, people with incomes in excess of \$1 million or assets

in excess of \$15 million, pay their fare share. After all, they were ones who benefited the most during the Reagan-Bush years.

The Congressional Budget Office found that the richest seven-tenths of 1 percent of all families enjoyed 75 percent of the growth which occurred in the 1980's.

The 1980's were a decade of tax cuts, but whose taxes were cut? The tax burden for those earning \$1 million a year fell by almost 50 percent, while the burden rose for the middle 60 percent of all taxpayers.

H.R. 4210 is an economic growth package for all Americans, and if it has to be paid for with a slight increase on the ultrawealthy, so be it. I urge my colleagues to support the override of the President's veto.

HEALTH CARE COVERAGE SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO ALL FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

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

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the country is gripped with anxieties over the high cost of health care for their families and their loved ones. Congress has embarked on aggressive studies of the situation.

Many of us held town hall meetings in our districts to try to bring our constituencies to understand the enormity of this problem. In the course of reviewing the problem and understanding the scope of 37 million Americans not being covered by any insurance whatsoever, I have encountered an imminent problem that this Congress and this Federal Government could solve immediately, and that is to provide adequate coverage for our Federal employees.

I am told by the Office of Personnel Services that there are probably over one-quarter million Americans who now work for the Federal Government who, because of the nature of their services or the length of their services, do not meet the requirement of continuous service for 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, this is an anomaly. I have investigated this in my own district. I find that some of my Park Service employees are dropped off one day each year just to avoid coverage by their medical plan.

So if the Federal Government is really serious about doing something about more coverage or extending coverage of health care to citizens in this country, we ought to take care of our own. The people who work for the Federal Government are entitled to this coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill asking for the committees to review this and find a way in which coverage can be extended to everyone who works for the Federal Government.

□ 1450

GAG RULE GUIDELINES ARE NO CHANGE

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Members should know that the gag rule—a regulation that utilizes information control and imposes censorship on the medical profession—is essentially unchanged from its prior form and will become final in 60 days. Friday's announcement starts the clock running toward total cutoff of funding for family planning clinics to the detriment of maternal and child health all across America and particularly in areas of poverty where it is needed most.

Under this gag rule, trained medical personnel will not be able to discuss options with patients who ask. In rural areas where the nearest doctor is hundreds of miles away this means no information will be provided. Under the gag rule, patients will still be given a weighted list of providers who won't tell the woman about abortion—this means that even if they know their options they won't be referred to anyone who can help them with this decision. Indeed, under this gag rule, even doctors can't fully discuss options with women.

The approach of the gag rule is simply un-American—it destroys the bond of faith between the governed and the Government that must exist in a democracy. Congress must legislate an end to this travesty.

NO MORE CHAUFFEUR-DRIVEN LIMOUSINES

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in this city of excesses, I think the citizens should note that there is one thing that we do not have an excessive amount of, and that is police protection.

Washington, DC, is one of the most violent cities in America, 3 murders a day, 10 shootings a day.

My colleagues can imagine my surprise when, because of a lack of policemen on the streets, we have so much crime, that up to two policemen from the Capitol Hill Police Force have been assigned the job of driving the whips around for the past 10 years at a time when there are not enough people on the street to protect the citizens, the people who pay our salaries.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues can imagine my further surprise when I found out that the driver for one of the whips, the minority whip, made \$60,000 last year, which is more than the state-wide elected officials in my home State of Mississippi make.

That is an excess. That has got to change. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are tightening our belts, when we have to live within our means, when we are unfortunately getting budgets from the President that are \$400 billion in the red, it is time to start right here.

I commend the Speaker for what he has done on making the House gym pay for itself, on making the Members pay for their prescription drugs. Let us take it a step further. Let us end the 10-year-old practice of the whips being provided chauffeur-driven limousines.

AN ISSUE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, to those who have taken the floor today during 1 minute who want to act as apologists and defenders of the status quo, to those who apparently still do not get it why the American people are up in arms over the flagrant abuse of privilege at the House bank and outraged at the spoils system operated by the patronage employees of the House Democratic leadership, let me simply say, this is an issue of accountability.

Without accountability, without the trust of our constituents, we have nothing. We lack the popular mandate necessary to govern and to deal with the very difficult and seemingly intractable issues confronting us as a country and as a legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartened by the news today that the winds of change are blowing, that reform efforts, bipartisan reform efforts are now under way that will embrace the concept of an outside independent oversight authority for Congress with auditing and investigative powers.

I am also heartened to hear the news that the Speaker today apparently has announced that he does want to move forward with a bipartisan task force, a work group to look at various congressional reform proposals floating around.

This is a good step, a very positive step, a healthy sign, the first one here in a couple of weeks time that we are serious about restoring public confidence and trust in this body.

TAX FAIRNESS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ACCELERATION ACT OF 1992—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on 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.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 1 hour. Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield time to other Members.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending veto message.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the frustration of the American taxpayer that we are here today trying to override the President's veto of a middle-class tax relief bill—the result of which we can all predict.

But I want to emphasize that Congress did the job we were asked to do in legislating a comprehensive, fair, and fiscally responsible package to stimulate the economy.

On January 28, the President challenged the Congress in his State of the Union Address, to send him an economic growth package in only 52 days, a great challenge in a very short time frame. Through much hard work, long hours, and compromise, Congress met the challenge—and sent him the bill in record time—not only on time, but on target.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the President chose to veto the bill and attack the Congress for not producing an economic growth package exactly as he proposed it.

The President called for an economic growth package that contained seven items—the Congress gave him six, including his long-time passion, a reduction in the capital gains tax. But meeting the President more than half way was not good enough. He vetoed the bill anyway—a bill that would have cut taxes for 78 million families and paid for that by raising tax rates on the richest 1 percent of our citizens—about 1 million of the most fortunate among us, including 60,000 millionaires.

What's the real problem here? Is it that the President didn't get everything he wanted? Or is it that we gave him too much? Congress is not a parliament—it is a coequal branch of government—with every right to modify proposals of the President. No—the

problem here is that the President and his Republican supporters did not expect us to make it—with their silly, macho deadlines. But the real problem is that the President and his Republican supporters do not want to pay for their bill, except with accounting gimmicks, and blue smoke and mirrors. That is what this veto is really all about.

Why did the President propose postponing the middle-class tax cut to a "second tax bill, later this year?" Simply because he did not want to pay for it. And we wonder why the American people are cynical about their Government and angry with incumbents.

I have just completed a tough, but successful primary myself, where I heard loudly and clearly from my constituents that they are sick and tired of political gamesmanship in Washington. They are tired of being used as political pawns.

Ask the American people whether they want Congress to write revenue-losing legislation against an empty Treasury the way the President proposes. The President's call for an economic program but his refusal to pay for it is the height of cynicism and political opportunism.

The President accuses the Democrats of class warfare. In fact, the Republicans won the class war that was waged for the past dozen years—and the middle class lost. The Democrats are now fighting back effectively, so the President and the Republicans want a truce.

Mr. Speaker, ask the millions of struggling working Americans who are trying to pay their bills and make ends meet in the midst of the current recession whether they think the President should have protected the rich through this callous veto. Ask the millions of middle-class American families, who bear the greatest burden of funding this Government, whether the President was politically correct by vetoing their tax cut.

The President says he is vetoing this bill because it contains tax increases and it does. But so does his own budget; it contains \$27 billion in tax increases—increased taxes on millions of firemen, policemen, teachers, Government workers, annuitants, and credit unions. The President should read his own budget before criticizing the Congress for raising taxes.

The President says he wants to get the Government off people's backs. Yet his budget calls for new reporting requirements for millions of people who donate to charities.

The President says he wants to freeze Federal regulations—but who has been writing those regulations for the last 12 years if not the Reagan and Bush administrations?

The President criticizes the Democrats for being too modest on the revenue-losing side. He does not think we

have cut capital gains enough. We did not provide a home buyer's credit. We have a 10-percent investment allowance rather than the 15 percent he recommended. In short, he wants us to spend more and tax less. He apparently wants us to forget about the record budget deficits confronting the Nation—\$400 billion by his own estimates—and just let the good times roll. But that is not an option. We are not about to abandon fiscal responsibility. We are not going to continue the borrow and spend policies of successive Republican administrations over the last 12 years. But that is not even the core of our disagreement. The real issue is tax fairness.

In a political war, truth is often the first casualty. The President's shrill attack against Democrats last week was nothing less than a declaration of political war against the Congress. His veto demonstrates a gross unwillingness to govern.

Will there be a second tax bill after this veto is sustained? That will be up to the President and the congressional leadership. But it is not going to be easy. While there is much similarity between the revenue-losing provisions proposed by the President and by Congress—such things as the extenders, passive loss rules, and tax simplification—there is not enough revenue on the table to finance even this limited agenda.

There is only \$2.5 billion in revenue common to the President's budget and this vetoed bill—\$2.5 billion, raised generally by the antidouble-dipping rules for savings and loans and market rules for security dealers.

The President has rejected our \$78 billion conference report, and we have rejected his \$27 billion of new taxes on firemen, policemen, and teachers. There is only \$2.5 billion left that's common between us, and that will not go very far to finance a second tax bill.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have little doubt that this veto will be sustained. I am saddened that the White House has refused to carry through on its own challenge to this Congress. But I am more saddened by our inability to govern in the country's best interest.

Until we dedicate ourselves more to governing and less to politics, the frustration—both within Congress and throughout America—will continue to grow.

Voters and their representatives share a sense that something is fundamentally wrong in the country today. We feel guilty about leaving a future for our children that is mortgaged to foreign investors and that will restrict the next generation's horizons. But that is the result of actions already taken—irresponsibly allowing the deficit to balloon to \$400 billion—and actions already avoided—allowing our competitiveness to deteriorate in international markets.

Our political failings in Washington—at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue—are failures of candor and courage. We need more straight talk—and we need a few national priorities and commitments to replace the thousand points of light designed to minimize our problems by bathing them in the soft glow of voluntarism.

Mr. Speaker, we know what the problems are that confront the country, and we know what needs to be done. The question is whether we have the courage to level with our constituents and tell them the truth.

History teaches us that the American people can accept the truth and will endure sacrifice if they are convinced it will yield a broad positive result for the country.

We are approaching gridlock and a political dead end. Honesty is the only way out. It is time to bring the curtain down on the high political theater and begin to govern in our people's best interest.

□ 1500

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let us frame this issue today in very simple terms. A vote to override the President's veto is a vote to cut Medicare benefits by \$5.2 billion in 1994. That is the official estimate of the Congressional Budget Office.

CBO says that H.R. 4210 would increase the Federal deficit by \$6.3 billion in 1994. That means a sequester under the budget laws—and the law is very specific on where those cuts are made; \$5.2 billion would be cut from benefits of sick elderly people.

Another \$1.1 billion would be cut from other programs such as veterans education and housing programs, rehabilitation and research for the handicapped, AFDC work programs, block grants for child care, and other programs Democrats claim to support.

Senior citizens, and all those who benefit from the programs I've just mentioned ought to thank President Bush for vetoing this bill.

Those who would vote to override should think twice before walking the plank for the Democrat leadership still once again.

Democrats claim to care about middle income Americans and try to demonstrate that care by providing some families with an 81 cents a day tax cut. All in the name of fairness. But millions of middle income families won't receive any tax cut at all. Many families will receive tax increases instead.

None of the benefit goes to senior citizens who are living on their Social Security benefits and savings—the same senior citizens whose health care benefits the Democrat leadership wants to cut.

Members who vote to override the veto ought to try that concept of fair-

ness out on the residents of nursing homes in their districts.

They get no tax relief under the Democrats' bill, and Democrats would cut their health care benefits to finance token election year tax reductions for other families. I am glad I am not going to have to explain that vote to the elderly in my district. Truth in legislation should require an explanation from the Democrats.

In addition to cutting Medicare, H.R. 4210 raises taxes on some American families by \$78 billion—again under the guise of fairness—to spend money on token election year tax cuts for some other families.

Tax and spend. Tax and spend. It is a broken record that speaks volumes about the inability of Democrats to deal with the Federal deficit and the economy.

But Democrats are not hitting the wealthy with their tax and spend policies. They're also hitting people who are already down and who don't need more bad news from Washington.

A laid-off worker who is living on his unemployment benefits—which are taxable—gets no tax relief.

What he does get is a kick in the teeth when he looks for work. The Democrat bill would more than double the number of miles he has to move to find a new job before he can deduct his family's moving expenses. That is fairness? No, it is a tax increase on the unemployed.

The truth of the matter is that fairness is just a bogus argument Democrat leaders are using to justify class warfare and the politics of envy.

It's pretty pathetic to see how the Democrat leadership has forced their members of the Ways and Means Committee to in effect repudiate what they used to view as their crowning achievement—the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

Taking 6 million Americans off the tax rolls, forcing taxpayers to realize more taxable income by eliminating tax shelters and reducing deductions, requiring upper income families to pay a larger share of the tax burden.

Those were all part of the Democrats' grand scheme to shift the tax burden in 1986—changes for which they were eager to take credit. Did they fail? No; of course not.

They claimed tax reform was a magnificent success—so much so that they changed the name of the Internal Revenue Code itself to mark their achievement.

Income redistribution is what Democrats set out to accomplish in the 1986 act—and it worked just as they intended it to.

That's as clear as a spring morning in Texas if you'll look at what's happened since 1986. But the Democrat leadership doesn't want to do that. It doesn't suit their current political needs. Instead, they reach all the way back to Carter administration statis-

tics to create a phony justification for more tax and spend initiatives.

The Democrat leaders in Congress are scrambling around for an election year issue—and that apparently means trashing the 1986 Tax Reform Act their members used to claim credit for.

It's ironic. Those of us who led the opposition to the 1986 act would now likely find ourselves in the majority if a vote were taken on it again today.

Maybe it's time that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle started to question the direction their leadership is taking them. Saying "no" by voting against this override attempt is a good place to start. We all know the override is going to fail.

The Democrat leadership's effort to create class warfare is going to be repudiated. Their bill's callous disregard for senior citizens' health care benefits is going to haunt those who vote against the President's veto. I say to my Democrat colleagues: Don't listen to your leadership. Do the right and the smart thing. Vote "no" on this override.

□ 1510

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide some context to today's debate, I would like to start with a quote from an obviously partisan source:

The Democratic Party deplores the increasing concentration of economic power in fewer and fewer hands * * *. The last ten years have seen a massive shift in the tax burden from the rich to the working people of America * * *. The cost of government must be distributed more fairly among income classes. We reaffirm the long-established principle of progressive taxation—allocating the burden according to ability to pay—which is all but a dead letter in the present tax code.

No, Mr. Speaker, this quote did not come from the current Speaker of the House or even the majority leader. It came from the Democrat National Platform adopted in Miami, FL, on July 11, 1972.

What is most interesting about this quote is that it shows how little the Democrat Party has changed in the past 20 years. The Democrats were railing against the unfair tax cuts for the rich even when the top rate was 70 percent.

Ironically, the Wall Street Journal reported last week that the British Labor Party is also seeking an increase in the top income tax rate. In Britain the current top rate is 40 percent, the Labor Party wants to raise it to 50 percent.

The fact that the liberal party on both sides of the Atlantic are calling for a redistribution of income doesn't represent a consistent economic policy, but rather a blind commitment to a bankrupt ideology.

As syndicated columnist Joseph Sobran has observed:

Conservatives have adopted various economic and pragmatic strategies for coping with redistributionism. One of the most publicized has been the "supply-side" approach. But supply-siders made the mistake of thinking they were dealing with economists rather than ideologues. They were arguing that the goose, given a little more latitude, would lay more golden eggs. But the liberals didn't want the golden eggs, they wanted the goose.

Only an ideolog would argue that the rich aren't paying their fair share regardless of whether the tax rate is 31, or 40 percent, or 70 percent.

The two tax bills recently passed by the Democrats in the House and Senate are designed to reverse the supply-side policies of the 1980's. As one member of the Democratic leadership likes to say, Americans are tired of waiting for the trickle down, they need some bubble up economics. He suggest that by cutting taxes on the middle class, they will spend the money and it will bubble up through the economy creating jobs and economic growth. However, by raising taxes on the rich, these Democrats will actually do more harm than good.

About 60 percent of adjusted gross income in excess of \$200,000 is investment income; and income in excess of \$1 million is almost all investment income. Raising taxes on investment. Higher taxes on investment means less investment and less economic growth. Despite what the Democrats would like everyone to believe, the wages of working Americans are closely tied to the amount of capital in the economy. In fact, 98 percent of the variation in wages can be explained by the capital-to-labor ratio. For every 10-percent increase in the average amount of capital per worker, the real wage rate increases by 2 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we must sustain the President's veto of this bankrupt economic policy.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, after 20 months of recession our economy is still ailing, and this bill is just what the doctor ordered. It fortifies our economy by strengthening its very fiber, the middle class, in a variety of ways. Our people need the tax credits for workers and children, expanded access to IRA's, and targeted capital gains tax cuts this bill offers them.

This bill also treats the symptoms of the business community with an investment tax allowance, enterprise zones and passive-loss relief, an extension of the health-insurance deduction for the self-employed and other job-creating tax provisions, and a healthy dose of tax simplification as well.

The President claims this bill is not good medicine, that it is just a tax increase and the doctor should skip the house call. He is right about the tax increase, but only if you happen to be

rich. If you are among 78 million middle-class families still waiting for trickle down to reach you, it is not a tax increase; it's a good shot of fairness and a long-term cure for your economic ills.

Mr. Speaker, let us start the program for economic recovery right now. Let us override this veto unanimously.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 8 years I will not vote to override a Presidential veto. It is not because I think the President is right on the issue. I believe the Democrat Party is not right on the issue.

American workers are disgusted. My district has lost more jobs than anybody else's. And the bottom line is simply this: An 80-cent token election day tax cut is not what the American workers want.

□ 1520

They want an opportunity for a job and a paycheck at the end of that 5-day workweek, and it is not there, because I say our trade and tax policies are un-American.

Tell me, how can an American family enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness if they have to move to Mexico to get a damn job?

I say our policies, including the Democrat side of the aisle, will do nothing more than to ship jobs overseas. No one is dealing with these issues.

So I am not here today to sustain the President's veto simply because I support the President, but I was not sent down here to agitate the President and to play election day politics either, and I do not see our Democrat plan being good for this country, period, and I am not going to vote to override that veto and to put in place another law that we seem to have every year that continues to send jobs overseas.

So I appreciate the time, and I hope that Members of this Congress will stand up and look for an incentivized Tax Code that will keep jobs in America, keep some Americans working.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of overriding the veto of H.R. 4210, the Middle Income Tax Relief and Economic Growth Incentives Act of 1992. I deeply regret that the Congress and the administration have not been able to reach agreement on this important tax legislation. I believe that this is an acceptable bill. It contains many important provisions which the administration and members of both parties have agreed ought to be adopted. For example, the taxpayer bill of rights ought to move forward so that we can give some protection and relief to thousands of honest taxpayers all across the country. The research and

development tax credit needs to be extended, as do several other expiring tax provisions, including the low- and moderate-income housing credits. The super IRA provisions will help millions of American families if we can get them enacted. The bill contains capital gains tax provisions that will encourage savings and investment which we need to get the economy going again. And, the passive-loss relief in the bill would provide some measure of equity for people in the real estate business.

These are all things that the country needs, but which are caught up in the legislative gridlock that is paralyzing our Federal Government. We cannot continue in this manner. We need to reach some agreement on how to accomplish these important tasks.

Fundamentally, we must agree on how to pay for the Government that the public demands and deserves. The administration must do more than veto this bill, it should propose a way that it would pay for the things we all recognize must be done, either through tax increases, spending cuts, or a combination of the two. We in Congress have offered our proposal. If the administration doesn't support this approval, it should suggest an alternative.

It seems to me, that the administration is taking the position that there can be no new revenue from the income tax system. However, if we are ever going to enact the many important provisions in this tax bill, we will need new revenues. If we cannot reach agreement on how to get these revenues, then the American public will never receive the benefit of these important provisions. This is disturbing. I am afraid that the administration is going to force the country to turn to some other type of broad-based tax. This will, in my opinion, make the adoption of a value added tax inevitable. This is just another glorified national sales tax. For those who support a progressive tax system, in which all Americans pay their fair share, such a result is deeply troubling. I would hope that before we go any further down this road, we can find a way for all parties to work together constructively to solve these difficult problems.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHULZE].

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

I might say to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, if he believes all these flatter taxes lack progressivity, I would be happy to sit down with the gentleman, because there are methods of keeping a degree of progressivity and yet simplifying our Tax Code, and we should go in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the veto override attempt.

In his State of the Union Address, President Bush called on the Congress

to send him a bill he could sign that would stimulate economic growth. Instead, you Democrats chose to send him a bill you knew he would not sign. As one former great leader of the free world once said "there you go again."

There you go again playing politics instead of working with the President to put Americans back to work.

There you Democrats go again, pitting the rich against the poor and playing on the heartstrings of the press rather than doing your job.

There you go again, tax and spend, spend and tax.

Well, let me tell you something. Mr. Speaker, your \$70 billion tax increase is not playing in Peoria. It is not playing in Pittsburgh—you know you are in trouble because it is not even playing inside the beltway.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have announced my retirement, and seven other members of the Ways and Means Committee will not be returning in the 103d Congress. After 16 years of trying to rein in Federal spending and to reduce the tax burden on American taxpayers, Congress is back to square one.

The President has called for tax reductions to be financed through spending reductions. You Democrats insist on resorting to tax increases.

There you go again, Mr. Speaker. Will you ever learn? Vote "no."

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Abbott and Costello routine, some of you may have seen it, where Bud Abbott says to Lou Costello, "Lou, if you had 50 bucks in one pocket and \$75 in the other, what would you have?"

And Costello says, "Somebody else's pants."

That is what has been going on for 12 years. Money has been going into the pockets of the wealthy and out of the pockets of middle-class families.

Mr. Speaker, with his veto of the tax cut bill the President has abandoned the middle-class families, and it was not the first time. He has used that veto 25 times.

Unemployment benefits. Veto.

Family and medical leave. Veto.

Mr. Speaker, 25 times. He would rather do nothing than give middle-class families a tax break, paid for by the wealthy. We are not talking about average people here. We are talking about a surtax on millionaires. We are talking about couples who make \$140,000 a year or more to share in the burden of getting this country moving again.

The President would rather do nothing than give middle-class families an IRA.

He would rather do nothing than pass a growth package that could get out of this Republican recession that has been going on for 2 years.

His motto is: "Don't do something, stand there."

Yesterday, a Republican Member of the other body called the middle-class tax bill trash.

Well, \$600 is not trash. Helping kids pay their tuition is not trash. Paying the mortgage is not trash.

Mr. Speaker, the President is out of touch. They do not get it at the White House.

We know we are not going to override today, and perhaps the President and his party will try to delude themselves for a moment that they have won this great big victory.

After all, in our system of government all you need is one-third, plus one, a third of that side of the aisle in this body or the other body, plus one, and they can shut it down. A third of this House, one-third of the Senate, that is all you need to block, all you need to do is to do nothing.

But Mr. Speaker, the country has lost. And they still want to know, where is the President's plan, for jobs, for fairness?

The President is up to his old tricks. He is up to trickle-down theories where you give a lot at the top and somehow it is going to filter its way down. He wants to protect his wealthy friends.

He needs to forget about the country club crowd, and start thinking about the country.

Vote to override.

□ 1530

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our respected leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for my tardy entrance to the Hall here, but I have a few other issues that are pending, hopefully to be taken up later, maybe today or tomorrow.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of sustaining the President's veto. We have heard all the usual arguments. So just let me tell you why this particular debate had to take place here today.

America is a victim of divided government. Very simply, the Democratic Party controls the legislative branch and the Republicans control the executive branch. We are divided not only by party but by opposing divisions of the functions, the limits and the dangers of big government.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, are guided by a 60-year-old vision of the Federal Government as the benevolent big daddy of the American economy. That vision, quite frankly, is reflected in this bill, with its silly argument that a few hundred dollars tax cut for some Americans is worth the price of a gigantic tax increase.

Even if that argument were theoretically true, it has rather become irrele-

vant. The big-daddy Democrat tax increase plan is a case of too much, too late.

Furthermore, to my friends on the Democratic side, you do not pay for this tax bill on a year-by-year basis. According to the Congressional Budget Office, this tax bill would cause a \$5.2 billion sequester in the Medicare Program in 1994.

Believe me, the American people are wise to big-daddy economics. As a matter of fact, a poll taken by Time magazine and CNN shows that 77 percent of those polled believe a tax cut like this one is an election year gimmick. A CNN/New York Times poll reports that 83 percent say a tax cut like this will make no difference or have "small effect" in ending the recession.

The President and the Republican Party, on the other hand, are guided by a vision of the free market as the main source of job building in our country, and, yes, Republicans are willing to use Government to nudge the economy in the right direction at certain times, but we do so with proper caution, with respect for the power of freedom and of economic choice.

The Democratic majority dismisses our view by saying Republicans lack fairness in not wanting to have a tax increase.

After all, they tell us, our present Tax Code is just awful for families; it needs some drastic changes.

But whose Tax Code is it, anyway, that we are talking about here? My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, told us on September 25, 1986, that H.R. 3838, the Tax Reform Act of 1986, was "remarkable, the broadest tax bill ever written." He spoke glowingly of his tax bill's "promise of fairness to working families." Those are direct quotes.

Now we are told it is all Ronald Reagan's fault. But what were all of these Democrats doing when tax laws were being rewritten in 1986? Hibernating?

You controlled the Committee on Ways and Means back in 1986. As a matter of fact, let us go back 30 years; you controlled it in 1956 and every year in between. The very same people who are now telling us that this tax raise is good for all Americans were telling us that they had written a utopian tax bill for families just 6 years ago.

Now they are telling us to forget what they said then.

Mr. Speaker, that is not governing, that is just big-daddy economics, selective amnesia combined with defective tax policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the President's veto of this measure by voting to sustain the President's position.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let us quickly analyze what it is that the President vetoed. For the majority of Americans, a tax cut; for the majority of Americans, a tax cut.

To pay for it? The 1-percent wealthiest in this country got a tax increase. Did the President say he vetoed a tax cut? He said: "No, I vetoed a tax increase."

So, the 99 percent of America who benefited, they got cut out of the debate. For the 1 percent who would have had to pay a little bit more during the 1980's, they paid not their fair share but got a real free ride, the President protected them instead of the 99 percent. A family of four earning \$35,000 a year would have seen a 25-percent cut in their personal income tax if he had not vetoed this bill.

We would have seen the President take this first steps toward relieving this Republican recession we are now in if he had not vetoed this bill. The deficit would have been reduced by \$13 billion in the next 5 years if he had not vetoed this bill.

His bill, the one he talked about here, right here on this platform during the State of the Union, would have increased the deficit by \$30 billion.

And finally, all during the time that he is standing here telling us how much fairness he wants, he is building a nine-hole golf course in Kennebunkport with public funds. If that is what you think is what the President's fairness is, then I think, Mr. Speaker, the people on the other side have another thing coming.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCEWEN].

Mr. MCEWEN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak, but I heard an earlier speaker shedding crocodile tears about the individual retirement accounts, the IRA's. I voted for the IRA's in 1981, in July when we passed that legislation, and every Democrat on this side of the aisle and every Democratic member of the Committee on Ways and Means opposed it.

They were opposed to it then, and have been opposed to it ever since.

We instituted the individual retirement accounts for working Americans; savings began to prosper and people began to put things away for their retirement years.

Democrats have whittled that away time after time until, as we stand here now 10 years later, only 1 person in 5—I had 2 people in my office yesterday who explained to me that they could not participate in an IRA because their wife, who worked part time, had a small, very, very small retirement association at her work. Since she had that, they have written the regulations

and the law such that IRA's do not apply. Individual retirement accounts are not available to four out of five Americans.

So, when they stand up here and talk about individual retirement accounts, it was a Republican idea that was instituted under Ronald Reagan, which has been stolen in recent years by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The conversation today has been about fairness. I asked, when the bill came before our Committee on Rules, as to what was fair? They always talked about fairness for the rich, fairness, carrying their fair share.

I asked them what is their fair share? Let us hear about fairness, what is it? After five attempts, the record will show, there was no response.

Let us talk about the facts: In 1981, the top 1 percent of earning Americans paid 18 percent of all of the income taxes in America. The top 1 percent paid 18.

Why did they not pay more than that? Because taxes were so high that if you risked your income and you lost it, then you were just out of luck. But if you won, Uncle Sam would immediately take 70 cents out of every dollar, local and State taxes would take 12 cents, and conceivably, possibly, maybe you would have 9 cents to 12 left.

So, people did not risk.

As we lowered the rates, people began to risk once again; the stock market that was at 700 began to jump to 1,000, to 2,000, to 3,000. As capital came back into the financial markets and people began to risk again, until now today as we stand here the top 1 percent pays not the 18 percent of the burden that they did 10 years ago, their fair share; they do not pay 18 percent of the burden anymore, they pay 28 percent of all the income taxes paid in America. Why? Not because the rates are no longer confiscatory, that they are willing to risk, because if they hit, they get to keep half of it and as a result they are doing it and creating jobs and bearing a greater percentage of the burden.

Now, when they talk about fair share, their fair share is this: They want the top 1 percent to pay less again. They were paying 18, they went up to 20, to 22, to 24, to 26, and now they are paying 28 percent now. They want to increase the rates on the rich. Why? For demagogic purposes, for socialistic purposes, not to have them pay more, because with the higher tax rate they will pay less and that burden will go back on the poor and on the middle class and thus they are willing to absorb that in order to have the political rhetoric of saying, "We increased taxes on the productive because it is that they have not paid their fair share."

I close as I began: Will someone please identify for me what is their fair

share? If 18 percent was fair, when we cut rates, they are now paying 28 and you want to increase rates again and that will drive down their fair share from 28 percent of all the burden of carrying, they will go back to 25, 24, 22, and to 20.

□ 1540

Why? I ask my colleagues why.

For political, demagogic, socialistic, left-wing, ideological campaign purposes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I voted against raising taxes last month, I voted against raising taxes last week, and I will vote against raising taxes today.

Americans do not need a few extra cents a day; they need jobs. Two-thirds of those needed jobs will come from small businesses, but only if those businesses are able to compete and grow in a healthy economy.

The Democratic bill raises taxes on the over 90 percent of small businesses who file individual returns. Higher taxes will stifle growth in these businesses and kill job creation.

I want Congress to pass economic growth incentives. I want to pass legislation that cuts the capital gains tax and stimulates investment. I want to pass legislation that helps first-time home buyers, including my own legislation to allow for penalty-free IRA withdrawals for first-time home buyers.

However, I will not support tax increases, and I will not vote for this antijob, antigrowth tax package.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the attempt to override President Bush's veto of the Democratic tax package.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a loss of memory here in the Chamber with Members that I know were here in 1986. If I remember the structure of the tax bill as it was sent to the Senate, President Reagan had requested a top rate of 35 percent. However, the House-passed bill as sent to the Senate contained a top rate of 38 percent. And, as I remember it, the House bill also would have continued to allow a deduction for passive losses, it kept a capital gains rate differential, and continued IRA benefits that President Reagan was very much in favor of, as was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was only when that bill reached the Senate and when deliberations took place there that these provisions were changed. As I remember, Mr. PACKWOOD, a representative from Oregon, a Republican, was chairman of the Finance Committee at that time, and, as I remember, Mr. DOLE was then the leader of the Senate.

What I am confused about here is the criticism of a bill that was, under at least the auspices of the prior administration, agreed to until it got to the Senate. There the rates went from the

suggested rate of 35, that President Reagan wanted, to 28 percent, and it was at that time that the IRA's went out, passive losses went out, capital gains went out, all because the rates of the very wealthy would come down to 28 percent.

Now talk about fairness. I think it is only fair, after we have seen what the consequences of that legislation are, that if the middle class is losing while the wealthy are gaining, that we redistribute a little bit of the burden on the wealthy and let some fairness reach the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I have one more request for time, and then I am concluded.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, to conclude the debate I yield the balance of our time to the majority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I think the veto by the President is simply an indication of his not listening to what the American people want in this tax recovery package. I think it shows an isolation from the experiences of average American families, and I think the veto of the middle-income tax cut is the ultimate emblem of this isolation. In dollar terms, in dollar terms, this legislation provides more middle-income tax relief than the Kemp-Roth tax bill provided over a decade ago. Equally important, it is self-financing.

All weekend the President, Chief of Staff Skinner, said, "This is a tax increase bill." What they failed to say was that it is a tax increase on families who earn \$140,000 a year and above to pay for tax relief for middle-income, hard-pressed middle-income, American families. I understand the principle here: Try to get people to believe it is a tax increase on everybody. But it is not. It is a tax increase on the very wealthy in order to do things for the middle-income people, things for business, things for individuals to invest in the future of this economy.

Mr. Speaker, we simply believe that people who have done well in the last 10 to 15 years should pay their fair share of the burden. They should pay some more taxes in order that we can get this economy to move in the right direction.

Let us remember the things that were in the bill, Mr. Speaker. When the President vetoed the bill, he vetoed individual retirement accounts. When he vetoed the bill, he vetoed capital gains, which the President has preached for and talked for 4 years now; and people like me who do not think that is the best idea for our country right now, I voted for the bill because it was capital gains for middle-income families. The President vetoed the cut in capital gains. He vetoed an investment allowance for business, and especially for

small business, the ideas that he had in his own tax bill. He vetoed research and development credits for American companies to be competitive with foreign companies. He vetoed a student loan deduction for the parents of students in college.

For the life of me I do not understand why this is not the right thing to do. It is paid for. It is paid for by people who can afford to pay for it. It helps people who need help and who have needed help in their daily lives, and it gives business—American business, especially small business—the ability to create jobs for the future. The President did not even read the bill before he vetoed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand here to say that the President must have made a political calculation that will not only damage the country, but, I think, will damage his own political prospects. He has decided to fight with the Congress, rather than work with us, to accentuate the differences, rather than lay down the groundwork for progress. Every major issue important to the reconstruction of this country could be held hostage to such a determination.

I finally believe the President underestimates this country's willingness for change, this country's appetite for changing things so that we can have the kind of economy that we want and need in this country.

So, I will proudly cast my vote to override this veto because I am casting my lot with the people who really should be benefiting from the enactment of this legislation, the average, hard-working, hard-pressed American families who contribute so much to this country and ask for so little, and I ask Members on both sides of the aisle to join with me in overriding this veto, in helping our economy move in the right direction and in helping middle-income families who have made this country great.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush and the Republicans showed the American people exactly where their priorities lay, with the richest people against the interests of average, middle class Americans.

All they talk about is the 1 million Americans that would pay more taxes as a result of this fairness and growth legislation. What about the 78 million families that would get a tax cut? They say nothing about those middle class families that this bill targets for much-needed tax relief. The Republicans choose to ignore them, as they have in all their economic policies over the last decade.

If we override this veto, about 24,000 of the richest Wisconsinites will pay more in taxes, more of their fair share. However, over 1.7 million Wisconsin families will get a tax cut. In other words, for every 1 family that will pay more in taxes, 100 families will pay less. I call that a tax cut bill, a tax fairness bill.

Some Washington insiders scoff at the amount of the tax credit in this bill. But I've heard from many hardworking Wisconsin families who tell me that the credit is equal to a

mortgage payment. To my way of thinking, this is nothing to scoff at.

It is no longer enough to pay lip service to the needs of the middle class. They have been squeezed by higher prices and stagnant wages. Now, we must act. Support this tax cut bill, vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 215, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—211

Abercrombie	Flake	Moakley
Ackerman	Foglietta	Mollohan
Alexander	Foley	Moody
Anderson	Ford (MI)	Moran
Andrews (ME)	Frank (MA)	Murphy
Andrews (TX)	Frost	Murtha
Annunzio	Gaydos	Nagle
Anthony	Gejdenson	Natcher
Applegate	Gephardt	Neal (MA)
Aspin	Gibbons	Neal (NC)
Atkins	Glickman	Nowak
Bacchus	Gonzalez	Oakar
Bennett	Gordon	Oberstar
Berman	Guarini	Obey
Bevill	Hall (OH)	Olver
Bilbray	Harris	Ortiz
Blackwell	Hatcher	Owens (NY)
Bonior	Hayes (IL)	Panetta
Borski	Hefner	Pastor
Boucher	Hertel	Payne (NJ)
Boxer	Hoagland	Payne (VA)
Brewster	Hochbrueckner	Pease
Brooks	Horn	Pelosi
Browder	Hoyer	Perkins
Brown	Hubbard	Pickle
Bruce	Huckaby	Poshard
Bryant	Jacobs	Price
Bustamante	Jefferson	Rahall
Campbell (CO)	Jenkins	Rangel
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Chapman	Johnston	Richardson
Clay	Jones (NC)	Rose
Clement	Jontz	Rostenkowski
Coleman (TX)	Kanjorski	Rowland
Collins (IL)	Kaptur	Roybal
Collins (MI)	Kennedy	Sabo
Conyers	Kennelly	Sanders
Cox (IL)	Kildee	Sangmeister
Coyne	Kleczka	Savage
Cramer	Kolter	Sawyer
Darden	Kopetski	Scheuer
de la Garza	Kostmayer	Schroeder
DeFazio	LaFalce	Schumer
DeLauro	Lantos	Serrano
Dellums	LaRocco	Sharp
Derrick	Laughlin	Sikorski
Dicks	Lehman (FL)	Skaggs
Dingell	Levin (MI)	Slaughter
Dixon	Lewis (GA)	Smith (FL)
Donnelly	Lipinski	Smith (IA)
Dooley	Lowe (NY)	Snowe
Dorgan (ND)	Manton	Solarz
Downey	Markey	Spratt
Durbin	Martinez	Staggers
Dymally	Matsui	Stokes
Eckart	Mavroules	Studds
Edwards (CA)	Mazzoli	Swift
Edwards (TX)	McCloskey	Synar
Engel	McDermott	Tallon
Erdreich	McHugh	Tanner
Espy	McNulty	Thornton
Evans	Mfume	Torres
Fascell	Miller (CA)	Torricelli
Fazio	Mineta	Towns
Feighan	Mink	Traxler

Unsold
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington

Waters
Waxman
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise

Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NAYS—215

Allard	Hancock	Penny
Allen	Hansen	Peterson (MN)
Andrews (NJ)	Hastert	Petri
Archer	Hayes (LA)	Pickett
Army	Hefley	Porter
Baker	Henry	Pursell
Ballenger	Herger	Quillen
Barnard	Hobson	Ramstad
Barrett	Holloway	Ravenel
Barton	Hopkins	Ray
Bateman	Horton	Regula
Bellenson	Houghton	Rhodes
Bentley	Hughes	Ridge
Beruter	Hunter	Riggs
Billrakis	Hutto	Rinaldo
Billie	Hyde	Ritter
Boehlert	Inhofe	Roberts
Boehner	Ireland	Roe
Broomfield	James	Roemer
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Rogers
Burton	Johnson (TX)	Rohrabacher
Byron	Jones (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Callahan	Kasich	Roth
Camp	Klug	Roukema
Campbell (CA)	Kolbe	Russo
Carper	Kyl	Santorum
Carr	Lagomarsino	Sarpaluis
Chandler	Lancaster	Saxton
Chlinger	Leach	Schaefer
Coble	Lehman (CA)	Schiff
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Schulze
Combest	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Condit	Lewis (FL)	Shaw
Cooper	Lightfoot	Shays
Coughlin	Livingston	Shuster
Cox (CA)	Lloyd	Siskiy
Crane	Long	Skeen
Cunningham	Lowery (CA)	Skelton
Davis	Luken	Slattery
DeLay	Machtley	Smith (NJ)
Dickinson	Marlenee	Smith (OR)
Doolittle	Martin	Smith (TX)
Dornan (CA)	McCandless	Solomon
Dreier	McCormack	Spence
Duncan	McCrery	Stallings
Dwyer	McCurdy	Stark
Early	McDade	Stearns
Edwards (OK)	McEwen	Stenholm
Emerson	McGrath	Stump
English	McMillan (NC)	Sundquist
Ewing	McMillen (MD)	Sweet
Fawell	Meyers	Tauzin
Fields	Michel	Taylor (MS)
Fish	Miller (OH)	Taylor (NC)
Franks (CT)	Mollinari	Thomas (CA)
Galleghy	Montgomery	Thomas (GA)
Gallo	Moorhead	Thomas (WY)
Gekas	Morella	Traficant
Geren	Morrison	Upton
Gilchrest	Mrazek	Vander Jagt
Gillmor	Myers	Vucanovich
Gilman	Nichols	Walker
Gingrich	Nussle	Walsh
Goodling	Olin	Weber
Goss	Orton	Weldon
Gradison	Owens (UT)	Wolf
Grandy	Oxley	Wyllie
Green	Packard	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Pallone	Young (FL)
Hall (TX)	Parker	Zelliff
Hamilton	Patterson	Zimmer
Hammerschmidt	Paxon	

NOT VOTING—9

AuCoin	Ford (TN)	Peterson (FL)
Costello	Levine (CA)	Weiss
Dannemeyer	Miller (WA)	Whitten

□ 1610

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Peterson of Florida and Mr. Weiss for, with Mr. Miller of Washington against.

Mrs. BYRON changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, due to a family emergency I was unable to cast my vote on overriding the President's veto of the conference report to H.R. 4210, the Middle Income Family Tax Relief Act of 1992. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the override effort.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote 55. Had I been present during this vote, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 55.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader how the program will develop for the balance of the day.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I know Members want to be able to plan the rest of the day.

The intention is to bring up the request to go to conference on the campaign finance legislation. There could be a vote or two on that.

Following that, we will bring up the rule on the higher education legislation. There will probably be a vote on that rule, and then we will go into general debate and to an amendment, but we will not have a vote on an amendment.

So once the vote on the rule for higher education is finished, Members could be assured that there would not be additional votes tonight.

I would, to give an estimate, I would say all that business could probably be transacted in the next 3 hours, maybe less.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, perhaps we could get some kind of a clarification. There was a rumor going around saying that there is a possibility that a request could be made to go back to the Committee on Rules to change the rule on the higher education bill in some way for the remainder of the amendment process. We would just like some kind of assurance, if we are going to begin

debating the bill, that that is not going to happen. This is the rule, and this is the bill we will be debating.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is our intention to go into the bill and not to go back to the Committee on Rules but to use the rule we have, to try to pass that rule, and then consider the legislation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that puts these rumors to bed and I certainly appreciate that.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe there are any rumors around here about things like that.

Mr. SOLOMON. It is nice to have one of them put to bed anyway.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 3, SENATE ELECTION ETHICS ACT OF 1991

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a voluntary system of spending limits for Senate election campaigns, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. THOMAS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3) be instructed:

To include provisions in the conference report that would limit the total cost of the bill to the total savings to be derived from the recommended offsets in the Senate bill and House Amendment and specify the account given such costs and offsets under the terms of Section 301, Requirement of Budget Neutrality.

And to include in the conference report provisions containing the requirement that no taxpayer dollars may be used to finance congressional campaigns, such financing to include (1) any payments to reimburse the postal service for postage discounts provided to congressional campaigns (2) any payments to congressional campaigns (3) any other expenditure or obligation to offset revenue losses created by tax credits or other subsidies for the purpose of financing congressional campaigns.

□ 1620

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the directions of the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] are beyond the scope.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do.

It is my understanding that when the amendment to H.R. 3750 was presented to the House, the gentleman from North Carolina, the author of the amendment, indicated in an explanation of the measure that "the requirement that no taxpayer dollars may be used to finance congressional campaigns" was a portion of a substitute amendment.

In addition, on the floor during debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 34667 (11/25/91) the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] said, "No taxpayers' dollars are involved."

During the same debate on page 34702 (11/25/91) the gentleman from Connecticut said, "We do not have public financing in this bill."

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] on page 34704 (11/25/91) said:

Taxpayers are used to making tax contributions to pay for elections in this country, but they did not want their tax dollars at this time going to candidates for Congress.

What this motion to instruct says is that no taxpayer dollars should be used to finance congressional campaigns. There are three examples of areas that financing should not be allowed, based upon the provisions that were in the bill.

For example, first, no payments to reimburse the Postal Service for postage discounts; second, no payments to congressional campaigns, either in a matching fund or some other way, they should not go directly to congressional campaigns; or third, that there should not be any other expenditure or obligation to offset revenue losses created by, for example, tax credits in any conference agreement.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, based upon all the allegations that were presented during the presentation of this bill, it seems to me that the scope of the conference certainly would find acceptable an explanation which simply delineates more specifically where no taxpayer dollars are to be allowed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule, if there are no further arguments.

Neither the House nor the Senate version contains the provision which the second part of the instruction directs the House conferees to include in their report.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] is quoting statements on the floor made by Members supporting the bill, but neither the House nor the Senate version contains such provisions.

For this reason, the motion exceeds the scope of the matters formally committed to conference and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] have an additional motion?

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. THOMAS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3) be instructed:

To include provisions in the conference report that would limit the total cost of the bill to the total savings to be derived from the recommended offsets in the Senate bill and House amendment and specify the account given such costs and offsets under the terms of Section 301, Requirement of Budget Neutrality.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, is my understanding correct that this motion to instruct is in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK). No point of order was made against it.

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

I thank the Speaker for that clarification. No point of order was made against it.

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that since that language is part of the motion that the Chair just ruled out of order, minus those provisions which go into specifics in the bill, including the language which was used by Members on the floor, what now have is an inability to write a motion to instruct which carries out the specific rationale that was offered by the Members who were in support of the bill. In other words, although the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OKAR] said that no taxpayer dollars are involved in the bill, and the gentleman from Connecticut said we do not have public financing in this bill, it is out of order, apparently, to use the phrase that the gentleman from North Carolina used in his description of his amendment. That description was that the bill contained the requirement that no taxpayer dollars may be used to finance congressional campaigns.

That phrase was included in the last paragraph, to wit, "and to include in the conference report provisions containing the requirement that no taxpayers' dollars may be used to finance congressional campaigns"; this phrase in fact has been ruled out of order. That motion is ruled out of order.

What I have in front of the Members is another motion to instruct since we are not able to say that no taxpayers' dollars can be used in congressional

campaigns, the exact point that the Members on the other side of the aisle tried to argue was contained in their bill, but which is not acceptable as a motion to instruct. What we have contained in this motion to instruct is the requirement that the cost of the bill can only come from the savings and the recommended offsets that are in the bill.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if in fact we cannot say that no dollars can be expended for campaign-related activities, in other words that it is out of order to say that, it seems entirely appropriate, then, that given the way the bill is written, no money can be spent under the bill that is not provided for in the bill.

That is what this motion to instruct does. It says that we can spend for the various functions under this campaign finance bill only those moneys that are raised under this bill, and that requirement, it seems to me, is entirely appropriate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to say that it always astounds me that the objections of the President's party to public funding is their basic philosophical objection to campaign finance reform, which includes so many important things, including spending limits and other positive reforms that I think the voters and those involved in campaign finance reform for years have wanted on soft money and other issues that are in these two bills.

But what particularly stuns me is that the President of the United States himself, by the end of this campaign, by all estimates, will have taken \$180 million in public financing. At the same time, this President threatens to veto bills that might have spending limits and other things in them. The logic absolutely floors me that the administration, and one of the clouds that hangs over this bill is opposition by the administration, we ought to put it on the table, it floors me that public financing issues, which are really not central to the debate, are at the heart of the concern of the party whose President, as I have said just a moment ago, will by the end of this campaign have taken \$180 million in taxpayers' money.

That is not what the debate is on this bill. The debate will be, and hopefully we will have a rapid conference, on whether we want spending limits, whether we want reform on soft money, and other issues of that nature. That is the real heart of the issue.

Are we going to have the courage to take a step forward in limiting spending in campaign races around the country so candidates and incumbents can properly utilize their time in the de-

bate of the issues and not simply the race for the dollars in campaigns?

□ 1630

It seems to me sad that we continuously try to divert the public's attention from that critical issue. So I would hope that we would accept the gentleman's amendment so we can move rapidly and get this into conference, and pass the kind of campaign finance reform bill that will make us proud of ourselves, that will give our constituents an opportunity to see that indeed we are moving forward with the process of reform.

What they want is a limit on spending, a limit on spending for the House and Senate candidates. That is in the bill.

I just want to take one moment to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], for all of the assistance he has given us during the entire time of the hearings, as well as all the members of my subcommittee, and Bill Gray, who of course retired in the midst of this term, and all of the other members of the subcommittee, but particularly the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], who has put so much time into working on this legislation. Of course I also want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR], who is not on the committee, but has been one of the leaders in campaign finance reform on our side of the aisle.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I find it absolutely ironic in terms of timing that the gentleman from Connecticut gets up and makes this kind of an impassioned speech about the content of a Democrat package which was put together for the sole purpose of political campaigning. I find it ironic because it follows immediately upon a vote of this House on a tax package which was put together by the Democrats for nothing but campaign advantage. The President said if you send me a tax package which is nothing but a thinly veiled campaign position for the Democrats, I will veto it.

Interestingly enough, the vote was stay with the President, 215, stay with the campaign package, 211. Even your own Democrats could not stay with you. And what you are making now is an impassioned plea to move a campaign package to conference which the President has already said he will veto. And you will bring it back in hopes of creating additional embarrassment, and I am quite sure the only people you are going to embarrass are more people on your side of the aisle.

In fact, if this were a serious effort, to try to engage in a reasonable cam-

campaign finance reform, if it were a serious issue, we would be working together to present to the President a bill that he could sign. This was not a serious engagement. You have played games from the very beginning in terms of the way in which you are operating. As a matter of fact, you just did it in your speech. You made an impassioned plea for taxpayers' money to be spent in campaigns when your own bill does not even contain a provision to have taxpayer spending, because your Members could not stand the heat of tying the two together. Member after Member in the debate, as I just read, came to the floor and said there is no taxpayer financing in this bill. And then you stand up and plead that we ought to support it because it has taxpayer financing.

Either you ought to read your own material or understand that campaign rhetoric is not the kind of discussion that ought to be carried on today.

What I have asked for in this motion to instruct is to make sure that any money spent on campaign financing, which we know this bill will do, will be financed only out of the provisions that are in the bill itself. And if, in fact, there is no money in the bill, then no money can be spent for it.

Let me say that had the gentleman from Connecticut been serious in terms of trying to work out an agreement, there were a number of areas which we could have come together on. Republicans offered a position which I think is a fundamentally new one. Republicans presented a position which was not given any serious consideration, and which I think would fundamentally reform the structure that we now have.

More importantly, the American people also support it by enormously positive numbers, as they do not do in terms of public campaign financing. When asked of the American people, is it a good idea or a bad idea, 80 percent of the American people said it was a good idea to require the bulk of campaign funds to come from the district or the State. Our position was that if candidates are going all over the United States raising money, and that is the wrong thing to do because it takes up too much time, or because influence groups are giving them money and they are gaining control over the decisionmaking of the incumbent, that perhaps who we ought to tie them to, the people that they should be tied to, the people that they were sent here to represent. And the position that we offered was that a majority of campaign finance money come from people who vote in the election. Local control of campaign finance would fundamentally realign the forces in this system, not just in terms of money but in terms of power brokering.

We still believe that within the scope of both the Democrat bill and the Republican offerings we can achieve a bill

which the President would sign. I am anxious to deal with a number of secondary areas that would reform the political process and that could be agreed to by both sides, once they decided that a campaign package designed to embarrass the President and designed to embarrass Republicans would not go forward. Apparently they did not learn the lesson of the vote just cast. Apparently they are continuing to put together jury-rigged operations which they will send to the President, and which he most assuredly will veto, and which he most assuredly will be sustained. Then perhaps we can get on to the very serious business of not posturing for campaigns, but attempting to rewrite some of the fundamental laws by which Members are elected so that the American electorate can have more confidence in the body than they do now.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to hold this up any longer. But I have to say to the gentleman that he is well aware that I offered an opportunity to develop a bipartisan bill. It was rejected by the gentleman from California. And if we had taken the Republican measure in this instance, an individual running for the House of Representatives could have gotten \$4 million in PAC money. That is reform?

I would hope that my colleagues watch what we do in the conference. We are coming back with a bill of real reform, and when we listen to our friends on the other side of the aisle, time and time again what they want to do is protect the wealthy in America.

We could have gotten a tax bill if we protected the billionaires that the President wants to protect. We could probably get a campaign finance agreement from the President if we protect the rich there.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me that the gentleman has just said that in a government that has divided leadership it is unacceptable to them to sit down and work out a package in which the President, elected by the American people, and a Congress, elected by the American people can agree, that that is unacceptable to him as a process for American Government to go forward. I thought American Government was based upon accommodation and compromise. Apparently the way in which you folks are now writing legislation is exactly the same way you have been running the House. There is no belief in accommodation and compromise, that since you own the House you will rule

the House that way and all of the instruments in it.

I am really saddened by the statement from my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, that had they put in some provisions which the President felt were necessary that we could have gotten a bill signed. That is an admission that they had no interest in getting a bill signed. They had more interest in a campaign document in terms of the tax bill. What we have in front of us is another attempt to get a campaign document in terms of public financing.

I think sooner or later some of the members of the majority need to understand that the American people are a little tired of the failure to accommodate and compromise to make the kinds of decisions that are necessary to govern and to move forward so that we can actually change the current relationships. The American people do not like the current relationships.

I am willing to sit down anytime, anyplace, and attempt to negotiate an agreement. What the gentleman from Connecticut failed to mention when he said he offered me a compromise bill was that he had one little tag on it and that was, "By the way, taxpayer financing is nonnegotiable." That is exactly the kind of arrogance that has brought this House to this point, and that is exactly the kind of arrogance that has brought this Government to this point.

□ 1640

I simply refer the gentleman to the last vote. It was his party and his Members, 54 of the Democrats, who did not go along with his leadership's plan. So apparently the failure to accommodate and compromise within his own party is part of the arrogance of the leadership on his side of the aisle.

He can rant and rave all he wants to about what this bill does or does not do, but I can assure him one thing: it will never become law. All of the time and energy spent to craft a clever campaign package is just that: time and energy wasted, time lost for the American people to have a more efficient, a better, a more responsible campaign finance system.

I am sure that he will continue to rant and rave about the fact that "the President will not give in to us and will not agree to what we want."

I think the appropriate approach in the American governmental system is accommodation and compromise, and after this failed effort goes forward and the President has vetoed it and it does not become law, I am more than willing to sit down and continue to work for the American people to try to put together a campaign finance package that is not just a useful diatribe on the campaign trail but actually a fundamentally reform in the way in which we elect people in this system so that

we can change it, so that the American people can take a little pride in this institution, a little pride in this Government, that we are moving forward and we are actually agreeing to pass laws that change relationships, that fundamentally need to be changed.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will appoint the conferees upon his return to the chair.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1992

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 403

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3553) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and which shall not exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 4471, as modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. Said substitute, as modified, shall be considered for amendment by title and each title shall be considered as having been read, and all points of order against said substitute, as modified, are hereby waived. No amendment to said substitute, as modified, shall be in order except: (1) pro forma amendments for purposes of debate and (2) those amendments printed in the "Amendments" portion of the Congressional Record prior to the consideration of the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for

amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text by this resolution. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After passage of H.R. 3553, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 1150 and consider said bill in the House. It shall then be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3553 as passed by the House. All points of order against the motion are hereby waived. It shall then be in order to move to insist on the House amendment to S. 1150 and request a conference with the Senate.

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

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only. I yield the customary 30 minutes, for the purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 403 is an open rule which provides 2 hours of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

House Resolution 403 makes in order a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 4471, as modified by the amendment printed in the report accompanying the rule, as an original bill for purposes of amendment.

The substitute will be considered by title with each title considered as read. All points of order against the substitute as modified are waived.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to consideration of the bill and pro forma amendments for purposes of debate.

The rule also provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides for a hook-up to the Senate companion bill, S. 1150. The rule makes it in order—after passage of H.R. 3553—to consider S. 1150 in the House, to move to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H.R. 3553 as passed by the House, and to insist on the House amendments and request a conference. All points of order against the motion to strike and insert are waived.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair that we begin the debate on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act by giving credit where credit is due.

We are about to consider a 5-year, \$100 billion piece of reauthorization

legislation. Putting this bill together, listening to and responding to the concerns of a wide variety of interested and affected parties, and charting a responsible course for the future of higher education in America is no easy task.

The Education and Labor Committee under the leadership of Chairman BILL FORD brings to the floor the product of over 44 hearings. And I know from my own experience that the chairman and his staff have been willing to work with those of us who have special concerns about the reauthorization.

While I do believe that this bill can be fine-tuned, most importantly in terms of program integrity, I do want to congratulate Chairman FORD, ranking full committee member BILL GOODLING, and ranking subcommittee member TOM COLEMAN for working long and hard on some of the most tedious and complex issues that come before this body. I think I speak for every Member of the House when I express my appreciation for the committee's good work.

They have crafted a bill that is a major step forward for higher education and the future of the Nation.

I believe the debate over the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act is one of the most important issues of this session.

I believe that for two reasons. First, because education is the key to a productive, creative, and competitive work force. Education is the key to our future, and higher education is the key to our economy's place in the world.

Second, this debate is important because the way we handle the issues before us will let the American people know whether we are ready to make the tough choices, whether we are ready to say "no" to a well-organized special interest lobby and say "yes" to protecting the rights of underprivileged and middle-class families who need well-run Federal education programs.

The American people know some of the programs we will consider in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act have literally spun out of control.

Mr. Speaker, here are the facts:

Student loan default expenses have risen from just under \$300 million in 1982 to more than \$3.5 billion last year.

In 1983, loan defaults consumed 10 percent of the net program costs—the amount the program costs the taxpayers. Last year, defaults wasted 54 percent of program costs.

At the current rate, default expenses could total \$9.5 billion—79 percent of program costs—by 1997.

For-profit trade schools educate about 10 percent of our Nation's students in post-secondary education, but account for about 50 percent of the defaults.

The number of for-profit trade schools have increased 210 percent from

2,000 in 1980—the year before schools could participate in the Pell Grant Program—to more than 6,200 in 1990.

The default rate at for-profit trade schools is about 32 percent, twice the rate for public community colleges and technical schools and almost four times the rate for 4-year public colleges.

Mr. Speaker, today's New York Times lays out what this debate is all about. On one side, we have—and I quote—"a Washington power play." A lobbying campaign "even some trade school officials regard as too slick * * * a million-dollar-a-year lobbying campaign."

And on the other side are people pushing for serious, commonsense program integrity. The same New York Times story hits the nail right on the head. Again I quote, we are playing on "a field that includes virtually no organized lobbyists on the other side."

All we have—and all we need—on the side of program integrity is the good sense of the American people and the Members of this body.

We are our own lobby. We are the lobby for the people who sent us here to stand up and represent them. We are the lobby for the middle-class families in MARGE ROUKEMA's district and the underprivileged youth in MAXINE WATERS' district. We are the lobby for America's students and the taxpayers. I hope that it is our lobby and not the lobby described in the New York Times which wins today and tomorrow.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the chairman and ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee for a job well done.

□ 1650

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is no coincidence that two Tennesseans are handling this rule today. We have a former Governor of Tennessee dedicated to education, now as Secretary of Education, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] and I are also committed to better education.

Mr. Speaker, although I disagree with the preprinting requirement for amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to floor consideration, I do rise today in support of this modified open rule.

This legislation reauthorizes the Higher Education Act of 1965 for 5 years, providing support to all major Federal postsecondary education programs. Mr. Speaker, we all know the importance of reauthorizing our Nation's higher education programs. In drafting this legislation, compromises were made by both parties. As originally reported, the bill made Pell grants an entitlement program and proposed substituting a direct Federal

loan program for all existing student loan programs. The compromise version made in order by this rule removes the Pell grant entitlement provision and scales down the Direct Loan Program to a \$500 million demonstration project.

Mr. Speaker, eliminating the Pell grant entitlement title and keeping the bill in accordance with pay-as-you-go show how committed this Congress is to improving and expanding education programs in this country. President Bush highlighted education as one of his administration's top priorities, and I'm proud that we are able to demonstrate our willingness to follow suit.

While most of the major problems with the bill have been ironed out, there will still be some important amendments offered during consideration. Most important, perhaps, will be the amendment offered by the ranking Republican of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, TOM COLEMAN, to cap the direct loan demonstration project at \$500 million per year. As the bill now stands, the Education Secretary must pick a group of schools with a combined loan volume of \$500 million under the current system. The students at those schools would have a contractual right to receive direct loans—thereby creating an open-ended entitlement for those schools. If adopted, this amendment would generate support from the minority and the administration on final passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note that there are several other amendments which would cut waste, fraud, and abuse in higher education programs. Some of the amendments would eliminate Pell grant eligibility at high default schools, strengthen triggers for State oversight, permit loan assignment for increased collections, and strengthen requirements for accreditation agencies.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Representative GOODLING and Representative COLEMAN for their leadership and congratulate them on a job well done. I urge all my colleagues to support this rule so that we can begin consideration of this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who has put so many hours into bringing this bill before us.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I also thank him for his very generous remarks about the work of the committee, and in particular the work that we have done together, as one of the foremost advocates of tightening the requirements

for so-called trade schools or profit-making businesses that are in the education profession. We have worked closely with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON]. I trust that we have been able to respond to most, if not all, his concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to support this rule because someplace a rumor started that I was up to something and I wanted to defeat this rule so that we could go back to the Committee on Rules and get a closed rule to prevent people from offering amendments. That is not true.

I assume by coming up here to speak for the rule, I can put that to rest. I do not know who concocted that kind of scheme. Even I am not sneaky enough to try anything that dumb; but nevertheless, I am here to tell you that I want you to vote "yes" on adopting this rule.

Is the rule written the way I would have written it? No; it is not. They very seldom are.

Is the rule written the way I asked to have it written? No; it is not; but as I said, I do not always get my own way at the Rules Committee, but it is the best we can do under the circumstances. The rule clears up a possible point of order against consideration of the bill and will let us go forward with this legislation.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and ask all Members to vote for it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] for the work they have done, and to the Rules Committee for the work they have done.

I rise in support of the rule and the bill; however, I am disappointed.

Today, we had a real opportunity to make a long-term investment in our economy, an opportunity to begin to shift our Nation's priorities—from investing in weapons systems to investing in our human strength. Instead, we have chosen to maintain the status quo.

There are signs all around us that people are calling for change. Election results have stunned the pundits and insiders. People want us to shift our priorities. And yet we are slow in responding.

People throughout the country have known for some time that we are in economic decline. But by the time we discovered this economic free-fall, we acted as though we didn't know what to do. We had a whirlwind of hearings, we listened to experts, we talked about

middle-class tax cuts and capital gains tax cuts and investment tax credits and other ways to stimulate the economy. But after the President's veto, we are left with the same old Government paralysis.

People throughout America can tell you how to stimulate the economy—in-vest in education. People know that if their kids have a chance to continue their education, they will be better off in the future. I believe we can use that same logic here in Congress.

But rather than breaking the mold and developing legislation that would stimulate our economy by greatly increasing our investment in higher education, we have chosen to tinker around the edges of an existing program.

After World War II, when we faced a similar crossroads in our economy, our predecessors courageously enacted the GI bill—a real investment in our future. Forty-eight years later, we are still reaping the rewards of that legislation. Judging from the increase in the Nation's total output of goods and services produced by GI bill beneficiaries, for every \$1 we spent on GI's, we got \$5 to \$12.50 back later in benefits. It's hard to find a better investment—public or private.

I believe Americans are self-reliant. They do not want handouts. But they do want us to give them the resources they need to better themselves and ensure their future. Federal financial aid for higher education is a major building block.

We hear a lot of talk lately about welfare reform. Angela Slaughter, a single mother on welfare in my congressional district, is going to college so she and her daughter can take care of themselves. You'd think we'd embrace Angela and give her whatever help she needs to get through this short-term struggle. But instead, she can describe one obstacle after another that the Government stuck in front of her. She is making it—with Federal aid—but we could do more so that people who do not have as much determination as Angela can work their way off welfare as well.

We also hear a lot about retooling our economy—retraining our workers for a changing work force. Larry Lynch, an unemployed logger in my district who decided to go back to school to study nursing, can tell you how all the odds were stacked against him. He is also making it—with Federal aid—but we could do more to encourage people like him who are willing to make a heart-wrenching change.

While I wish we could do more, I fully support the measure we have before us today.

This bill simplifies the application process so that we do not bury potential students in a mountain of complicated paperwork.

It also extends loans to middle-income families who make too much to

qualify under the current program but not enough to cover their kids' tuition costs. And it adds incentives that reward parents for saving for their kids' education rather than penalizing them.

The bill also makes a number of changes to ease the way for nontraditional students like Angela Slaughter and Larry Lynch. It increases child care allowances, removes home equity from the needs analysis, makes aid available to those attending school on a part-time basis, and simplifies the application process for independent students.

Finally, the bill includes almost 100 provisions to strengthen the integrity of our Federal financial aid programs. By eliminating fraud and abuse in the system, more students will be able to benefit from these programs.

Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I support the higher education bill.

My only regret is that we did not take this opportunity to say that now is the time to shift our Nation's priorities and make a commitment to economic development that will last forever: a commitment to our children and their education.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues in this Congress and the people of this Nation to keep holding the vision before us.

□ 1700

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on this bill. During my years in Congress I have been a strong proponent of higher education. Indeed, higher education is an historic commitment of the Federal Government. Arguably, this bill is one of the most significant pieces of legislation this Congress will be called upon to pass. My constituents think so, too, I can tell you that, and probably yours do, too.

I know that no eyes glaze over when I rise to talk about student loans or access to higher education. There is always spontaneous applause whenever I speak about expanding access to loan programs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support a great many of the provisions in the bill before us. The bill has changed from its inception, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] the ranking Republican member on the full committee, and the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] have worked very hard and worked together to bring forth this improved bill. I commend each of them for their efforts on behalf of our Nation's students.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the gen-

tleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] do not view this bill as a perfect bill. Many of us will offer amendments, some of which will be agreed to and some will not. Nevertheless, it is important to note that this new bill represents a far more fiscally responsible approach to the needs of our Nation's students and their families.

This measure is said by its sponsors to be responsive to the needs of students from middle-income families. I wholeheartedly agree with that assessment. We must assist such families in financing the high costs of higher education.

By eliminating consideration of home, the farm and small-business equity from the needs analysis for student aid programs, this bill will insure that many, many more deserving students will have access to Federal student aid. I proposed this change, and I can assure you that many of the families across this Nation and specifically in high real estate areas such as New Jersey and the Northeast, and other areas where farm values are high, those people who are house-rich or farm-rich but cash-poor, will be helped by this proposal. In fact, it may be the single most significant middle-income provision in the bill before us.

But there is a major deficiency in this bill with respect to the vast middle class number of students for which GSL's were created and designed. It is indeed unfortunate that this bill stops short of helping students from middle-income families access the financial assistance that they need to finance tuitions in the 1990's.

The bill, in contrast to the one that came out of the committee, this bill under consideration does not—repeat, does not—increase the maximum loan eligibility for GSL's. Loan limits under the largest and most popular student loan program, the Stafford program, have not been increased since 1987. Under this bill, there will be no increase in limits until 1996.

During that time, tuition has increased at a rate far in excess of inflation. During the past decade, for example, the cost of attendance at public institutions has increased 85 percent, and they have increased more than 107 percent at private institutions.

Very recently we have seen tremendous increases in the tuitions at a number of public institutions whose revenues have eroded due to the States' budgetary shortfalls.

In fact, tuitions charged by many public institutions now rival those charged by many private institutions.

Mr. Speaker, again I repeat this is the most serious deficiency in this bill. Even the administration acknowledges this deficiency and supports an amendment for program improvement to expand loan limits and eligibility.

I will be offering later tomorrow an amendment to deal with this deficiency. I hope that amendment, Mr. Speaker, will be supported by the majority of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, the new reauthorization bill arguably weakens the program integrity provisions that were approved by the committee last October. I would suggest that amendment offered by Representatives GORDON and WATERS and myself will be moved tomorrow to strengthen the integrity provisions and to curb the waste and fraud. We have gone far in the bill to do this, but not far enough. I think it will be a great enhancement and a perfection of the bill.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA]. We have spent time together working on this, trying to bring about this amendment that I think is going to make a good bill even better. The gentlewoman has been very diligent.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I thank the gentleman, my classmate, for the time. I want to compliment the committee and its chairman, who has always lobbied on behalf of education and an opportunity for education for all Americans.

But, you know, we have 700,000 high school graduates who cannot read. In a February 1992 Washington Post story, students fared less than most major industrialized nations in their proficiency in mathematics and science, all of which takes me to a part of my presentation because in Public Law 101-589, signed November 16, 1990, I had included in the Excellence in Education Act my National Academy of Science, Space, and Technology, which was supported by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of this House.

The Science, Space, and Technology Academy would provide scholarships for bright young students from each congressional district to attend a college that is, in fact, accepted by the new advisory board to be created by the law. It was signed into law, but appropriations were never made. It has to be reauthorized.

That is the essence of the amendment that I bring now, to reauthorize into law the National Academy of Science, Space, and Technology, with several changes that are made at the request of certain House leaders and which make sense.

Rather than have the Members nominate and have the academy select, as they do with the others, the new amendment language to be offered on the floor will call for the academy to have competitive examinations and the two top students in each district would

thus be afforded that scholarship. After the completion of that 4-year scholarship, they would have to give the 4 years back to Uncle Sam in some related field.

More than 60 percent of the House chairmen supported this legislation. I was glad that in 1990 the Congress had seen fit to incorporate it into law. It was signed into law, and I am very pleased to see that the chairman of the committee and the minority side also will support the amendment with these new improvements.

□ 1710

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this to the Congress: We are going to have to get our brightest and our best, recruit them into public service, have them work for our Government and instill a sense of competency as we move to the future.

In addition, this bill will help to attack those problems where the 700,000 high school students graduate and cannot read. That is an indictment on our educational system that must be reversed.

I think Congress will take those steps, Mr. Speaker, by implementing and passing this bill, and I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, House Resolution 403, presented today regarding two bills designed to reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965, H.R. 3553 and H.R. 4471, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. I am pleased that the Higher Education Act reauthorization has finally made its way to the House floor.

The rule provides for consideration of all amendments that have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Although I do believe in completely open rules, I recognize that Members have been placed on notice since last week that the bill would be considered in such a manner. I am also pleased that the rule automatically makes the text of H.R. 4471 considered as the original bill and that the rule brings the bill into budget compliance by amending the text of H.R. 4471 so as to eliminate the offending spending provisions. Furthermore, the rule does not waive points of order against individual amendments; hence, most of these amendments will be subject to these points of order.

I am pleased to witness the effect of the Budget Act in ensuring no amendments that violate pay-go or the budget resolution will be considered. I must confess, however, that there were amendments that I would have otherwise supported.

As to the text of H.R. 4471, I must admit that while this bill makes tre-

mendous changes over the committee-reported bill, H.R. 3553, we still need to make additional changes to H.R. 4471 in order to craft a bill which all Members should be eager to support. The rule corrects the severe problem dealing with pay-go and hence makes it a bill that merits our support.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule considered today.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to rise in opposition to the rule, and what I want to do—as a consequence—is to call attention to a very egregious process which permitted the introduction of an amendment to the bill which was introduced that consisted of a compromise worked out very carefully by the minority ranking member of our Committee on Education and Labor and by the chairman of our committee. The difficulty with the consideration of the higher education bill was that in reviewing the budget authority, which places a restriction on the entitlements in the bill, it was found that it was in excess by \$1.25 billion over a course of 5 years. The current fiscal year, there was no objection, but in carrying forward these projections it was found by CBO that it would, in fact, have exceeded by \$1.25 billion. Therefore, in order to avoid the difficulty of bringing such a bill to the floor and relying upon waivers and all of that discussion, it was decided by the leadership that the only way this bill could come forward is to tack on in the Committee on Rules an amendment which would add a provision which restores the origination fee which students are being called upon to pay.

The committee, I believe, led by the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], has done an outstanding job in putting together a bill which I believe merits the support of this body, and I was extremely proud to be associated with that bill and to be an original cosponsor of the second bill which was introduced. What I am objecting to today is the introduction of all element that has not been approved by the committee and which actually goes against the policies that the committee had adopted, and that was to phase out this origination fee, which is an abomination added in the 1981-86 Budget Reconciliation Acts.

What this origination fee does is to say to a student who goes in to get a loan—for example, \$2,000—that they must pay a 5-percent fee for that \$2,000 loan, making the cost of the note that they must sign to the Government and to the bank or the lender for \$2,100. They receive \$2,000 to pay their educational expenses, and yet the note that they commit to is \$2,100, and on top of that, not receiving the principal

amount of the note, they must continue to pay interest on the \$2,100. At a time when this Congress and this Nation is focusing its attention on the importance of education, and particularly the importance of higher education, it seems to me critical that we eliminate this kind of excess, an unnecessary burden on students.

I stand here today in opposition of the rule, in full support of the work of the Committee on Education and Labor, and I commend the chairman and the minority ranking member of that committee in bringing this measure. What I object to is the process which would allow the bill to eliminate some of the salutary provisions in the process of its being considered in the Committee on Rules. I find that highly objectionable, highly contrary to the work product of the Committee on Education and Labor. So, I would hope that this body would vote down the rule and make it possible for the Committee on Rules to give a waiver in this instance so that the higher education bill can come forward, and in this particular instance, in the entitlements, accept the fact that the cost of the entitlements meets the current fiscal year's requirements under the Budget Authority Act. I find that, without any other possibility of raising this issue before the House, this was the only recourse, to rise in opposition to the rule, because there is no possibility that I could raise this matter even with an open rule. The Parliamentarian tells me that there would be a point of order, and I could not make a motion to eliminate this origination fee or to restore it back to the way that the higher education bill had presented it to this body. So, I am left with no recourse. There would be a point of order made against my amendment.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to consider what we have done in the rule is to amend the bill that was presented to us by higher education. I urge that the rule be defeated.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule so we can get down to discussing the bill itself, and its provisions, as well as the amendments, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McEWEN].

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by me and my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS]. This amendment, which would preserve limited eligibility for Pell grants by prison inmates, strikes an important balance between fiscal restraint and open access to higher education services.

As you know, the United States is responding to cries to get tough on crime by imprisoning an increasing number of persons each year. In my State of Ohio alone, nine new prisons have been completed and construction for an additional four more has been budgeted. With approximately 1.1 million Ameri-

cans currently in Federal, State, or local prisons, taxpayers pay about \$20.3 billion a year in maintenance costs alone. However, we cannot overlook the role of education in reducing the revolving door of our prisons.

While I support preserving unrestricted access to higher education services for incarcerated students, I believe our amendment responds to the justifiable concerns that many schools are taking advantage of loopholes in the Pell Grant Program.

Among other aims, our amendment specifically would limit the percentage of incarcerated students in an institution to 30 percent of that body, and deny a Pell grant to any incarcerated student who is serving a sentence of death or life without parole; not eligible for parole within 5 years; or is classified as a "habitual criminal".

Mr. Speaker, there are many significant reasons to support continued Pell grants for inmates, among them:

Offenders are drawn from the same indigent population that Pell funding is designed to serve.

Less than 2 percent of current Pell grants go to incarcerated students.

Offender use of Pell funding yields crucial social benefits, including cost-effective enhancement of prison security, increased employment levels among at-risk minority youth, and substantially lower recidivism rates—as much as 60 percent lower after 1 year.

In a study of 317 paroled offenders performed by the Correctional Education Department of Wilmington College in Wilmington, OH, 27 percent of the parolees were reincarcerated within 1 year—106 persons. These 27 percent had less than a high school education. However, only 11 percent—95 persons—were reincarcerated who had the benefit of some form of college education.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these facts speak for themselves. We simply cannot afford to cut off this valuable resource for offender education. This amendment seeks to assure the taxpayer that Pell moneys will not be abused, and will go only to those prisoners with the greatest chance of success.

I thank the gentleman from New York for his efforts and for the opportunity to work with him in addressing this essential issue. I urge my colleagues to adopt this compromise amendment.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, for the leadership that he has given in bringing this bill to the floor.

□ 1720

I would like to thank him for the long hours and the hard work in dealing with a very complex subject matter.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] for the work they have done, working with me and others, to

include some emphasis on the trade schools, the vocational schools, the private postsecondary schools.

I am delighted to be here today for that particular purpose. Poor people around the country are being conned and cheated by proprietary vocational schools at enormous personal cost to the students and huge financial costs to the taxpayers.

Some people refer to these schools as trade schools or vocational schools, but the fact of the matter is, these proprietary schools are supposed to be providing opportunities, but really we have an enormous unconscionable rip-off to disadvantaged people that is going on in this country.

Many of these schools, far too many, are preying on the very vulnerable in our society.

My interest in protecting students from dishonest proprietary vocational schools began while I was in the State assembly in California. I was able to pass some laws there to get at this problem.

I know about this problem. The representatives of these so-called trade schools stand in unemployment lines, in welfare lines. They are in housing projects throughout America. They are even in the churches. They lure people into these schools promising them that they are going to train them, that they will be able to connect them with jobs and work opportunities. And, let me tell you, these fly-by-night, Joe Blow schools of computer learning that have no computers, are ripping off students, many of whom have decided to go back to school for the first time after having dropped out, after not being able to find a job.

We should not fight for the right of our constituents to be saddled with a debt they cannot repay, or an education they did not receive, when the best they can hope for is sham training, or maybe, just maybe, a job paying \$5 to \$6 an hour. It does not make good sense.

We are told there is no money for creative education for minorities and the poor because of the budget deficit. We cannot pay for creative programs. We do not have money for capital improvements. We cannot build new buildings. We cannot pay teachers adequate salaries. But we can stand by and watch the unconscionable ripoff of billions of taxpayer dollars going into these private postsecondary schools that are not training anybody.

I do not want the owners and the lobbyists of these schools pointing to my community and my people telling me how they are providing opportunity, when in fact they are ripping them off.

How many victims must there be before we say enough is enough and stop protecting these schools?

Mr. Speaker, let me give you some examples of how bad it really is. They are not just ripping off the Pell grants.

They are not just ripping off the Stafford loans. But they have gone further. They are now into the supplemental loans, the student programs that were intended for higher education.

We now have people who are being trained for security guards, something called medical assistants, and other kinds of jobs that are not real jobs, and we are paying thousands of dollars using all of these three granting programs to do it. Programs costing as high as \$7,000, \$8,000, and \$9,000, that lead to nothing.

Mr. Speaker, you know who they are. You see the ads on television. They are all over television, promising to train folks, promising to get jobs. They are in your offices. They have a well-oiled, well-heeled lobbying program around here, and all of the Members know it.

Well, I am telling you: I am tired of my community being ripped off, and communities like mine all over this country.

I am here to support the open rule because I, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORDON] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] would like to stop this ripoff. We would like to get some amendments in. We have a package that is supported by the administration, supported by the department, the integrity package that we are going to put on this floor, and we fully expect for it to be supported.

In addition to that, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] has some more amendments, and I have even more amendments. Because I intend to be before this Congress on this issue year-in and year-out until I stop the hemorrhaging of taxpayer dollars in these ripoff schools that are doing nothing for anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here today to begin to raise this question in new ways, to begin to point my finger directly at those who are doing the ripoff, and to challenge my colleagues to do something about it.

This scandal can emerge as big and as serious as the S&L scandal has emerged in this country. We are going to put the amendments on the floor at the appropriate time, and the open rule allows us to do that.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with a lot of things the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] has said, but I certainly want to make very sure, as I have said on many occasions, that we do not throw the baby out with the bathwater. Many of the good institutions that are proprietary schools, as a matter of fact, are going to be needed more than ever to train and retrain.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] has had a terrible experience. In my district, fortunately, I have had a good experience. I

have three proprietary schools who have default rates under 5 percent who have placement rates that are up in the 80 and 90 percent brackets. One is commercial art, one is a Yorktown business institute, and one is a drafting and electronics institute.

Mr. Speaker, much of what the gentlewoman said was true, particularly before we made tremendous changes in the last 2 years in reconciliation. Those changes have put 500 of those fly by nights out of business, and I think the legislation probably is crafted to put more of them out of business.

But, again I want to reemphasize, we do not want to throw the baby out with the bathwater, because there are an awful lot of good proprietary schools that we are going to need as we train and retrain the retrain again.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that when you find an industry where an overwhelming majority of that industry is involved in ripoff activities, something is desperately wrong.

I wish that I could agree that something has taken place in the last 5 years or so to change it, but it has not. According to a study done by the General Accounting Office, about \$2 billion in SLS money given to first-year students during academic years 1987-89, 88 percent of the total, or \$1.7 billion, went to students in vocational proprietary schools. In fact, vocational students account for 52 percent of all SLS.

Mr. Speaker, this is the money above and beyond the Pell grants and the Stafford loans.

Over the same 3 year period, proprietary vocational school students accounted for 80 percent of all SLS default dollars. The price tag: \$248.4 million, with 74 percent of those default dollars in the hands of first-year students.

Mr. Speaker, I too would not like to throw the baby out with the bathwater. But let me tell you, it is not just my district, and I do not want anyone to think it is one little congressional district in the United States. Most of the congressional districts in the United States are being ripped off. If you are lucky enough to have the majority of your schools with less than a 30-percent default rate, then you are indeed lucky, and you are an aberration and not what is going on in most of the districts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], that the question before us is not whether or not proprietary schools are good or bad. I think

there are many good proprietary schools, and I want to protect those good proprietary schools.

There are also many good S&L's and I am sorry we did not get in sooner and get rid of the bad apples so that they would not all be spoiled. And that is what we are trying to do with the proprietary schools in this country, is take care of the bad apples.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that 10 percent of the students in this country go to proprietary schools, yet they account for 35 percent of all the loans and 55 percent of all the defaults.

□ 1730

Something has got to be done. We are not going to throw the baby out with the bathwater by simply saying that there is a 35 or 30 or even 25 percent default rate threshold.

Clearly, that is enough room for these schools to operate. All we are saying is that if one has got a 25- or 30- or 65-percent default rate, they are not doing the kind of job they need for their community. If they are not responsible in handling student loans, how in goodness sake can they be responsible in handling grants?

Clearly, if they are not eligible for student loans because of mishandling and a poor job, they ought not to be allowed to have grants.

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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Pursuant to House Resolution 403 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3553.

□ 1731

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3553) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in support of this bill, H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of

1992. While this bill represents a step forward, I had really hoped to come to the floor with a bill that would give us a giant leap forward because I really believe that unless we get our priorities in order and begin to invest in the future of this country, all of the other things we do, worrying about the national debt and the future economic and other strengths of this society, are going to be wasted.

We know we fall woefully behind in competitiveness with the rest of the world and yet, when it comes time to really try to do something about it, we begin to snivel and cringe and back away from doing anything decisive.

It is well-known that I tried to make this bill considerably more expensive. Indeed, I had hoped to structure here on the floor an opportunity for the Members of Congress to vote on a waiver of the infamous budget agreement, which would be clear and understandable to all Americans, waive it for the purpose of investing in our young people, their future and our future through them.

I was not permitted, under the rules and the Budget Act, to do that. So I confess woefully that we are here with a small step forward, but at least it is forward.

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and the other Republicans on the committee for their cooperation and all of the members of the committee on both sides for the contributions they made. No bill that I have ever been involved with on this floor had as many days and hours of hearings, listening to people all across this country tell us in advance of writing this bill what they thought education policy ought to be for the next 5 years.

I want to thank the members of the committee who traveled to places around the country to accommodate members' requests for opportunities in all parts of the country to participate in the initial drafting of the bill.

I would like to pay particular recognition to the new members of the committee who jumped into this very early and participated with us all along the way, a course of conduct that has made them all players in this legislation.

I trust that we will be able to hold to a minimum the serious disagreements between the members who have been working the longest and hardest on this legislation and, even as we proceed this evening, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] and I will continue to negotiate on items that may make it possible for us to avoid any more floor fights than we find absolutely necessary.

Of course, he sometimes can be stubborn, unlike me, who is known never to be stubborn. And that could get in the way, but I think we will work things out.

I look forward to writing a piece of legislation that every Member in this House will be proud to go home and talk about.

I would like to finish by saying this: There is a lot of talk about what we ought to do about jobs for the future in this country. This piece of legislation will be the biggest piece of legislation to equip Americans for meaningful employment that will come before this Congress. And this is our one big opportunity to get on board if we have been promising folks at home we are going to do something about jobs for the future.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, which reauthorizes the programs contained in the Higher Education Act as well as expanding and improving those programs. Action on this bill is necessary because the Higher Education Act expires at the end of fiscal year 1992, this September 30.

While this bill certainly represents a step forward, I had hoped that it would be a stride or a leap forward. However, given the shackles of the budget agreement, that we seem currently unable to break, our ambition has been substantially constrained. We had hoped to make Pell grants an entitlement with a significant increase in the maximum award so that low-income and working families could have had an assurance about the availability of future help to send their children to college. We are left with a higher maximum award but it will be subject to the annual vagaries of the appropriations process. The administration continues to oppose even these changes arguing that any increases should be concentrated on students from families with incomes below \$10,000 and that these increases should be paid for by eliminating more than 400,000 current recipients from the program.

Looking at where we are in historical perspective, the end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet Empire mean that the national strength and status of the United States as a great power now depends on our ability to compete economically rather than militarily. The productivity and performance of our economy are inextricably linked to our investment in our human capital. Education and training are central to developing the Nation's human capital.

It is clear that the structural changes in the American economy will make it necessary that there be more people with education and training beyond high school for the workforce of the future. The Second Industrial Revolution—the revolution in technology—leaves little place for those without skills in reading comprehensive, mathematics and problem solving, without the habits and attitudes that make them reliable employees and without specific skills related to available jobs.

While 40 percent of today's jobs are in low skills occupations, only 27 percent will fall into that category in the year 2000. At the same time, jobs in high skill occupations will rise from 24 percent to 41 percent of the work force.

Looking at new jobs, more than half of the new jobs created between now and the year

2000 will require some education beyond high school. The median years of education required by the new jobs will be 13.5 years, 1½ years beyond high school graduation. In the 1990's, it is estimated that jobs requiring college degrees will grow 1.5 percent per year while those requiring only high school diplomas will grow 0.6 percent per year, less than half as much. Thus, some academic/technical education beyond high school, if not a 4-year undergraduate education, is essential for the workers of the future, particularly in the high wage, high skill jobs at the cutting edge of economic growth and productivity.

The job market provides an increasing college wage premium. The average pay of entry-level workers with a 4-year or advanced college degree rose one-third more than the pay of workers with only a high school diploma in 1975 to 80 percent more in 1988. A recent study estimates that the value of the increased tax revenue to the Federal Government for each dollar of student aid is \$4.30. Estimates for the return in increased Federal taxes for each dollar provided by the post-World War II GI bill range from \$5 to \$12.50.

It is clear that those in the education pipeline are increasingly from disadvantaged, low-income, minority and limited-English speaking backgrounds. In the 1990's, the white non-Hispanic college-age population will decrease by 18 percent while the minority college-age population increases by 11 percent. The fastest growing groups in the education pipeline are those from backgrounds where they are least likely to pursue the education beyond high school which they need to fill the jobs of tomorrow and which the Nation needs in order for them to be the foundation of the Nation's wealth.

In addition, working and middle income families, the traditional source of reliable and productive workers, are seeing the dream of higher education for their children slip away. In the last decade those with incomes below the top 20 percent saw their incomes either stagnate or decline in inflation-adjusted dollars. Meanwhile costs at public and private colleges have increased from two to three times faster than the growth in median family income.

Middle income families can also no longer call on their traditional financial reserve, sending mom to work, to meet the costs of higher education for their children. Mom has already gone to work and for families fortunate enough to have two wage earners, these dual incomes are barely sufficient to maintain their current standard of living.

A recent Gallup poll found that 93 percent of the American public believes that having a college degree is important in order to get a job or to advance in one's career. At the same time, 87 percent of the American public agrees with the statement: "College costs are rising at a rate which will put college out of reach of most people." And, 74 percent of the public agrees with the statement: "I would be able to afford college costs at this time, only with low interest loans or grants." It is, therefore, not surprising that 90 percent of the public supports grants to low income students and 93 percent support low-interest loans to middle income students.

Since the Federal Government provides 75 percent of the student financial aid from all

sources, we must look to changes in the Federal student aid programs authorized by the Higher Education Act to respond to the need for increased grants and low-interest loans to students.

It is important to note that the financial aid programs authorized by the Higher Education Act do not only serve students in traditional higher education programs. Of the approximately \$18 billion made available to students through the financial aid programs about one-third or \$6 billion goes to students in postsecondary occupational and vocational programs. This makes the Higher Education Act the largest source of Federal support for job training. In addition, the student financial aid programs make a vital contribution to employee retraining since over half of those receiving Federal student aid are working part-time or are over the age of 24.

H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, is the vehicle for expanding the Federal commitment to postsecondary education and training to create the work force of the future. It would lower the financial barriers to higher education for students from working and middle income families and open the doors of educational opportunity for millions of students.

When President Johnson signed the Higher Education Act in 1965, he said that this law "means that a high school senior anywhere in this land of ours can apply to any college or any university in any of the 50 States and not be turned away because his family is poor." When President Nixon sent his proposal to Congress for reauthorizing the Higher Education Act in 1970, he said, "No qualified student who wants to go to college should be barred by lack of money. That has long been a great American goal: I propose that we achieve it now." With this bill we propose to continue to pursue the goal and the dream of equal educational opportunity for all Americans.

In specific, enacting H.R. 3553 would ensure that:

All students regardless of income will be able to borrow up to the maximum Stafford loan, with eligibility for the in-school interest subsidy based on financial need. As a result, in the first year, 3.1 million students would either be newly eligible to borrow or would be eligible to borrow an increased amount; 1.7 million of these borrowers would be from middle income families—incomes above \$30,000.

Through changes in need analysis, eligibility for the in-school interest subsidy will be expanded. For example, a student from a family with an income of \$78,500 attending the average-priced college will be able to receive the in-school subsidy.

All parents regardless of income with no adverse credit history will be able to borrow up to the total college cost minus other financial aid through the PLUS Program. The interest rate in this program would also be capped at 10 percent. Approximately 6 million families of students would be able to borrow increased amounts. Well over half of these families would be middle income.

A family's home, farm and small business equity will not be considered in determining a student's eligibility for financial assistance.

The maximum Pell grant award will be increased to \$4,500 and a student from a family

of four with an income of \$49,000 will be eligible for the minimum Pell grant. At full funding in the first year, 5 million students would either be newly eligible to receive a Pell grant or would be eligible for an increased grant. About 1.1 million of these Pell grant recipients would be from middle income families.

H.R. 3553 also improves the effectiveness of student aid in other important ways. Nearly 100 provisions in the bill strengthen controls on schools and colleges to end waste and abuse and to minimize loan defaults. These provisions include prohibiting the use of commissioned salesmen and recruiters, requiring pro rata tuition refunds and strengthening the ability of the Department of Education, the States and accrediting bodies to terminate the eligibility of schools which abuse the programs. H.R. 3553 ensures that an increased investment in student aid will be well spent.

Many students and their families are denied access to student aid because they cannot navigate through the bewildering complexity of the current student aid forms and delivery system. H.R. 3553 provides for dramatic simplification including a single free Federal form for applying for Federal student aid and a single need analysis and allows students to update their application from the prior year rather than filing a complete new application each year.

Nontraditional students—those who are older, independent of their parents, working or attending school part time—are now the majority in postsecondary education. H.R. 3553 revises the programs to serve these students more effectively by increasing support for child care expenses and extending eligibility for Pell grants to less than half time students.

Students and their families are frequently not well informed about the availability of financial assistance, the range of postsecondary educational options and the appropriate high school programs that lead to postsecondary education. H.R. 3553 improves early outreach and intervention efforts by strengthening the TRIO programs, creating a new Federal-State partnership to provide tutoring and advising, providing support for training high school counselors and establishing a national computer network of financial aid information.

H.R. 3553 also extends and improves the programs to support historically black colleges and universities, teacher training, college libraries, international education, the fund for the improvement of postsecondary education and community service.

H.R. 3553 was written on the basis of recommendations received from the administration and more than 100 national organizations interested in higher education. In addition, the bill draws extensively from bills introduced by Members of the House. Provisions from 58 bills that were referred to the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education have been incorporated into H.R. 3553. Following my statement I am including in the RECORD a list of the bills and their sponsors which were drawn upon for contributions to H.R. 3553. These recommendations and bills were scrutinized in 44 days of hearings, including 19 days of hearings outside of Washington. A total of 447 witnesses were heard and a hearing record of over 7,000 pages was developed in the 134 hours of hearings.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3553.

BILLS INCORPORATED IN H.R. 3553

Andrews, Robert—H.R. 3211 establishing a direct loan program incorporated as a demonstration program in Part D of Title IV.

Ballenger, Cass—H.R. 2943 requiring an evaluation by the Secretary of Education of programs which offer guarantees of assistance to elementary and secondary school students included in Title XIV.

Barrett, Bill—H.R. 3411 to preclude the consideration of nonliquid assets in the determination of need for Federal student financial assistance included in Title IV.

Clay, Bill—H.R. 1503 to provide financing for capital facilities at Historically Black Colleges and Universities included in Title VII.

Cunningham, Duke—H.R. 3957, "The Higher Education Access Act," to provide assistance to needy students to cover the cost of fees associated with taking Advanced Placement examinations included in Title IV.

Frank, Barney—H.R. 2171 to require notice to borrower by both seller and new holder when a loan is sold included in Title IV.

Gaydos, Joseph—H.R. 3129 to clarify the difference between study by telecommunications and correspondence incorporated in section 484.

Goodling, William—H.R. 2495, "The Teacher Leadership Act of 1991," contributed to the development of Title V particularly with respect to the Mini-Corps, job banks and business partnership; H.R. 2637 (by request), Administration's Higher Education Act reauthorization proposal, contributed a variety of proposals particularly with respect to program integrity and Title III; H.R. 2716, "Integrity in Higher Education Act of 1991," substantially included as Part H of Title IV, "Program Integrity"; H.R. 2852 to encourage articulation between two- and four-year postsecondary education programs included in Title I.

Gordon, Bart—H.R. 3239 to improve the integrity of the student aid programs. Most of the provisions of this comprehensive integrity legislation are included in H.R. 3553; H.R. 3372 to create a comprehensive student aid data system included in Title IV.

Gunderson, Steve—H.R. 3241, "Nontraditional Student Opportunity Act," substantially incorporated into Title IV; H.R. 3426 to improve access to postsecondary education for students with disabilities substantially incorporated into Title IV and other programs.

Hayes, Charles—H.R. 3362 to establish a program for minority international service professional development included in Title VI.

Henry, Paul—H.R. 2433, "The National College Athletics Accountability Act," to require institutional reporting of expenditures for college athletics included in Title IV.

Horton, Frank—H.R. 3437 to require a study of the use of Pell Grants by prisoners included in Title XIV.

Jefferson, William—H.R. 3032 revises Title III, provides for increases in the Pell Grant maximum and a Pell Grant entitlement, modifies the Perkins program, need analysis and general provisions, and includes revisions to Titles II, V, VI and IX substantially incorporated into Titles II, III, IV, V, VI and IX; H.R. 3244 revises Title III included in Title III.

Kildee, Dale—H.R. 3179 amends the cooperative education programs substantially included in Title VIII; H.R. 3181 amends the college library programs included in Title II; H.R. 3455, "Tribal Development Student Assistance Act," and H.R. 3456 included in Title XIII.

Klug, Scott—H.R. 2952, provides Perkins loan forgiveness for providers of services to individuals with disabilities included in Title IV; H.R. 3182 amends Title VII included in Title VII.

Lipinski, William—H.R. 3136 to provide for evaluation of the TRIO programs included in Title IV.

Lowe, Nita—H.R. 2065 requires institutions of higher education to disclose foreign gifts included in Title XII; H.R. 2142 expands focus of programs under the Higher Education Act to promote access to the sciences for women and minorities included in part in H.R. 3553; H.R. 2350, "National Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act of 1991," incorporated in Subpart 4 of Part A of Title IV.

Machtley, Ronald—H.R. 1141, "Education Partnerships Act," to permit students to use College Work Study funds for mentoring activities included in Title IV.

Miller, George—H.R. 907 allows the use of state assessment system in the determination of eligibility for Title IV of ability-to-benefit students incorporated in Title IV.

Mink, Patsy—H.R. 2300 provides for cancellation of Perkins loans for borrowers entering nursing included in Title IV; H.R. 2331 provides Pell Grant eligibility for less-than-half-time students substantially incorporated in Title IV.

Molinari, Susan—H.R. 3261 authorizes pre-freshman summer outreach programs for at-risk youth incorporated in Subpart 4 of Part A of Title IV.

Owens, Major—H.R. 3189 provides for support for minority students and faculty members to complete doctoral studies included as Part G of Title IX.

Panetta, Leon—H.R. 1154, "Global Education Opportunities Act," to facilitate the participation of students in programs of study abroad included in Title IV.

Payne, Donald—H.R. 3364 revises several programs to expand postsecondary opportunities for low-income and minority students substantially included in H.R. 3553.

Perkins, Carl—H.R. 3632, "Work Colleges Act," to provide increased College Work Study support for work colleges included in Title IV.

Reed, Jack—H.R. 3078 removes home equity from the determination of expected family contribution included in Title IV; H.R. 3274 and H.R. 3275 alternative approaches for excluding from need analysis assets in accounts which have been frozen included in Title IV; H.R. 3329 amends the TRIO programs to encourage more efficient and effective administration and to strengthen early intervention services for disadvantaged youth included in Subpart 4 of Part A of Title IV.

Richardson, Bill—H.R. 2009, "Higher Education Tribal Grant Authorization Act," and H.R. 2821, "Critical Needs for Tribal Development Act," to improve the postsecondary educational opportunities of Native Americans incorporated in Title XIII.

Roe, Robert—H.R. 190 to remove home equity from the calculation of expected family contribution included in Title IV.

Roemer, Tim—H.R. 3279 increases Pell Grant maximum and allowance for child care in need analysis included in Title IV; H.R. 3396 amends the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education included in Title X.

Roukema, Marge—H.R. 1117, "Student Financial Aid Improvement Act of 1991," revises independent student definition, prevents double counting of student income, excludes home, family farm and small business assets from need analysis, provides for

overaward tolerance in College Work Study, restricts eligibility for Title IV assistance of parents of a dependent student and reduces amount of dependent student's contribution from income incorporated in Title IV; H.R. 1118, "Student Loan Default Prevention Act of 1991," includes provisions for exchange of information between guaranty agencies and State licensing boards, increased information from borrowers, improved exit interviews, restrictions on commissioned recruiters, academic year definition and application of tuition refunds to repayment of federal funds included in Title IV.

Sawyer, Tom—H.R. 1524, "Student Counseling and Assistance Network Act of 1991," incorporated in Subpart 4 of Part A of Title IV; H.R. 2531 provides for Urban Community Service and Urban College, University, and School Partnerships programs included in Title I.

Serrano, Jose—H.R. 2938 establishes a Teacher Opportunity Corps to enable paraprofessionals working in schools to become teachers incorporated in Title V.

Solomon, Gerald—H.R. 933 to prevent the double counting of student income and assets included in Title IV.

Weiss, Ted—H.R. 3334, "Perkins Loan Improvement Act," to allow cancellation for teachers who teach in any Chapter 1 school included in Title IV.

Williams, Pat—H.R. 2561, "Middle Income Student Assistance Act of 1991," expands eligibility for student loans, provides for an assurance of Pell Grant funding and excludes home and family farm equity from consideration in need analysis included in Title IV; H.R. 2597, authorizes support for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards included in Title V; H.R. 2912 authorizes support to institutions of higher education for programs to recruit and retain students preparing to become teachers largely incorporated in Title V.

Wise, Robert—H.R. 4260 increases maximum Pell funding, excludes home, farm and small business equity and establishes single need analysis system included in Title IV.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], the right hand man of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that we are finally considering the bill to reauthorize the Higher Education Act.

When we started this process over a year ago, it was my hope that we could continue one of the proudest traditions on the Education and Labor Committee: Full bipartisanship on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Unfortunately, in this election year, this was not to be the case. I, a strong supporter of Federal support to higher education, found myself in the regrettable position of having to vote against H.R. 3553, the reauthorization bill that was reported out of the committee.

I am pleased to stand before you today to tell you that we have come a long way from that point. H.R. 4471, the substitute amendment we are considering today, reflects many hours of hard work and compromise by Republicans and Democrats on the Education and Labor Committee.

H.R. 4471 reauthorizes the Higher Education Act for 5 years. It makes a number of significant and fundamental changes in the scheme of Federal support of higher education.

The bill improves student aid opportunities for hard pressed middle-income families by:

Eliminating consideration of home, farm, and small business equity from the calculation of a student's eligibility for student grant or loan assistance.

Revising the Pell grant program so that a family of four with an income of up to \$49,000 will be eligible to receive a Pell grant award. Under this bill, an additional 1.2 million students will become eligible to receive Pell grant awards in the first year of the authorization.

Expanding eligibility for guaranteed student loans to an additional 350,000 students from middle-income families.

Adding an additional education savings protection allowance so that families who have saved for their children's education have an incentive for doing so. This allowance is equal to the amount of the family's expected family contribution.

Creating a new, unsubsidized loan program which will ensure that educational loans are available to all students regardless of their family income.

Students and their families are frequently not well informed about the availability of Federal student aid, the range of postsecondary education options, and the appropriate high school programs that lead to postsecondary education. The bill improves outreach and early intervention by:

Strengthening the existing TRIO programs.

Creating a new Federal-State partnership to provide tutoring and student advisement.

Developing a national computer network of financial aid information.

Many students and their families are denied access to student aid because they cannot navigate through the bewildering complexity of student aid forms and delivery systems. The bill seeks to address these problems by:

Providing for a single, free Federal student application form.

Allowing students to update their application from the prior award rather than file a completely new form each year.

Developing a single system of needs analysis for assessing a student's financial need.

Providing for a straightforward system of student loan deferments.

Perhaps most important, the bill goes beyond trying to correct the problems with our student aid programs which have already occurred and emphasizes preventing problems in the future. The bill includes nearly 100 provisions to strengthen controls over

schools to insure an end to waste and abuse and minimize loan defaults. Many of these provisions are a direct outgrowth of recommendations made by the Department of Education's inspector general. For example, it:

Spells out minimum standards for State licensing. Although State licensure has long been a requirement for title IV eligibility, there have never been any clear expectations of what State licensure should entail. These new standards will ensure that the State licensure will really mean something.

Under the bill, the Secretary of Education must review all institutions wishing to participate in the Federal student aid programs against criteria such as default rates, compliance with Department of Education title IV requirements, and student complaints. Through his review, the Secretary identifies institutions who meet this criteria and refers them to the State for an indepth review with the State postsecondary review agency to conduct such a review. Under this State review, institutions are required to meet published State standards which include: The quality and content of the school's programs and financial and administrative capability; success with regard to student completion; student withdrawal and student placement. Schools that do not meet these State standards will be terminated from eligibility for continued participation in student aid programs.

Strengthens the Department of Education's hand in its review of institutions seeking eligibility for participation in title IV funds. Under this bill, every institution seeking participation in student aid programs must be recertified by the Department of Education and regularly re-reviewed. The bill also requires that eligibility is contingent upon meeting strong administrative and financial capability tests.

Requires standards by which accreditation agencies are to be judged by the Secretary. Like State licensure, the Department of Education has often overrelied on accreditation in the review of institutions. Setting out a clear articulation of standards for accreditation will enhance their role as a title IV gatekeeper.

Strengthens criminal penalties for program fraud.

Prohibits the use of commissioned salesmen and recruiters.

Requires institutions to provide pro rata tuition refunds.

Throughout the reauthorization process, I have recommended that a harder look be taken at the problems with the current GSL program.

In looking at the problem of student loan defaults, I have found that rarely, if ever, is the loan delivery mechanism the cause of defaults. Rather, in virtually every case, it is a failure of institutional accreditation of Depart-

ment of Education certification of eligibility of institutions that has led to loans being made to students virtually certain to later default on them. This is a problem that I believe is intensively addressed in H.R. 4471.

The changes that the gentleman from Michigan and I have worked out to promote institutional integrity and rid the student aid programs of the bad actor schools, will in my opinion, further reduce defaults and the flow of red ink created by bad loans.

While H.R. 4471 makes great strides to guard against program abuses, I still believe more could be done to enhance the integrity of our student aid programs. I understand that several amendments will be offered to title IV in this regard and I will speak on those which I support as they come up.

Much has been said over the last several months on the supposed savings to be derived under direct loans, with savings estimates of up to \$1 billion a year being suggested by some. I question these savings claims. In January 1992 the Congressional Budget Office issued a report that indicated that claims that direct loans save money over guaranteed loans are overstated since direct loan programs have administrative costs which are unaccounted for under credit reform. At least one big six accounting firm, who has thoroughly reviewed the direct loan proposal has suggested that there are no savings at all once the transitional costs and increased costs to educational institutions are taken into account.

The fact that direct loans appear to be less costly under the Credit Reform Act than the current program should not blind us to the fact that, under credit reform, administrative costs and transitional costs are simply not taken into account.

We need to get past simplistic notions that Federal funds will be less costly than private sector funds, and start focusing on the fact that the Government is likely to be a dramatically less efficient manager of the student loan program than the current guaranty-agency-based program.

Finally, and most troubling to me personally, is the complete absence of accountability in the direct loan demonstration program. Under direct loans, the Federal Government provides 100 percent of the money to make the loans through Federal borrowing and pays 100 percent of every default claim.

However, despite all my reservations about direct lending, I reluctantly agreed that, given the level of interest and concern regarding direct lending, the bill ought to authorize a demonstration program to put to rest the question of whether the Government should run the student loan program.

The committee amendment contains a provision for a direct loan dem-

onstration project of \$500 million. I have yet to be convinced that movement toward direct Federal funding of student loans is a step in the right direction.

I feel very strongly that any demonstration project must be limited in scope. The demonstration program in H.R. 4471 is far too large and open-ended to test whether or not this program will work and I will offer an amendment to limit this demonstration to the loan volume to \$500 million a year.

In closing, I want to thank all concerned on the Education and Labor Committee for the work they have done to bring us to the point we are at today. I hope before H.R. 4471 passes this House that we be able to amend it and make it an even stronger piece of legislation.

□ 1750

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS], the ranking Democratic member of the committee.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill reauthorizing the Higher Education Act of 1965 for two primary reasons. First, it recognizes that students from families considered to be in the middle-income category—typically \$30,000 to \$50,000 a year—need assistance if they are to pursue higher education.

And, second, it recognizes that many Americans who are interested in non-academic programs and especially those men and women with families to support who have recently lost their jobs need access to quality schools that offer specific skill training in order to get into the job market as quickly as possible.

Both of these groups need to be served and the bill before us today makes that commitment because we know the value of higher education—regardless of the type of educational program or the size or the type of institution attended.

It is easy to see the personal financial benefit education provides because men and women who continue their educations past the high school level consistently earn more money on average each year than people who do not. In 1990, for example, the average income for high school graduates was almost \$18,000, compared to incomes of about \$24,000 for those with 1 to 3 years of postsecondary study and \$31,000 for college graduates, according to the most recent statistics from the Census Bureau.

One simple fact that is all too often overlooked is that the United States, as a whole, also benefits when Americans are provided with the necessary assistance to pursue higher education.

Look at the experiences of our World War II veterans. Through the GI bill the Government invested \$14 billion in education and job training benefits for 7.8 million men and women. For every dollar the Government spent in education under the GI bill, the Nation got back no less than \$5 and as much as \$12.50 by most estimates.

We can even look at a more recent group of students, the high school class of 1972, and see similar results according to a 1990 study. For every dollar we invested in these students under the financial assistance programs, we get a return of \$4.30 just in tax revenue to the Government.

And even the return of \$4.30 in tax dollars alone is an extremely conservative estimate according to the economist and the professor who conducted the study. They also conclude that the failure to invest appropriate levels of Federal funds in student financial aid has serious consequences.

One of the major consequences cited in the study is that access to higher education could be limited since students who are able to attend would fail to do so because of a lack of finances.

We have already seen students delaying postsecondary education for a year or two and sometimes even indefinitely simply because they don't have the money to go straight from high school to college. If this continues much longer, it probably won't be too long before we see financially strapped young Americans forgoing college altogether.

We should take this even farther because it is common knowledge that insufficient financial resources not only affects access, but also affects choice.

Unfortunately, many students are choosing the schools they will attend based on what the institutions charge for tuition and other items, and, far too many students have already been forced to forget about attending their first, second, and even third choices simply because the costs are too high.

What is more, the students who seem to be hurt most are those from middle-income families. This is why I wholeheartedly support the provisions in this bill which would help bring these students back into eligibility for the student assistance programs—and particularly the Pell Grant Program.

Over the past several years, due to Federal budget constraints, inflation, and skyrocketing costs of higher education, the purchasing power of the Pell grant has steadily declined.

This has had disastrous consequences for all students and their families. Even while the grants have continued to be available to the very neediest of needy students, many of these low-income students still have had to rely on loans to fund most of their educational expenses.

But, middle-income students, who very rarely qualify for even a mini-

mum Pell grant of \$200, have been forced to rely almost exclusively on loans if they decide to further their educations.

After 4 years of school and no guarantee of finding a job, some of these graduates face \$30,000 to \$40,000 of debt—an overwhelming and unmanageable burden. And, if a middle-income student goes on to medical or law school, the accumulated debt burden is often more than \$100,000.

One provision in this bill raises the maximum amount of a Pell grant from \$3,100 to \$4,500. This will enable a student from a family of four with an income of about \$49,000 to be eligible for a minimum grant of \$400. That may not seem like much, but, believe me, every bit of assistance helps.

Unfortunately, this could end up being an empty promise if not enough money is appropriated to fully fund the program.

While many of us would like to see Pell grants become an entitlement program, this will not become a reality under the current Republican administration because the President has threatened to veto any reauthorization bill—no matter how beneficial it would be for students, parents, and this country—if it has anything even remotely resembling an entitlement for Pell grants.

Nonetheless, by raising the maximum grant amount and through other changes to the current law, we are taking a step in the right direction by trying to provide as much assistance to students as possible.

This does not mean, however, that I support everything in the bill. I believe some of the provisions in this bill are an overreaction to a perception that too many of America's higher education institutions, particularly the for-profit career training schools, are in business just to rip off their students.

Frankly, nothing could be further from the truth. In recent years some people were so insistent that the student loan default rate should be used as a gauge to determine the quality of educational programs that two very basic facts about the default rate have been consistently overlooked.

First, study after study has proven that the No. 1 reason students default on their loans is they don't have the money to pay them back—not because they did not benefit from the education and not because they were dissatisfied with the program.

Some studies have looked at students to try to determine what conditions, or risk factors, prevail when students are unable to repay their loans. These studies have concluded that students are at a higher risk of defaulting if they come from low-income families, have little financial and moral support, and take out smaller loans. It has also been found that many loan defaulters are single parents.

Knowing this, it is not surprising that more of these students choose a career training school so they can learn needed skills and get a job quickly instead of devoting 4 years to an academic program that may or may not teach them marketable skills. It is also not surprising to find that student loan default rates are higher in the career training sector than in the 4-year college sector of the educational community.

And, second, the student loan default rate does not accurately reflect how many students actually default.

Default rates indicate the percentage of students who ever entered default. Once a student defaults on his or her loan, that student is always counted as a default—even if the loan has been fully repaid.

One study conducted for the Department of Education found that between 40 and 45 percent of defaulted loans enter repayment within a period of 36 months, and that 30 percent of these enter repayment within 20 months with the majority entering within the first few months of default.

The default rate is clearly not an accurate measure of how many student loans are in default. It is also absurd to think this erroneous figure could or should be used to judge where abuses in the student assistance programs are occurring.

I think we are all well aware that there have been abuses and that these abuses were coupled with a severe lack of oversight. In recent years, the situation had gotten so serious that very understandable and very necessary integrity questions have been raised regarding the stability and purpose of the programs, as well as the structure of the delivery system and the effectiveness of the entities responsible for conducting oversight.

This bill tries to answer those questions and put in place reforms that will hopefully eliminate current abusive practices and decimate any opportunity for future forms of abuse to be implemented.

Not everyone is happy with some of these reforms. The attitude surrounding most of the discussions about these provisions seemed to be, "yes, there is abuse but not in my backyard. You should devote all of your attention to the other guys and leave us alone to go about our business."

I have heard this from all of the groups who have a hand in the assistance programs—including the banks, secondary markets, and servicing agencies, as well as the schools.

One thing that has aggravated me for years is that even though we know full well that there has been abuse practiced by all of the players in this program and throughout every sector of the higher education system—from 2- and 4-year universities to community colleges and career training schools—

the favorite scapegoat for both real and perceived abuses in the programs consistently has been the for-profit career training schools.

Year after year, students in short-term programs that provide job skills have been a major target in the budget reconciliation process. Actions were taken that reduced the amount of financial assistance available to these students under the guise of saving money by reducing loan defaults and ending abusive practices which were somehow perceived to occur only in this sector.

I am encouraged to see that this reauthorization legislation appears to treat these students and the schools which serve them more fairly than in the past, and I applaud the effort that has been made along these lines.

It is true that some of the program integrity provisions will be difficult for many schools in all sectors of the higher education community to comply with, but, hopefully, they will be implemented and enforced in a fair and unbiased manner.

If they are, I am confident that the good schools from all of the sectors will be able to comply with the provisions and continue to provide their students with high-quality education.

We need good schools now more than ever—particularly quality career training schools.

Career training schools have been, and continue to be, a vital and necessary component of our higher education system almost from the very beginning of formal education in this country. They provide students with the avenue to acquire needed skills allowing them to enter the labor market quickly or to upgrade or build upon existing skills enabling them to get a better job.

These are not the students we want to eliminate from the assistance programs—especially now, when so many men and women are unemployed because their jobs have been eliminated and desperately need retraining if they are to get jobs in new lines of work.

We must ensure that these students as well as students wishing to attend 2- and 4-year institutions have access to the education they need and want. We cannot afford to do anything less.

At no time in recent memory has the necessity of providing hundreds of thousands of displaced workers with the skill training needed to reenter the work force, upgrading the skills of American workers so we can compete with other countries, and improving the quality of life for all Americans been as pressing as it is today.

We know that investing in education can accomplish all of these objectives. It is an investment that we must make and one we will never be sorry for having made.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for H.R. 4471.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. I want to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN]. I doubt whether there is any piece of legislation that has come to the floor of this House recently that had probably as much scrutiny, as many hearings, as much writing, re-writing, et cetera, as this piece of legislation. I think we now have a very excellent opportunity to present the American public with the finest higher education bill that we have ever had, and they have always been good because the chairman has written them all. So how could they have been anything other than that?

The programs authorized by the Higher Education Act are enormously important to the lives of American students and their families. These programs have provided billions of dollars in the form of grants and loans for postsecondary educational opportunities. Last year, these programs provided over \$5.2 billion in grants and over \$12 billion in loans leveraged by the Federal guaranty. I am especially supportive of the changes made under the loan program in determining a student's financial need and, hence, the student's eligibility for Federal student aid. Under this bill, we have eliminated the family home, family farm, and family small business in the calculation of need under need analysis. This bill truly takes enormous steps to increase access for American students to a postsecondary education.

I am pleased that the bill includes provisions from three bills that I introduced: First, changes in title V, educator recruitment, retention, and development which are programs for teacher education and recruitment through, State and local programs and programs conducted by institutions of higher education; second, additions to title I, articulation agreements between 2-year colleges and 4-year colleges in order to assure that academic credit earned by a student at a 2-year institution will be transferable to a 4-year institution; and third, changes to title IV, part H, dealing with program integrity and State oversight in order to curb defaults and ensure quality programs are receiving Federal aid. As you know, the student aid programs have been under severe need of increased accountability and oversight. Last year, the program reached an all time high of \$3.6 billion in default costs. Of the \$52 billion loaned to students under this program, \$17 billion is currently in default. We must ensure that the law requires accountability and oversight.

That is one of the reasons, having just said that, that I have some real concerns about a direct loan, simply because I feel that we have to really show the American public that we can clean up the present act. Second, we have no research, nothing to turn to indicate that the fact that the American taxpayer will guarantee 100 percent, not the institutions who would be direct loaning, means that we could be in serious trouble. It is an unknown. I do not know how anyone can credit savings in this particular area, although CBO did, because, as I said, it is an unknown and it could be just the opposite. There could be tremendous risk.

I too, like the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] would like to limit the pilot program. I would like to make sure that no one is forced into it that does not want to be in it. There is no question in my mind that institutions who have all sorts of money coming to them from different sources are familiar with this and can handle this. But that is a small percentage of colleges and universities that are out there.

The second concern I have deals with the 600 clock hours. I notice that a staffer was quoted as saying Republicans tend to see these institutions as businesses and say, therefore, we ought not to be too harsh on someone who is trying to make a buck, where Democrats tend to see them as points of access for training for some lower income students. I do not know where he did his survey. I never heard anyone, any Republican on this committee ever tell me that that was their purpose for wanting to try to make sure that the good proprietary schools and the good courses that may be short courses continue. I always thought that they were telling me, and I am sure that is what they were, as well as every other Republican that came to me and made it very clear to me that their concern was what do we do about the 50 percent, 51 percent or more of students who never go on to a 4-year institution, but who must be trained and retrained many times.

I just visited a heavy equipment operating school. I never met graduates of a school that were so enthused about the training that they received and were so pleased that they were out there with a job that was very, very beneficial to the community, but also paid quite well.

One of the gentlemen, after 17 years working for a company, all of a sudden found himself without a job because the company closed its doors. He was a father of three small children. He had no idea what in the world he was going to do. He did not know how he was going to support his family. He did not know how he was going to be able to get any help to go about getting some training and retraining that was necessary.

□ 1800

Fortunately, there was help, not only the help that we have provided here but some other help that he could get in order to get that training, and now he is a very successful operator, but he is also a great provider for his family, and he is not on any public assistance.

So again, I would hope that we would be very careful, as I said before, when we point out how terrible some of these institutions are, and there is no question that there have been an awful lot of fly-by-night organizations that got away with public money. We made a lot of corrections to that. We have done a lot of good.

I think we can do some more, but at the same time we want to be very, very sure that the people who need this training have an opportunity to get it, and if they do not have any money, they will need help somewhere, or they will continue through life drawing public assistance, et cetera, and not being a productive citizen in our society. So I think if we can make a couple of changes, we will have the best.

As I said before, they have all been good, but this will be the best higher education bill.

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for this opportunity to call upon our Members to support and quickly pass this comprehensive reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

There is no piece of legislation more critical to the future of this country than this measure. I know that the Committee on Education and Labor members and staff have worked long and hard to craft a reasonable and balanced bill, and I commend them for their work.

There is another component, however haunting, to today's debate. We must call upon the President to lay aside politics of the current campaign and work with us, not against us, in the interests of America's young people.

In only a few short years the United States will enter the 21st century. At present we are witnessing a remarkable change in the makeup of the world's superpowers.

We cannot remain the strongest power in the world on the sheer fact of our military prowess. We cannot expect to remain the leading symbol of political and economic success with the rest of the world if we fail to properly support and educate our young people.

This debate is not about who wins or loses this November's election. It is how many of our children will go on to school.

We can no longer rely upon our elementary and high schools to properly

educate and prepare our young Americans to go out and conquer the world and succeed ahead of others with just that education. A college education or a proper technical training should be available to every qualified young American. I cannot emphasize that enough.

I wish that we would have this as a matter of right for every young person. Hopefully, this measure which consumes 97 percent of its total assets in educating America's young people of tomorrow will be a step in the right direction.

I urge all of our Members, after the lengthy debate on amendments tomorrow, to support its passage.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, let me join with those who have come before me from the Committee on Education and Labor in commending the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and all of the staff and his colleagues on the Democratic side, and certainly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], and all the staff on our side of the aisle for all the work that they have put into this reauthorization.

Mr. Chairman, if you are interested in restoring America's competitiveness in the world economy, if you are interested in preparing America's workers for the 21st century, if you are interested in making sure that Americans have the opportunity for upward mobility, not downward mobility, in the years in front of us, it is this bill which will be the most important piece of legislation that Congress will consider during this session.

We on the Committee on Education and Labor, as we began this process some time ago, really faced six major challenges before us. We recognized that we literally could not keep up with the challenges families and students faced as they tried to continue their education and training in the high-technology world that demanded that. The reality is that schools across this country, for many reasons, some legitimate, some not so legitimate, have continued to increase their tuition charges at least twice the rate of inflation. We on the committee have increased funding for student financial aid since the beginning of this last reauthorization between 1986 and 1990 by 16 percent, almost \$2 billion, and yet we find that fewer families are able to obtain the financial resources they need.

In particular, we began this process recognizing that middle-income families were more and more finding themselves ineligible for student financial assistance and, therefore, an opportunity for postsecondary education.

We recognized that the demographics of our student body were changing dramatically when now a majority of students attending postsecondary education were adult nontraditional and, in most cases, part-time students. We recognized that last year this Congress passed the Americans with Disabilities Act to deal with the handicapped in the workplace of America. We recognized that earlier, in handicapped education, we had dealt with handicapped students in the elementary and secondary grade levels. We recognized, however, that gap that higher education had still not opened its doors for full opportunity for the handicapped population.

Fifth, we recognized real challenges faced us in the area of graduate education. Almost 50 percent of the graduate-education degrees in American colleges and universities today unfortunately go to foreign students. In the area of math and science, something like 57 percent of the graduate degrees go to foreign students. We are happy to provide this industry for them. We are challenged by the fact that we need more and more American students to participate in those programs.

As those before me have mentioned, we recognize the challenges in the area of program integrity, especially in the area of guaranteed student loan defaults.

Perhaps it was put best as we tried to meet these challenges for us to look back at the 1965 committee report in the first Higher Education Act of that time, and I would like to quote from that act where it said,

The committee has not set age limitations with respect to recipients, nor is a preference accorded to any specific academic discipline or year of study.

Well, as I mentioned earlier, one of the great challenges we faced in this particular reauthorization is the market change in the composition of that student body. Today more than 5 million students, over 40 percent of those attending postgraduate secondary education, are older than 24 years of age, and the average age of a student attending community colleges in our Nation is 29 years of age. Two-thirds of those students attending our postsecondary institutions in this country, Mr. Chairman, attend on a less than full-time basis.

Recognizing these changes, I personally am pleased to report to the full Congress that a number of provisions deal with these particular problems. In the area of the nontraditional student, we now include changes in removing the farm, the home, and the small business from calculating that student's eligibility for financial aid. That helps middle-income people. That is essential to that single parent head of household who seeks financial assistance as they return to college.

Second, we have formally defined what a nontraditional student is.

Third, we have opened up the Pell grant eligibility for less than half-time students, and I would call to the attention of my colleagues tomorrow, as we consider the amendments, an amendment I will offer strongly supported by the administration that will expand eligibility both for Pell grants and for the guaranteed student loan to those students all the way down to a one-course enrollment.

Many, many of our adult single-parent heads of households are taking one three-credit course per semester. If they qualify for financial aid, they should be eligible for it even if they are going part time at that level. This becomes essential in making sure that we truly are a nation of students.

Fourth, we are directing our colleges and universities to expand their human resource departments of operations to deal in evenings and weekends with those nontraditional students.

□ 1810

We have asked the Department to begin doing the kind of study necessary to get the accurate statistics we need to assess exactly what kind of service we are or are not providing to the nontraditional students. Unfortunately, none of that data is eligible today.

Finally, we are making sure that for those students who go to school part time because they are disabled that they will be considered in terms of eligibility for financial aid. They will not be biased by their handicap or by the costs associated uniquely with their handicap or disability.

Finally, in the area of disability, we also move to establish a national clearinghouse for postsecondary education materials for students with disabilities, a major problem we have discovered across this country, thanks to a blind student by the name of Paul Frank at Viterbo College in my district, and we have called for the formation of partnerships between higher education institutions and secondary schools serving students with disabilities.

Mr. Chairman, we bring you a good bill from the Committee on Education and Labor. At a time of polarized partisanship, we also bring you a bipartisan bill. This is a commitment, an investment in the future of our Nation. We ask you to join with us in supporting it and moving it to enactment.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield this time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of H.R. 4471, because I think it is a good bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4471, the Higher Education Amendment Act of 1992, and want to commend my chairman, Mr. FORD, for his tireless efforts in bringing this important measure to the floor. It has always been my belief that education is the most effective means of ex-

panding economic and social opportunity. It often serves as the cornerstone of personal achievement, and is essential to winning the battle against many of this Nation's greatest social ills such as crime, drug abuse, unemployment, and poverty. For nearly every challenge that we face, education can be a principle factor in the solution.

Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons why I serve on the Education and Labor Committee, and why I am committed to improving educational opportunities in this country. It is more than appropriate that the largest domestic measure to be considered by the 102d Congress thus far is today's education bill. Providing access to education is clearly an economic stimulus—a concrete answer to the Bush depression under which this country continues to suffer.

As you know, the higher education amendments of 1992, authorizes the major Federal programs supporting postsecondary education. After over 400 hearings and many days of drafting, I believe that our committee has developed a measure that makes positive improvements in postsecondary education.

H.R. 4471 specifically:

Boosts the Pell grant maximum award from \$2,400 to \$4,500;

Raises the income level for Pell grant eligibility from \$30 to \$50,000;

Expands Pell eligibility to less-than-half-time students;

Allows all students, regardless of family income, to obtain loans;

Expands the TRIO Program to assist first generation and disadvantaged students prepare for college;

Increases support for child care expenses;

Forgives students' loans in cases of school closings; and

Simplifies the student aid application.

While this reauthorization moves this Nation in a very positive direction, I am disturbed by key provisions that have been eliminated. At the outset of this process, I was a strong advocate for the Pell grant entitlement provision. My position has not changed. It is my belief that the entitlement provision directly addressed the issue of the loan grant imbalance and the default rate issue. It is ultimately in our best interest to continue in our efforts to make the Pell grant an entitlement. It is not only an issue of fairness, but is also drastically needed by this Nation's students. The idea is very basic, if the student is eligible for a \$4,500 award, he or she should receive that amount.

In addition to the entitlement provision, I also strongly oppose the imposition of the new origination fees on SLS and PLUS loans, and the reinstatement of such fees on the Stafford loan. Placing these burdens on students and their parents severely undermines the intent of this reauthorization. Taxing students who are already needy merely creates additional access problems, and will serve as an obvious disincentive to a higher education. Moreover, as has been pointed out by my dear colleague from Hawaii, PATSY MINK, this issue was never considered by the Education Committee and was drafted by the Rules Committee. I find this approach to be plain and simply wrong.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly highlight three provisions which I have au-

thored as part of this reauthorization measure. First, H.R. 4471 establishes an institute for international public policy which will develop programs and curriculum with the hope of increasing the number of African-Americans and other minorities in the U.S. Foreign Service, as well as other international services. Second, in an effort to increase the number of women and minorities in the field of science and engineering, the bill creates a new Women and Minorities Science and Engineering Outreach Demonstration Program. Finally, this measure provides training dollars for school-based decisionmakers for school districts in the process of systemic restructuring and reform.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly encourage my colleagues' support for this measure, because in my assessment H.R. 4471 is the first true economic growth package we have considered in this Congress.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege at this point to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be here to support the reauthorization of the higher education bill, and to commend particularly Chairman FORD for his outstanding leadership, and all my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor, and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] for their efforts in this great undertaking.

When I came to the Congress last January, I wanted to serve on the Committee on Education and Labor, because I truly believed that education is the engine that pulls this country forward. Individually, it is the mechanism by which people rise to seize all the opportunities that this country offers. Collectively, it is the force that has always made us the leader in the world.

Today we have an opportunity to renew our commitment to education through this legislation.

I am an example of someone who benefited from education. I grew up in a working class family. My father was a custodian and my mother worked in a factory. They wanted me to go to school, and with their hard work and my effort and with the assistance of our Government, I was able to go to school, first attending West Point and later going on to law school, and my brother and sister were able to go to school because they could get Pell grants and loans.

We have to commit ourselves to continuing this investment in the people of America through education. It is very, very difficult these days. The cost of education is accelerating. This legislation will give working Americans a chance.

I am particularly struck by the testimony we heard at a field hearing in Providence, in which a mother described the fact that her young daughter graduated from school thousands of

dollars in debt, the family itself having borrowed money. This young lady was not able to go directly to the field she wanted because she had to get a job to pay her debts.

What was more unsettling and disturbing is the fact that there was another child in that family, and that child had reached a point where the parents could not make the same effort for her.

I do not want us to return to a situation in which the favorite child gets to go to school. We have to commit ourselves to making education available for all our citizens with the ability and determination to seize it.

Our Nation cannot afford anything less. We are moving away from a world of military confrontation to a world of economic competition. The key to success in that battle is good strong education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of this important measure.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and my congratulations, as others have said, to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] and to Chairman FORD and also to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for their work in putting the higher education bill together.

This is obviously not a perfect bill. It has been a bill that at times has had a number of contentious points that we have argued about. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN] indicated earlier some of the concerns that many of us share on this side of the aisle with the direct loan program, and also the Pell grant entitlements; but I think we have come to a point now where we have reached a number of key compromises.

In particular, I want to thank both the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for earlier this fall taking time out of their busy schedules to travel to the University of Wisconsin in my home town of Madison to listen to concerns of people at the University of Wisconsin, as well as a number of students and people involved in the vocational technical areas as well.

I think what became clear in that hearing was that this bill will address one fundamental need in our Nation's college community at this point, and that involves financial aid, both loans and grants to the middle class.

At the present time, more than 70 percent of the financial aid in this country goes to people and to families who make less than \$20,000 a year.

Now, we have been able to substantially change that by taking the family home or the family farm out of the calculation. We think that the changes in

the bill will now allow families with incomes of \$40,000 or maybe even \$50,000 a year, middle-class standards certainly by today's dollars, to get some help so that they do not have to literally sell their farms or put their homes in hock in order to send their sons or daughters to go on to college.

The bill also has two key provisions of which I am particularly proud. Earlier the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], my colleague, talked about foreign students in this country. There has been a lot of writing over the last couple years about the entire subject of competitive advantage. Professor Porter at Harvard talked about the fact that some companies manage to succeed, while others fail, and later on made the argument that some nations managed to succeed while others fail because each nation or each company enjoys a number of strategic advantages.

At the present time, more than 450,000 foreign students are studying in the United States. Many of those students from China, India, Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, are studying at my home institution at the University of Wisconsin. Many of them come here to study economics, science, and math. It has been an area in which the United States has excelled. In fact, if you look nationwide at international surveys, consistently 7, 8, 9 of the top 10 science programs in the world are right here in the United States; but if you look at the infrastructure on our Nation's campuses, the buildings where scientific research is done and where graduate students in science do their research at biology and physics buildings, for instance, at the University of Wisconsin, you find that many of them were built with sputnik money in the late 1950's and they are beginning to crumble around us.

In title VII of the higher education bill, I am delighted to tell my constituents at the University of Wisconsin and to the higher education community around the country that we have dramatically increased the amount of money available for States who are willing to put up competitive money raised from either private foundations or from their own taxpayers to help rebuild our Nation's scientific infrastructure on those university campuses. It was an idea that I brought back with me from Madison, an idea that I am delighted to say most of my colleagues quickly embraced.

On the other side of the issue, we are now in the second year of a 5-year program to dramatically assess the problems of children in our Nation from birth to three who are saddled with a number of disabilities, learning disabilities in particular. Under the Perkins Loan Forgiveness Program, we have managed to extend forgiveness programs to teachers who now look at ages from birth to 2, and as we begin to

implement this program, as I said, we are in the second year of planning in a 5-year program, and it is obvious that we do not have the teachers to assess children at this point. I think this provision of the higher education bill will help provide more teachers to help accomplish those tasks in that measure.

On the Direct Loan Program, I am delighted to see a compromise that will take us away from a full-pledged program across the country instead to a pilot program, because before we eliminate banks and other financial institutions, I think it is crucial that we discover if a direct loan program will work and to see if the Department of Education really has the resources and has the ability and the willingness to collect the money.

Finally in closing, if I can tell you how delighted I have been as a freshman to be able to participate in putting together what I think is one of the most important pieces of legislation this House will pass this year, one of the more important pieces of legislation any Congress can act on and for the more than 40,000 students at the University of Wisconsin in Madison and the faculty and staff, they and I hope, with fingers crossed, that all this hard work of the last year can be put behind us and that we will be able to see a bill passed out of this House sometime tomorrow.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, for various reasons: No. 1, I think actually it created a hundred ways to curtail the abuse and the default in student loans, and because I know it goes a long way to provide access and opportunity to many young people who hitherto have not had it.

Mr. Chairman, once upon a time high school was considered a luxury—today it is mandatory. Even low-technology jobs—such as auto repair and security—have gone high technology. Today's car has more computer power than the first lunar lander. America now faces a choice of high skills or low wages.

America has chosen to invest in people. From Jefferson's northwest ordinance schools to Lincoln's land grant colleges to Truman's G.I. education bill to Johnson's student aid, our Nation has widened access to education for all Americans with the ability to benefit from education opportunities. That is American wisdom.

This legislation builds accountability and opportunity. It includes over 100 provisions to eliminate student aid abuses and defaults. It cracks down hard on the fly-by-night operations and rip-and-skip folks. This legislation reinforces accountability.

Opportunity is the other part of the American agenda. The swelling cost of college tuition has put college out of reach for all too many Americans.

Education remains our best investment in a better future. After World War II America in-

vested in the G.I. bill for education. The G.I. bill not only paid for itself—bringing in between \$5 and \$12.50 for every dollar invested in it—it also built the foundations for our modern economy.

In the last decade, Republican Federal student aid focused on putting low-income students in debt, and squeezing middle-income students out of eligibility for student aid.

The consequences are clear—high default rates among low-income students trying to begin careers, keep a roof over their heads, start good families, and repay Federal loans. Meanwhile, middle-income families found themselves squeezed out of eligibility for many aid programs. The results show up in many ways—including the declining proportion of blacks and Hispanics enrolling in college. This is truly something that American cannot afford.

Today is the time to set clear priorities. Like the G.I. bill, this legislation invests in America—to help provide real access to all students—increasing Pell grants so that they can once again help pay for real education, and restoring middle class access. This legislation helps bring college back into reach for all Americans.

Our high-technology economy requires high skills. Access, accountability, and investment in a better future—that is what this legislation is about. We need smart students, not just smart bombs. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this vital legislation.

□ 1820

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, and I commend my colleague, Mr. FORD, for his diligence and timeliness in bringing this important legislation to the floor.

H.R. 4771 improves existing student assistance programs and provides greater access to higher education for all students, especially students of middle-income families, by increasing financial aid funding, simplifying our financial aid system, and improving early intervention and outreach programs.

I am also pleased the legislation includes two provisions I sponsored on Indian higher education. The first provision will simplify the administration of the scholarship program operated for Indian students through the BIA and will free up additional funds for Indian college students. The second provision will encourage Indian students to pursue studies in areas most needed by their tribes. A one-to-one service pay-back to the tribe would then be required of students participating in the new program.

I am delighted these provisions have been included in this bill as they benefit both Indian students and Indian tribes by furthering the education of an Indian student who might not otherwise be able to attend a college or a

university and provides tribes with a knowledgeable and much-needed work force.

I had originally intended to offer an amendment later today that would have provided funding to Hispanic colleges and universities with a Hispanic student enrollment of at least 25 percent. After assuring me that this issue will be protected in conference, I will withdraw my amendment. In order to qualify for these funds, institutions would have to comply with current part A regulations requiring that they serve significant population of low-income or needy students and also have a minimum 25 percent Hispanic student enrollment. These institutions could use the funding to strengthen and enhance their capacity to increase Hispanic educational achievements by upgrading their current curriculum and facilities and to establish and expand new programs and support services.

The need for this provision has been clearly demonstrated by numerous studies emphasizing the low number of Hispanic students served by colleges and universities. Hispanic college enrollment is lower than almost any other major population group. Hispanics, between the ages of 18-24, have had the lowest college participation rates of any ethnic group and achieve degrees at much lower rates than white students. In 1989, only 16.1 percent of Hispanics between the ages of 18-24 were enrolled in college compared to 23.5 percent of all African-Americans and 31.8 percent of whites. Furthermore, Hispanics make up only 3.6 percent of all students in 4-year higher education institutions.

Hispanics are one of our fastest growing populations and, as such, make up a large part of our work force. As a nation, if we are to remain competitive, we must do what we can to ensure that Hispanic-Americans are as well trained and educated as possible for the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, while I will not be offering this amendment, I firmly believe that colleges and universities that serve a significant number of Hispanic students need the resources to design and implement programs that would support and expand the number of Hispanics attending college and the number of Hispanics graduating from college.

A similar provision was offered by my colleague from New Mexico, Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, and incorporated into the Senate higher education reauthorization bill. I hope that this important provision will be given serious consideration during the House/Senate conference committee as the benefits it would provide to Hispanic students and the Hispanic community are vitally needed.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a distinguished educator,

the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. I'd like to congratulate Chairman FORD for his leadership on this important legislation. It was his perseverance and determination that helped bring this legislation to the floor today.

It has become increasingly difficult for American families to provide their children with higher education. Costs at public and private colleges have grown two to three times faster than the average family's income, and we can't expect parents to handle this extra cost at a time when most working, middle-class families are struggling just to make ends meet.

Higher education fuels the engine of our economic train. We as a nation must invest in our country. America's work force must move toward high-skill occupations in order to improve the Nation's economic outlook. In fact, more than half of the new jobs created between now and the year 2000 will require education beyond high school. Our country's long-term economic security depends on our ability to bring higher education within the reach of all Americans.

This bill is clearly a step in the direction of aiding middle-class families. A key component of the bill addresses the increasing costs of higher education by increasing the maximum Pell grant from \$2,400 to \$4,500. In my State alone over 50,000 students received an average Pell grant of \$1,344 in 1989. We must do better.

One of the great tragedies of the 1980's is that this country and this Government has overspent and overspent on misplaced priorities. Now is the time to change our priorities and begin reinvesting in our children, our future. Instead of fixing other countries' problems and excessive defense spending, we must spend those funds here.

Many Members worked to make Pell grants an entitlement and therefore ensure full funding for all students who are eligible. While falling short of an ideal bill, this measure is a first step in putting our priorities back in place.

I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and strongly encourage the appropriations committee to fully fund this authorization.

Today, Congress has a perfect opportunity to achieve this goal. H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, reaffirms the Federal commitment to the support of postsecondary education.

H.R. 3553 will ensure that middle-class families will be able to send their children to college. It extends support to middle-class families by offering Pell grants to families with an income of up to \$49,000.

All students regardless of family income will be able to borrow up to the

maximum Stafford loan, and eligibility for the in-school interest subsidy will extend to students from families with incomes of \$78,000. All parents will be able to borrow up to the total college cost through the Parent Loans to Undergraduate Students Program.

H.R. 3553 also simplifies and improves the application process. Financial aid forms are notorious for their bewildering complexity, and this has surely discouraged some students from applying for aid. Now there will be a single Federal form for all Federal student aid, and a single needs analysis. Students will be able to update their application from the prior year rather than filing an entire new application each year. Plus, family businesses, farms, and homes will no longer be considered in determining eligibility for financial assistance. Hard-working families will no longer have to face the choice of giving up their homes or being unable to send their children to school.

Nontraditional students—those who are older, independent of their parents, working, or attending school part-time—are now in the majority in post-secondary education. Adult students, often with children and financial responsibilities, are among the most dedicated members of the student population, although they are unable to attend school full-time. H.R. 3553 recognizes this fact by revising the student aid programs to more effectively serve the needs of nontraditional students. The bill will increase support for child care expenses and extend eligibility for Pell grants to less-than-half-time students. Also, H.R. 3553 ensures that a reasonable amount of Federal supplemental educational opportunity grants, which target students with the greatest financial need, will be allocated to nontraditional students.

None of these crucial changes in the Higher Education Act will have their full impact unless we make certain that students and their families are well informed about their educational options. Therefore, the bill establishes eight new programs to improve early outreach and intervention efforts. It strengthens the successful TRIO Programs, creates a new Federal-State partnership to provide tutoring and advising, provides supports for training high school counselors, and improves and expands honors awards programs. It also provides incentives for States to establish student savings programs and establishes a national computer network of financial aid information.

America has long made its goal equal educational opportunity, but it has yet to achieve that goal. Recently, even middle-income families have had to struggle and make sacrifices to send their children to school, and many feel that college is simply out of reach. The Higher Education Amendments Act is desperately needed to keep America on the path toward equal educational op-

portunity, and offers relief to students and their families trying to pay for higher education. I am an original cosponsor on this bill, and I will fight for its passage, and pursue every opportunity to support higher education.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the last of the big three from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. I thank the distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, reauthorization of my Higher Education Act has been called by some the most important social legislation to come before the 102d Congress. I share this opinion. In the United States, we have the preeminent system of higher education in the world. Our job during this reauthorization is to keep it that way, and to make certain that all Americans have access to the system.

Everyone agrees that a well-educated citizenry benefits the Nation. Education is not only good in itself, contributing to a higher quality of life; and not only important to the smoother functioning of democracy; it is also investment in human capital that increases individual productivity, and therefore income. However, in the case of postsecondary education people have a problem paying for those investments.

College and trade school tuitions keep rising and the middle class, in particular, is increasingly hard pressed to foot these bills, despite the fact that the education should pay off economically for most students. There is an array of Federal programs to help out, but they are focused on lower income families and are too expensive, wasteful, cumbersome, and even regressive.

The largest component of Federal student aid, the Stafford Student Loan Program, costs the taxpayers 28 cents for every \$1 loaned out, but most of that cost does not benefit average students. Instead, it subsidizes banks, administrators, defaulters, and high-income graduates. The program will experience \$3.6 billion of gross defaults this year. Moreover, since no interest is charged while the student remains in school, those who go to school longest, and therefore have the highest later incomes, receive the biggest subsidies, while dropouts and students in short programs such as vocational programs receive no subsidies at all.

Common sense suggests there ought to be a better way, and there is. Along with Representative GEJDENSON and 82 other cosponsors, I introduced the Income-Dependent Education Assistance Act, or the IDEA Act for short.

IDEA would set up a supplementary direct student loan program, in which repayment would be based on the borrower's income after school, and be collected as personal income tax by the IRS. It is a natural extension of the

principle that education represents, at least in part, an investment. Under IDEA, students pay for that investment out of its profits. And, under IDEA, the government backs such investments and spreads the risks across the entire student population, for which the investments yield handsome returns on average.

IDEA offers enormous advantages. First, it provides access to higher education financing to all students regardless of their parents' incomes. Second, it provides a better deal for most students, while providing complete flexibility of repayment that accommodates life changes like unemployment, periods of child rearing, divorce or death of a spouse, low earnings right after school, or periods of low wage public service employment. Third, it sweeps away the whole question of deferments and forgiveness provisions that, under the current system, constitute an arbitrary, unfair, complex mess.

In addition to these advantages, IDEA would save immense amounts of money, possibly in the billions of dollars per year. IDEA virtually eliminates defaults, targets subsidies precisely, simplifies administration, and enjoys a lower cost of capital.

If we want to spend more money on Pell grants or other parts of the Higher Education Act, we've got to find savings somewhere, and IDEA is a perfect source because it would save these tremendous amounts while still providing a much better loan program than the ones we have got now.

I understand that the administration has opposed the direct lending aspect of IDEA. I urge you not to be distracted. The difference between a guaranteed bank loan and a direct Federal loan is only bookkeeping. The effect on the economy is the same. IDEA has too many advantages to let a knee-jerk opposition to Federal borrowing stand in the way. We should apply the same principles that any private business would. We should be willing to borrow when we can make money doing it.

There will be several floor amendments to this bill that will advance the concept of IDEA. First, there will be a Ford-Coleman amendment requiring income-contingent loans to be offered in 20 percent of the institutions participating in the bill's \$500 million per year direct loan pilot program.

In addition, I will offer two amendments supported by the American Council of Education, its major constituent organizations, and the administration. The first amendment would authorize the Secretary of Education to purchase the loans of borrowers likely to go into default and offer those borrowers income-contingent repayment so they can avoid default and repay their obligations as they can afford it. The second would provide mandatory conversion of already-defaulted

loans into income-contingent repayment, pursuant to an agreement in the promissory notes of all new borrowers in the existing major loan programs. Both of these provisions would result in far greater collections on problem loans. They would establish the income dependent repayment principle for those who need it the most. Neither provision would go into effect unless the Secretary determined there was an effective collection mechanism in place and the provisions would save the Government money. Finally, I am prepared to offer the full IDEA proposal, which would substitute income dependent loans for the current Supplementary Loans for Students Program.

All of these amendments have been drafted without reference to either the Treasury or Internal Revenue Service. Instead, they authorize the Secretary of Education to enter into agreements with private firms or other agencies of the Government as necessary to collect payments based on income. But, frankly, these amendments do contemplate using IRS collection, and that cannot happen without the consent of the Ways and Means Committee. At the very least, Ways and Means could amend another tax bill to prohibit IRS collection of student loan payments. Therefore, although passage of any of these amendments will show important House support for the IDEA concept, further support from Ways and Means will be needed for actual implementation of these provisions.

In short, IDEA creates a loan program which increases access, reduces defaults, and makes repayment more manageable.

To the extent that subsidies are involved, they are progressive. And the money goes where it should go—to students who need it—rather than to bankers, defaulters, administrators, and the richest graduates.

In the process, IDEA frees up a great deal of Federal money which can be used for education grants or for deficit reduction. This is the kind of bold reform we should be looking at to lead American higher education into the next century.

□ 1830

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished author of the Middle Income Assistance Act, an important element in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of provisions in this bill which would make this legislation deserving of support, matter's to promote college libraries, teacher education, cooperative education programs, foreign language students, peace studies, but in my own judgment I believe that the heart and

soul of this bill is what it does for middle-income working families and their sons and daughters who want to off to higher education. Those families are the bedrock of our Federal tax system, and they, as we all know, are finding it increasingly difficult to finance their sons' or daughters' college education.

Middle-income working families are seeing college tuition rise four times as fast as their disposable income. Total college costs have risen three times as fast as have families' income over this past decade or so. Those families, middle-income families, have now gotten to the point where they can no longer provide their children with better opportunities than their parents provided for them.

We are losing the covenant which has inspired this country whereby each new generation of Americans would have more opportunities, and better chances and bigger hopes than the generation that went before them. That was the American dream, and for middle-income working folks that dream is quickly disappearing because they find they can no longer afford to send their sons and daughters to colleges and universities. This act helps correct that by making middle-income families and their sons and daughters eligible for college loans and grants.

Mr. Chairman, I have a lengthy statement here, but I know that other Members are waiting to speak about this bill and perhaps about the importance of the middle-income assistance portion of it. I have worked on this with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], and others for more than a year now, and so I want to yield back the balance of my time so that others may have additional time to speak on this and other important matters in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, my formal statement follows:

I rise in strong support of this legislation.

The bill before us is entitled the Higher Education Amendments of 1992. I think it would be more appropriate to call it the Middle-Income Student Assistance Act of 1992. For that is what it is. This bill opens up the Federal student aid programs to students from middle-income, working families.

This is an important bill for every Member of Congress who wants to do something that will actually help middle-income, working families. Earlier this Congress, I introduced with DICK GEPHARDT and STENY HOYER a bill that expanded Federal student aid programs to middle-income families. That legislation is cosponsored by 71 Members of this body. The legislation before us today incorporates the major provisions of my bill. And I thank the chairman of the committee, Congressman FORD, for that.

There are a number of provisions in this bill that would make this legislation deserving of support if they were all that it contained. The bill provides much needed help to our Nation's college libraries. It makes improvements in

teacher education programs, providing incentives to encourage the best and the brightest of our young people to become classroom teachers, especially in undeserved areas like our Nation's major cities and rural communities. It provides support for cooperative education programs—programs that blend school and work. And it gives some assistance to foreign language studies, something that is desperately needed if we are to compete successfully in a rapidly changing world.

But make no mistake about it, the heart and soul of this bill is what it does for middle-income, working families. These families, the bedrock of our Federal tax system, are finding it increasingly difficult to finance their children's college education.

Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of recent reports that have chronicled what actually happened economically to families during the past decade. We know that the rich got richer, and the poor poorer. What our constituents have been telling us, and what we have heard if we listened, is that middle-income, working folks have also been caught in the income squeeze. And the facts support that. For middle-income families, actual after-tax income has not improved one iota over the past decade. And when you account for the fact that the cost of everything else has gone up significantly during that period, you can see why middle-income, working families are hurting. When you adjust their income for inflation, these families have lost more than 20 percent of their purchasing power during the Reagan-Bush years.

And nowhere is this more apparent than when it comes time to pay for their kids college education. Middle-income, working families have seen college tuition rise four times as fast as their disposable income, and total college costs three times as fast. These families have now gotten to the point where they can no longer provide their children with better opportunities than their parents provided for them. We are losing the covenant that has inspired this country, whereby, each new generation of Americans would have more opportunities and better chances and bigger hopes than previous ones. That was the American dream and for middle-income, working folks, that dream is quickly disappearing.

And what does the Bush administration say about all this? They say the same thing that they have been saying since the Reagan-Bush bunch came into office. Too bad. Tough luck. Last week they sent to every Member's office an analysis of their positions on this legislation. Buried back on page 9 of that analysis was their opposition to the provisions of this bill that would open up student aid programs to middle-income families. Let me quote from that document, so that there is no mistake about where they stand:

The Administration strongly opposes the following provisions * * * needs analysis liberalizations * * * such as lowering the assessment rate of student income and elimination of consideration of all home, farm and business equity are unacceptable.

This is a lengthy way of saying that they oppose expanding these programs to help middle-income families.

To oppose this middle-income bill is beyond belief. Let me comment briefly on one of the objections the Bush team has to a provision in

this bill that would help families in my State. I live in a State that has a lot of folks who live in rural areas and on farms. These families have suffered quite a bit through the 1980's. These families are good, hard working folks, and they want to send their kids to college. But they find that the current student aid system makes them ineligible for student aid. The system assumes that they can mortgage their home or the family farm to raise money to pay for college. I don't think a family should have to make that choice—to choose whether they will mortgage their home, or their farm, or not send their kid to college. Working families don't think this is a realistic choice. Neither do I. And every farmer I have talked to in Montana tells me that the cost of operating a farm has become far greater than the return most farmers are receiving on their products, so that even if they wanted to mortgage their farm to pay for college, they would find few lenders willing to lend them the money. We have got to change this, so that the value of a family's home or farm will not be counted as an asset available to be used to pay for college. This bill makes that change, yet the Bush administration opposes it. I think we should say no to the Bush administration and yes to working folks and farm families.

Mr. Chairman, this bill gives us a clear choice. We can vote against it, and maintain the status quo. That status quo shuts out middle-income families from the student aid system. Or we can vote for this bill and open up our current system of student aid to the children of middle-income, working families. I think the choice is a clear one. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a real middle-income, working folks bill providing real benefits.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished and patient gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank and commend the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and all the Members and capable staffs on either side of the aisle because they have worked to give us more than a bill. They have given us the answer to some questions that we very often hear when we are at home in our districts.

They have given us an answer to the question of the person who has just graduated from high school who wants to go to a career school and learn a trade that will get that person a better job who says, "How can I pay for my education?" This bill has given us an answer to the schoolteacher who wants to further her education in a master's or Ph.D. program who asks, "How can I pay for graduate study?" Certainly this bill has given us an answer, not a

perfect answer, but given us an answer to the middle-class family that works hard all day or all week and is frustrated by the fact that, under present conditions, middle-class people pay for Federal financial aid but do not receive it, do not participate in it for themselves or their children.

This legislation that has been the product of so many hours of good hard work and good input from citizens and education leaders from around our country in hearings around our country, this legislation begins to give us an answer, begins to give us an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to go home to our districts across the country and say finally, after a long, long time, finally this Federal Government and this Congress is responding to those questions and saying, "We will help you earn your education, we will help our country compete, and we will help restore the idea that in this country people can go as far and as high as their ability and desire will take them."

Mr. Chairman, this legislation that we will debate this evening and tomorrow is a great step forward in that direction. I commend all those involved. It was a privilege for me to be personally involved.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I came to the U.S. Congress for three reasons: To see that we get fundamental changes and reforms in legislation, to see that we connect at home, places like South Bend, IN, and Goshen, IN, with legislation that we adopt in Washington, DC, and, third, to keep the dream of America alive for all Americans that they can get access to education. Mr. Chairman, this bill achieves all three of those objectives.

I am very proud to be part of this bill, and I commend the people that put this bill together, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and I commend the minority leaders, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] on the Democrat side, the fine staff that has worked on both sides to put this legislation together, and I also commend the willingness of this committee to listen to what is going on across America.

Father Hesburgh, who testified at a field hearing when I brought the committee back to Indiana, said, "As education goes, so goes America." This bill helps propel education forward, helps train people to compete with the Japanese and the Germans, helps us be competitive in a new century.

Diane Height, a parent and constituent, said in South Bend, IN:

This process is too complicated. Most Americans cannot even fill out the forms to get access to higher education. This bill simplifies those forms.

□ 1840

Joe Russo said not enough middle-class families that own homes or have farms have access to higher education. This bill addresses those concerns.

Cleo Washington said not enough working Americans, black and Hispanic, have access. This helps TRIO programs.

Mr. Chairman, we either invest now in education or later in prisons. This bill invests right now in our children and in students.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3553, the higher education amendments of 1992. This legislation reauthorizes the financial aid programs that enable students from low- and middle-income families to pursue the American dream of a college education.

Access and opportunity for postsecondary education will enable the students to today to compete in a global economy as the Nation's work force of tomorrow. More than ever before, our economic competitiveness depends on an educated, trained work force. Higher education provides the key to American competitiveness in world markets.

Just a year ago, the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education commenced a series of 44 days of hearings on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Through this hearing process, including one day in the Third District of Indiana, we were able to address a number of crucial education issues which confront students and their families. Before I address some of those issues, however, I would like to take this opportunity to commend Chairman BILL FORD for his leadership in this effort, and for accommodating more than 440 witnesses who sought the opportunity to present their views and recommendations to the subcommittee.

The witnesses who testified before the subcommittee were comprised of a broad cross section of experts, including college presidents, financial aid administrators, CEO's, students, and parents. Many of the recommendations of these witnesses are encompassed in the bill which is before us today.

Chairman FORD has had a particularly long and distinguished career in reauthorizing higher education programs, having chaired the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education in 1979 and 1980, in 1985 and 1986, and again in 1991-92. Many of the changes which the chairman sought and promoted in this reauthorization will improve and strengthen the current act. I was pleased to be involved in this comprehensive reauthorization process on one of the most important pieces of social legislation in the 102d Congress.

Although the Higher Education Act of 1965 contains a multitude of programs, the cornerstone of the legislation is Title IV, Student Financial Assistance, which provides approximately \$19 billion annually to half of the Nation's students enrolled in postsecondary education. Without Federal aid, the opportunity for higher education in America would not exist.

The main objective of the reauthorization focused on restoring the Federal commitment to all students and their families by improving access to quality higher education opportunities. For the past decade, families, particularly

hard-working middle-income families, have been squeezed out of Federal student aid programs. Moreover, loans have replaced grants as the major source of Federal student aid.

Over the past 10 years, families have also seen the cost of a college education increase much faster than their incomes. For many Americans, the dream of achieving a college education for their children has become an impossible dream because of the financial cost involved.

H.R. 3553 increases access to higher education by authorizing a much needed, long overdue raise in the maximum award for the Pell grant program. I am pleased that the bill which I introduced to raise the maximum Pell grant award from \$3,100 to \$4,500 is included in this reauthorization package. Although the Pell grant program is viewed as the true foundation of Federal student assistance, the purchasing power of the Pell grant has dramatically eroded over the past decade. In 1980, the maximum Pell grant paid for 50 percent of the average cost of attending college. Today, the maximum Pell grant pays for 25 percent of the cost of attending postsecondary education. If the Pell grant had kept pace with inflation, it would be funded at \$4,500 for the 1993-94 academic year. With a \$4,500 maximum, eligibility will be restored for students from working-class and middle-income families whose incomes fall below \$49,000.

The bill also enhances access for middle-class families by eliminating the consideration of home, family farm, and small business equity from the calculation of student need. In the past, the inclusion of the value of a family home, farm, or small business in the needs analysis has meant that many hard-working middle-income families have been unable to qualify for student aid. This bill enables these families to borrow money at a low interest rate rather than mortgage their homes or farms in order to send their children to college.

The legislation also increases access to higher education through simplification of the student aid application process. The complexity of this process has become a barrier to educational opportunity for low-income families. In fact, one of my constituents testified that, because the process was extremely complex, it discouraged students and families from applying for aid.

The bill also addresses program integrity issues. The student aid programs have been tarnished by reports of growing default rates and incidents of fraud and abuse. Unfortunately, we have seen a rise in the number of schools which are integrated in making a profit and not in educating their students. H.R. 3553 restores public confidence in student loan programs by strengthening the integrity provisions which are designed to prevent fraud and abuse in the title IV programs.

The legislation also significantly expands early intervention efforts. The TRIO programs, which provide special programs for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, have been effective in identifying eligible students and providing the necessary support services which promote access to college. Many of these youths are from low-income families and first-generation college students. Early outreach and intervention efforts at the middle and high school levels are particularly crucial

tools to help recruit and retain disadvantaged students who want to pursue a college education.

Mr. Chairman, the opportunity for a higher education should not be available just for the wealthy of this Nation. It should be available for every American who has the desire and the dream for a college education. I believe that the bill under consideration today will make Federal financial assistance available to more students and help make college more affordable for the American family. I commend Chairman FORD for his diligence and dedication to America's youth in bringing this bill to the House floor, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3553.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 4471, the higher education amendments of 1992. This bill truly represents a bipartisan effort after what began as a rather acrimonious bill, H.R. 3553, left the Education and Labor Committee because of namely two provisions which in H.R. 4471 have been eliminated or will be scaled back.

Gone is the fiscally unwise Pell grant entitlement provision which would've cost at the front end nearly \$12 billion a year with no apparent ceiling.

Gone as well is the \$360 billion full-blown direct loan program. Instead, a sizable demonstration program is in place to test out this bureaucratic, nightmarish Federal program.

For my rural colleagues, I suggest you talk to your rural colleges and universities to see if they could handle a direct loan program. For me, at least, whenever I've mentioned the idea of direct loan to the college administrators in my district, they gave me a look of horror at the idea of this program. They simply don't have the resources there to manage the program.

I believe the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education received important insight into the needs of many middle-income families when it held a field hearing in my district last year.

What the subcommittee heard were basically two things. First, students, even those attending small rural colleges, were graduating with a large debt. For example, students entering the teaching profession who are graduating from the University of Nebraska at Kearney, start with an average salary of \$17,000. On average, these students also have a \$12,000 student loan debt.

H.R. 4471 will allow students who may be financially hard pressed to seek a 3-year economic hardship deferment instead of the current 2-year deferment. I'm hopeful that this extra year will allow these students, who may be strapped for cash, a little more time.

The other issue we heard was that students were having a hard time obtaining financial aid. I'm hopeful that H.R. 4471 will allow more middle-income students to have access to these programs, like guaranteed student loans and Pell grants because it includes provisions from my bill, H.R. 3411, that provides for farm, home, and small businesses equity to be eliminated from the financial need calculations used to determine whether the student needs a helping hand from the Federal Government.

Students and their families have told me agonizing stories of being, in essence, penalized for providing a good home or having worked hard to have a successful small business or farm.

I hope that deleting what are the biggest investments a family may make from financial need calculations will help restore 1.1 million families and students to the roster of those eligible for Federal student loans.

I'm pleased as well that this draft addresses a concern I raised in the report accompanying H.R. 3553 dealing with accreditation.

H.R. 3553 had a regulatory blanket approach to controlling abuses in the Federal Student Aid Program. Covered by this blanket would've been the 24 colleges and universities in my district, which have an average default rate of around 11 percent, to be lumped into increased Federal and State oversight. All this because some schools in other districts have been abusing the program.

Instead, H.R. 4471 will allow these outstanding schools an opportunity to operate as they have in the past, and will subject abusers to closer State and Federal scrutiny.

And restoring the requirement that a school is accredited by a private accreditation council will help ensure that the Federal Government has an independent measure of academic soundness.

While much attention has been brought to the fact that it's costing taxpayers \$300 million a month to pay off defaulted student loans, the people who are really suffering are those who are being denied the opportunity to receive loans because of defaulters.

Just think of how many more students could be served by student loans if \$300 million more a month was available?

I've been thinking of it because, 40 years ago, I was an admissions officer at a small liberal arts college in Nebraska.

What I saw was families that often didn't have the financial ability to pay for, or borrow money to send their kids to college.

And then just a couple of years ago my wife and one of my daughters started going to a small State college in Nebraska, and they told me of the problems many of their classmates had in

paying tuition because they couldn't qualify for financial aid.

I'm hopeful that H.R. 4471 will bring us ever closer to helping those kids and older students who have started school again, after having raised a family or looking for a fulfilling job.

To close, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. COLEMAN, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. GOODLING, for their hard work and patience throughout this reauthorization process.

I'd also like to acknowledge the hard work and weekend hours the minority staff, Rose DiNapoli and Jo Marie St. Martin, have spent on this bill. They've helped this Member get educated on the higher education act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the strength of this bill is the fact that this bill speaks to access to higher education for all people in this country. It is really a great bill because it allows people who in the past have had a difficult time receiving a higher education to do it now through this bill. That is one of the reasons why I support the bill.

Mr. Chairman, also the bill speaks very strongly about nontraditional students. That is, in a changing world we now find ourselves with a lot of parents and younger people who are attending school parttime, who are attending school while working, who are attending school after having raised children, or been married, or returned from the military service. The bill speaks to that also.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also includes the proposal submitted by the Hispanic caucus which deals with the alarming dropout rate amongst Hispanics throughout the country, which has reached 44 percent.

The bill speaks about reaching out at an early stage in life and trying to prepare those youngsters for that opportunity which is provided in the bill to get a higher education.

Mr. Chairman, I also call attention to the fact that there is a provision of the bill which I was able to author which is a Teacher Opportunity Corps. It would allow paraprofessionals the opportunity to become certified teachers in the future, an opportunity I think that if fully carried out, will bring to us a whole new core of teachers, teachers that are very close to the community.

Mr. Chairman, lastly I would like to thank the chairman of the committee and the staff, but especially the chairman for allowing something to happen which sometimes does not happen, and that is to allow the junior members of

the committee full participation in drafting this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, when you read this legislation, you find that many of the amendments in this bill are in fact the product of the work of the junior members of the committee. For that we are very thankful to the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that all my colleagues support this bill, which indeed speaks to a better future in our country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1992, H.R. 3553. I am proud to have been involved in the crafting of this important piece of legislation that will determine how we will prepare our youth for the future.

My colleagues, to me the persistent theme of this reauthorization has been access. That is, greater access for all Americans to a quality education; albeit to low-income, part-time, nontraditional students who are pursuing their studies while also working and caring for a family, as well as access to middle-income students. Increased quality and effectiveness of our educational system is an achievable national goal.

The Higher Education Act of 1992 makes an attempt to meet the grave needs and demands of the diverse student population across the Nation. This bill is particularly sensitive to nontraditional students in that it includes measures to ensure equitable financial aid, special services such as child care and special hours for nontraditional students.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the ability to benefit provisions that would allow nonhigh school graduates to participate in the financial aid programs. Many of my constituents apply to institutions without the benefit of either an earned high school diploma or a GED. This is the only avenue available for them to escape from the cycle of poverty in the Bronx. Such students need opportunities to gain the education and confidence that will prepare them to assume meaningful positions in the workplace.

Very often students face obstacles before they even apply to colleges because they are not well informed about the availability of financial assistance, the range of postsecondary educational options and the appropriate high school programs that can facilitate their transition to postsecondary education. H.R. 3553 improves early outreach and intervention efforts by strengthening the TRIO programs, increasing coordination with other programs, and providing for a single integrated early outreach program supported by grants from the Secretary.

The congressional Hispanic caucus also has incorporated into this bill its first legislative measure. Its provisions focus on the state of crises faced by our Hispanic youth who, as of today, are dropping out of high school at an alarming rate of 44 percent. Our students must be reached during the early years of elementary school to develop the long-term goals of completing high school and college. Counseling and mentoring programs must be sensitized to nurture and inform minority students of the greater opportunities that are available upon the completion of a baccalaureate.

Mr. Chairman, also incorporated is a provision that would expand the Pell Grant Pro-

gram to accommodate the growing number of college students unable to complete their courses for a B.A. in the traditional 4 academic years. Additionally, this bill would assist low-income Pell recipients in their often-interrupted education due to periods of unemployment, by extending the period of eligibility by 1 academic year. The Pell Grant Program would for the first time, extend eligibility to less-than-half-time students. The bill would also establish a super-Pell scholarship for minorities who participate in early outreach and intervention programs.

Mr. Chairman, when students enroll in college or university they should be focused on their studies and not distracted by concerns of whether their high-interest loan or grant will cover all of their educational expenses. By establishing the Pell Grant Program as an entitlement, students would have been assured of a fixed amount of assistance not subject to the whims of policymakers. While I am dismayed that this provision was not retained, the bill does provide for an increased level of maximum Pell Grant awards from \$2,400 to \$4,500. I personally believe that students who are capable, willing, and desire an education should be provided with the necessary financial aid, regardless of their background, that will allow them to pursue a college education.

H.R. 3553 provides increased funding to institutions that target and expand graduate and teacher recruitment, training and retention programs for minorities. Another proposal I authorized, the Teacher Opportunity Corps, would award financial aid to paraprofessionals or teacher's aides that would enable them to become certified through part-time and summer study.

Education is power, and until every American is able to realize that fact and exploit all the available opportunities, our strength as a nation will continue to decline. There is simply no other more important task before us as a country. Resources previously invested in the maintenance of an international balance are now available for investment in our youth. We cannot let this opportunity pass. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the American people should set as their ultimate goal an educational system in which at no level—high school, college, graduate school, or professional school—will a qualified individual in any part of the country encounter an insuperable economic barrier to the attainment of the kind of education suited to his aptitudes and interests.

Mr. Chairman, this sentence was taken from the 1947 report on higher education issued by President Harry Truman.

Think of that. Forty-five years ago President Truman in this report went on to recommend that we extend 2 years of postsecondary education as an entitlement. That we go beyond K-12 and go to K-14 as an entitlement for every American.

Perhaps President Truman did that motivated by the extraordinary success of the GI bill of rights, in which I was a proud participant. The GI bill of rights educated about 14 million Americans and gave them their free ticket to as much postsecondary education as they could absorb. It has not only paid for itself several times over from the additional taxes that those young men and women paid during their earning lifetimes, but it made a spectacular contribution to American industry and American economic well-being. It provided the manpower that projected us as a leader in the postindustrial world. We never could have done it if we did not have the scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and administrators that the GI bill of rights produced.

Mr. Chairman, we need a GI bill of rights today. The average GI produced goods and services over what the non-GI's, without the benefit of postsecondary education, produced of about \$1,000 in 1947.

By the 1980's, that discrepancy, that additional output of goods and services by each GI who had benefited from the GI bill of rights, grew to \$19,000 extra production of goods and services for the benefit of our country, the benefit of our society, and the benefit of our economy.

We have to stop undereducating our population. This is a fine bill, and I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and all others who have worked on this. But it does not go far enough. Our reach should exceed that, and we ought to provide unlimited postsecondary education to kids who cannot afford it.

Mr. Chairman, the economy will benefit enormously. The cost-benefit calculations of each person in the GI bill was for every \$1 the Government spent, they got back between \$5 up to \$12.50. That is an investment in our youth that we cannot afford not to make.

□ 1850

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to show my support for H.R. 4471, H.R. 3553, which was previously reported by the Education and Labor Committee to reauthorize the Higher Education Act.

Last year at the beginning of the reauthorization process, before the 44 hearings that were conducted, many people were saying that the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act is

one of the most important pieces of social legislation of the 102d Congress. I wholeheartedly believe that this measure is of vital importance to our entire society.

As we approach the year 2000, everyone must be prepared for a society that is becoming increasingly dependent on advanced technology. This means that access to a quality education for every citizen of this country is imperative.

Therefore we had to address the needs of as many different types of students as possible. This measure ambitiously seeks to expand Federal financial aid to students from middle-class families and redresses the current imbalance between reliance on loans and grants, improves integrity of Federal financial aid programs, contains provisions to minimize waste and abuse and loan defaults and to serve nontraditional students more effectively, simplifies student aid programs, and improves early intervention and outreach programs.

The bill also contains provisions intended to improve programs that serve historically black colleges and universities, and to improve teacher training, recruitment, and retention.

However, I must say that I was disappointed that we were not able to make Pell grants an entitlement. Many of us worked hard to see that this bill went as far as possible to provide educational opportunities for all of our citizens. Yet, I know this was a compromise we had to endure in order to bring the bill to the floor in a timely manner.

Thousands of students from all over the world come to the United States to take advantage of our excellent system of postsecondary education. Through the efforts of this bill to increase access to postsecondary education, we can now encourage and help our own students take advantage of some of these opportunities, especially as the competition in the global marketplace increases.

Also, I would like to commend Chairman BILL FORD for his leadership and all of his hard work during this reauthorization process.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this measure and it deserves to pass the House without any major changes.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LANCASTER].

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me so that I might speak on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, slightly over 26 years ago Congress recognized, through passage of Public Law 89-329, the Higher Education Act of 1965, that it had a commitment to assist low- and moderate-income students attain a postsecondary education. Congress recognized that not all of America's college

students could afford to fund their education expenses and deemed it an obligation of the Federal Government to provide those students with equal access to higher education. However, recent budget cuts and program changes to the Higher Education Act have made it increasingly difficult for middle-income families to finance an education for their children, and nearly impossible for low-income students to attend college.

Mr. Chairman, this is not what the Higher Education Act is or ought to be about. Undoubtedly, Chairman FORD and ranking minority member GOODLING, along with the remaining members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, are cognizant of this fact. The legislation they have reported to reauthorize the Higher Education Act gets back to the sentiments President Johnson so eloquently expressed when he first proposed the Higher Education Act back in 1965:

Nothing matters more to the future of our country. Not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brain power to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

Mr. Chairman, by significantly simplifying the student aid application process and increasing disadvantaged and middle-income families' access to student aid, the House Committee on Education and Labor has once again breathed life into President Johnson's statement. I urge the rest of my colleagues to stand by the Federal government's commitment to provide access to higher education to our low- and middle-income students. Please join me in supporting passage of H.R. 3553.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], a member of the committee.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4471 and would like also to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

This bill is probably one of the finest pieces of work that will be brought before the House this year. Every reauthorization of the Higher Education Assistance Act gets a thorough review by all parties concerned. A maximum amount of opportunities are provided for input for all people concerned. It is a labor of great love of the chairman, and his thorough knowledge of the situation, his thorough knowledge of higher education assistance, plus the passion that he brings to it guarantees that it is a very fine-tuned piece of legislation.

We especially appreciate the sensitivities shown toward historically black colleges and universities, recognizing that although these are only

114 in a constellation of about 3,000 colleges and universities, they do play a significant role in this country. They probably play a much more significant role in the new world order of tomorrow, where Third World countries yearning for technical assistance and support will be able to draw on some of the kinds of people who are trained in these institutions.

I regret very much that we did not go further and create the Pell entitlement. I think that it is a debate that certainly had to cut off after this point, but we ought to renew it very soon and move as rapidly as possible to guarantee Pell entitlements, guarantee as much opportunity for higher education to as many people as possible.

In the new world order, our primary weapon, our primary strength will lie in the kinds of people, educated people we have to go forward.

We have a situation where America 2000, the administration's grand strategy for improving education in America, leaves out any major discussion of higher education.

Higher education is the one thing that works in America with respect to education. It is the one thing that already is a world class enterprise. The whole world looks at higher education in America and tries to emulate it. So why not invest more in that portion of our educational system that works?

It works now. It certainly can use fine tuning as this bill provides. It certainly can get rid of some of the waste, but higher education works. We should go forward. We should have Pell entitlements, and we should try to guarantee as much higher education to as many people as possible.

We should show to the rest of the world what we intend to do with the higher education system and the graduates that we produce. We need education for productivity. We need education for leadership. We need education in order to help people live together in our society in a better state of law and order.

All of these aims, all of this mission is accomplished by higher education institutions. I hope that very soon, not 5 years from now when we come up for another reauthorization, but very soon we can reopen the debate on the Pell entitlement.

I think that we have the funds. We have the opportunity in that the peace dividend is very real, as we say, for military expenditures. We will save in the next 8 years between now and the year 2000 at least a trillion dollars from those expenditures.

We could put some part of that into taking care of the deficit. We can put some part of it into a number of other enterprises. But a large part should go into increases for education. The increases in education ought to come first in the area that works, increases in higher education, in order for the

rest of the education system to operate.

We need better graduates coming out of our institutions of higher learning, and we need more of them. That is the first step toward improving America's schools.

I hope that we will understand the wisdom that was displayed when this bill passed out of committee and we will have Pell entitlements within the next 2 or 3 years and not wait for the next reauthorization.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am including in the RECORD an exchange of letters between me and the chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology involving the committee jurisdictions in parts of the bill affecting legislation from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, where we have agreement that they will not ask for sequential referral.

The letters follow:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC, February 26, 1992.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and
Technology, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of February 26, 1992, concerning your jurisdictional interest in certain provisions in H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, as ordered reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

I appreciate your offer to waive your request that the bill be sequentially referred to the Committee on Science and Technology. I agree that the provisions cited in your letter are no longer necessary and will take steps to see that they are deleted prior to, or during, floor consideration of the bill.

Thank you for your cooperation. I look forward to continuing to work with you on matters of joint interest to our committees.

With kind regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. FORD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE,
SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, February 26, 1992.

Hon. WILLIAM D. FORD,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has requested a sequential referral of H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992, based on provisions in the reported bill which were within this Committee's jurisdiction over science scholarships, the National Science Foundation, and aspects of math, science, and engineering education. In particular, Title I, Part E, "Manufacturing Engineering Education" (sections 161-165) are within the jurisdiction of this Committee. The sections would establish a Manufacturing Engineering Education Grant Program to be administered by the Secretary of Education in consultation with the Director of the National Science Foundation. A bill containing the identical provisions, H.R. 3044, was referred jointly to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Education and Labor earlier

in this Congress. In addition, conferees from the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology were appointed on nearly identical provisions contained in section 805 of S. 1507, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993, which was signed into law (P.L. 102-190). (The only difference in the two bills is that the duties given to the Secretary of Education in H.R. 3553 are given to the Secretary of Defense in S. 1507).

Recognizing the importance of the Higher Education Amendments Act and the need to expedite floor consideration, however, the Committee is willing to waive its request for a sequential referral with the understanding that the provisions cited above on Manufacturing Engineering Education be deleted by the Committee on Education and Labor before or during floor consideration of the bill, and that copies of this correspondence be included in the record of that debate to protect this Committee's jurisdictional interests. Since nearly identical provisions have already been enacted into law, deleting these provisions would not appear to significantly affect the bill.

I hope that this proposed resolution, which is offered in the spirit of continuing cooperation between our two Committees, meets with your approval, and I look forward to your written response.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.,
Chairman.

□ 1900

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], the acting chairman of the committee here today, who did such a wonderful job.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I would take just a moment to thank the chairman of the full committee and the ranking member for the quality of effort and the intensity of the effort with which we approached this 25th anniversary of the Higher Education Act.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania said it earlier, and I would repeat it again. The quality of the work that was done on this bill surpasses even the extraordinary quality of those that preceded it. The kind and number of hearings that were conducted across the country is reflected in the comments and statements on both sides of the aisle that refer to this point, and it has just been a real privilege to take part in the crafting of H.R. 4471. It is, quite simply, a very good bill.

It does more, though, than just expand the eligibility for student financial aid to middle-class families. It does so while preserving the American commitment to help students from less well-off families pay for higher education. That is what nation building is all about.

The bill goes further than that, however, than just providing funds for students who need financial aid. It authorizes programs to make sure students and their families know that financial aid is available and that higher education can genuinely be part of their future.

A recent GAO study found very few high school sophomores or their fami-

lies had any clear idea about the kind of financial aid programs that are available to them. If students are not aware that they can pay for college, if they do not think it is affordable, they simply do not prepare for college. They do not make those decisions early in their secondary school career that are crucial to whether or not the doors to higher education are open to them in the first place.

It has been said, and I think it is probably true, that a child's future may be more determined by the decision about whether to take algebra I or general math than any other subsequent decision they may make in the course of their lifetime.

School counselors have to be trained to know about financial aid programs and to share that knowledge with students and their parents if real access to higher education is going to take place.

The second item I want to mention this evening is that I am proud of what we have accomplished in title I of the bill. This provision, university and school partnerships, was created by the chairman of this committee a decade ago in 1980. It was based on a model that came to us a century ago that recognized that postsecondary institutions are a powerful tool that can be instrumental in raising the overall productive capacity of the Nation.

The Moral Acts of 1862 through 1896 really went a long way to democratize what had been the formerly elite system of postsecondary education in this country and put it to work in the task of nation building. It unleashed the creative energies of an incredible cross-section of Americans. The new title I of this bill could become the same powerful catalyst for economic change that the Moral Acts were 100 years ago, at a similar time of profound change in this Nation.

This new provision will encourage urban universities to act as natural pools of knowledge and research, teaching, talent, practical experience, in building partnerships with other institutions in communities, institutions that could include in those university partnerships hospitals and schools and businesses, community-based organizations, and, as in the case when I was a mayor of a medium-sized American city, local governments in the real business of day-to-day problem solving.

Their collective mandate would be to find solutions to the worst problems of their communities and to request funds as part of consortia. This not only avoids unnecessary competition but encourages communities to act as communities in consort with the real engines of economic growth in our Nation: the schools, the colleges, and the universities of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on at some substantial length about the kind of asset that that kind of partnership has been for the last decade in Ohio, and

the kind of asset it was to the cities like Akron and Cleveland and Youngstown and others as we seek to make the transition from one age to another.

Under this proposal communities will be able to act in consort with higher education to solve their most severe problems, to agree on a set of goals, to analyze and target their resources, and then to apply solutions.

Federal policy in that sense will only act as a guidepost in helping local communities and their universities work together. In these and many other ways, H.R. 4471 will make education more available to more Americans and make that education more useful to all Americans as we seek to make our communities and the Nation stronger. Every American will benefit from that.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to really passionately support Federal leadership in higher education and, in particular, in the Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

This bill will make a college education a reality for millions of Americans who could not otherwise afford to attend school. Mr. Chairman, we know what has happened in the last decade. The working middle-class family has taken it on the chin. Working families have been battered by increased taxes and soaring health care costs and college tuitions which have gone through the roof and out of the reach of many families.

During the last 10 years the cost of college tuition has risen at twice the rate of inflation, nearly doubling since 1980. At the same time, Federal support for education has withered away. Fewer and fewer middle-class families were eligible for grants or for loans, and those who did qualify for aid were burdened with mountains of debt.

Universal access to education is a foundation of our democratic system. If education is available only to the rich or to the very poor, our democracy and our country are compromised.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a working middle-class family. My dad came to this country as an immigrant and could not speak the language. As a matter of fact, he left school in the seventh grade because his teachers and his classmates laughed at him because he could not speak the language.

My mother worked in the sweatshops in New Haven, CT, and their focus and their attention was to make sure that I had an education. I would go to visit my mother at those sweatshops every day after school, and I would complain bitterly about the noise and about how dirty it was. What she would say to me is, "Take advantage of an education so that you will not have to do this."

My folks worked hard to see that I had that advantage and that I could be

able, today, to be in the House of Representatives. It was their hard work and it was the help of the student loan program and the Pell grants and the Stafford grants that allowed me to be able to expand my opportunities and my horizons.

Today we have a chance to tell the middle class that we understand and we know how hard it is for them to get their kids to college. This bill will help working middle-class families regain access to the higher education unavailable to them during the 1980's.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for education, to stand up for the middle class, and to support the higher education reauthorization bill.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the higher education reauthorization, and I want to commend Chairman FORD for the extraordinary work he has done with this bill under very trying circumstances.

A lot of talk in recent days has centered around the fact that this bill has been scaled back, and it is true that the bill does not go as far as the committee had initially sought.

I share the chairman's frustration that a Pell entitlement is not going to be enacted—or even voted on—this year, because the administration and many Members of Congress from both parties did not fully recognize the importance of that initiative to our Nation's future.

And I pledge now to join the chairman in doing battle again on this issue in the future.

However, we should not be left with the impression that this bill endorses the status quo.

Far from it. The bill before us today makes dramatic strides that will breathe new life into higher education and expand opportunities for all American citizens.

Where there is now only ignorance and defeatism, the bill offers early outreach and intervention.

Where there is now only confusion and complexity, the bill calls for simplicity.

Where there are now programs aimed primarily at traditional students, the bill recognizes the nontraditional student.

Where there is now insufficient emphasis on teacher recruitment and development, the bill offers a comprehensive new support system for the educators of the future.

Where there is now a vexing problem with student loan defaults, the bill demands accountability, cracks down hard on waste, fraud and abuse, and saves tax dollars.

And where cost now poses an obstacle to college attendance for the poor and the middle class, this bill offers a

major expansion of student aid for all American students.

It sends this message loud and clear: If you work hard and persevere, you can receive a higher education at the school of your choice, you can succeed in college and beyond, you can be a part of the American dream.

I would also like to take this occasion to mention several specific proposals which I have advocated and consider to be of crucial importance.

First, I am extremely pleased that the bill includes the provisions of my bill, H.R. 2350, the Liberty Scholarship and Partnership Act, which creates a State-level matching grant program for expanded early intervention services and comprehensive grant aid.

This program is based on New York State's Liberty Partnership and Scholarship Program, crafted by Gov. Mario Cuomo. I want to thank the Governor for his assistance in drafting and pressing for this important new Federal program, which has the potential to achieve a dramatic turnaround in college completion rates among disadvantaged youth.

I would also like to thank Mr. Eugene Lang of New York, whose innovative and highly successful I Have a Dream Early Intervention Program was the original inspiration for early intervention legislation in New York and elsewhere. Many of his suggestions for improvements in early intervention programs are important and should be given careful attention by Members of Congress.

Second, I was pleased to work extensively with Mr. GOODLING on our proposal, H.R. 2761, the Integrity in Higher Education Act, to significantly expand the State role in oversight and approval of postsecondary education institutions.

While the bill before us does not go quite as far as we would have liked in ensuring a strong State role in oversight, the compromise that we have reached gets tough on institutions which have violated the public trust.

At the same time, it does not impose an undue burden on high quality institutions which have been conscientious in administering title IV programs. The result will be increased accountability, reduced default costs, and a growing confidence that title IV aid is serving those it was intended to serve: our Nation's students.

In addition, it is important to note that State approval is only one leg of the triad of institutional eligibility and oversight which exists under the Higher Education Act. The other two legs, Department of Education certification and accreditation, are also considerably strengthened by this bill, and the bill incorporates key suggestions which I made with respect to increased minimum standards for accrediting agencies.

Third, I am pleased that my bill to expand opportunities for women and

minorities in science and mathematics, H.R. 2142, has been incorporated into the reauthorization measure. Women and minorities will make up more than 80 percent of new entrants into the work force during the next decade. Yet they are drastically underrepresented in science courses and careers. These provisions will help women and minorities succeed in these crucial fields, and help our Nation become more competitive.

Finally, I am pleased that the reauthorization measure incorporates my bill, H.R. 2065, the Higher Education Disclosure Act, to reinstate a provision of law which required institutions to disclose large gifts from foreign entities, as well as any conditions which are attached to them. This important "sunshine" provision was "sunset" without reason and deserves to be restored to the act.

The bill before us today has the potential to transform higher learning in America. It will expand individual opportunity and national prosperity, and it will create a better future for all Americans.

We all know that our Nation is facing an economic crisis as we head into the 21st century.

At the individual level, American families are hard pressed to make ends meet, let alone afford the high and rising costs of postsecondary education.

And at the national level, we face a shortage of skilled workers who are urgently needed if we hope to remain competitive in the global marketplace.

This bill responds to these pressing concerns.

To our Nation's young people and their families, it offers hope that their dreams of a college education and a brighter future will become a reality.

And to our Nation, it offers the prospect of a revitalized economy, spurred forward by a surge in the number of highly trained college graduates entering the work force.

These are not only worthy goals, they are among the most important goals we can set as a nation. And I hope that the entire Congress will embrace them as wholeheartedly as I do.

□ 1910

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield what time he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4471, which will reauthorize funding for the Higher Education Act of 1965. I would like to commend the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], for bringing this important legislation to the floor.

This measure would raise the maximum annual grant available to students under the Pell Grant Program from \$3,100 to \$4,500 and the minimum from \$200 to \$400. The cost of college tuition has skyrocketed in recent years, outpacing consumer inflation by a wide margin over the last decade. Tuition at many private institutions has increased steadily by more than 10 percent every year since the late 1970's, and budget crises in numerous States have caused tuition at some State universities to more than double in the last 3 years.

In the face of the explosion of educational costs during a time of economic hardship, a number of our colleges, beginning last year with Amherst College in Massachusetts, have been forced to drop their policies of need-blind admissions. If we allow this trend to continue, higher education will once again become just a dream for millions of lower and middle income students. By raising the award ceiling for the more than 3.4 million students who currently depend upon the Pell Grant Program, we are merely trying to regain a fraction of the ground that Federal funding has lost relative to the cost of higher education.

H.R. 4471 also raises the maximum income level to qualify a student for a Pell Grant from \$30,000 to \$50,000 for a family of four. In doing this, we recognize that a family earning under \$50,000 a year cannot afford to pay tuitions that now run, in many private institutions, in excess of \$20,000 a year without ample assistance. According to the college board, over the last 15 years, grants have dropped from 76 to 29 percent of Federal aid, increasing students' reliance on loans; this bill helps to alleviate this.

Mr. Chairman, this measure would also authorize a new loan guarantee program for middle-income students who need to borrow money for higher education but do not qualify for subsidized Stafford loans. For students who have little credit history this can be the difference in financing a college education, yet the majority of these guarantees will never cost the Federal Government any money. For fiscal year 1992, total budget outlays for the Guaranteed Student Loan [GSL] Program will exceed appropriated funds by over \$2 billion; H.R. 4471 attempts to meet this demand. This measure also helps control cost overruns by means of a 5-percent loan origination fee on Stafford loans, supplemental loans for students [SLS] and parent loans for undergraduate students [PLUS]. In addition, the bill attempts to prevent the fraud and abuse at every level that has plagued the GSL Program by means of a pilot program to test the effect of an aggressive collection program on defaults, a program to encourage employer assistance in repayment of

loans, and tougher standards on the availability of federally subsidized loans to schools with abnormally high default rates.

Another feature of H.R. 4471 is the direct Student Loan Program. Funded as a demonstration project, this program will examine the cost effectiveness of eliminating all the middlemen involved in the Stafford Program and bringing aid directly to students who need it.

H.R. 4471 provides numerous other benefits for our higher education system. It liberalizes the need analysis, providing a single determination for expected family contribution and encouraging home and business ownership by removing a family's home, farm, and small business equity from consideration as part of expected contribution. It provides grants or matching funds for new programs in teacher recruitment, merit-based scholarships for students eligible for Pell grants, early intervention for at-risk students, and the study of manufacturing engineering.

Mr. Chairman, some have suggested that this measure goes too far, or not far enough, and that we should hold out for a better higher education bill. Time, however, is running short on the Higher Education Act of 1965, and opportunities missed for next year's class of students can never be recovered. If we are to put recession behind us and remain competitive in the world economy, we must invest in making higher education available to every American who deserves it, and become once again the best educated people on Earth.

The President's fiscal year 1993 budget calls for an increase of almost 10 percent in educational funding, including an additional \$1.2 billion for Pell grants alone. It is our responsibility to pass a bill that meets this goal. Accordingly, I support H.R. 4471 and urge my colleagues to keep the door of educational opportunity open for lower and middle income students by voting in favor of it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for this historic piece of legislation. I feel that with this action we are attempting to straighten the path of higher education and enable the community to provide a more effective service to all students.

We are here today because of Chairman FORD's relentless dedication to pursuing what is right and fair for the students of our Nation. I know that the chairman has been forced to alter the priorities of the legislation as he moved toward the floor for today's consideration but I feel that H.R. 4471 is a bill this House can be proud of and support.

Of course I know that the majority on the committee regret the removal of the Pell grant entitlement language more than any change that had to be made. Had this provision been allowed to remain we would have initiated the reversal of an imbalance in the loan versus grant ratio. The policymakers of this country have given this issue lip service for many years and now when given the opportunity to make

a difference the committee is forced to change the bill and exclude this provision. I applaud Chairman FORD for pushing the issue as far as he was able and I hope the committee returns to address it again but with better results.

A theme that runs throughout the legislation is the tightening of the rules that govern the schools that choose to participate in the programs offered. We have seen the community tarred for too long based on the acts of a few bad apples. The changes that are included in this legislation combined with the work that has gone on before with this issue I feel we will have removed this accusation from the debate.

I support this effort and feel that access must be to a quality learning environment. I think the community as a whole agrees with this and will support the changes incorporated in H.R. 4471.

On behalf of the unique work colleges I want to thank the chairman and the committee for including in the legislation my provision that allows for a separate line item of funding for these institutions. Work colleges, of which there are five presently so categorized, require 100 percent of their student population to participate in work on and around campus. It is the ultimate in providing the opportunity to work one's way through college.

At this time there are five schools that have embraced this curriculum requirement but the legislation leaves the door open to any and all that would like to join these schools and I hope more do pursue this option. I know that this kind of educational environment is not for everyone but it has proven extremely successful in my State of Kentucky. This program provides an avenue of access that in many situations would not be available otherwise. Because of the school's unique set up the tuitions are drastically reduced, or there is no additional tuition at some institutions, but the work requirement provides the alternative means of payment.

H.R. 4471 addresses the issue of access in many other ways as well and that is a primary reason for my support for the legislation. By expanding the access to Stafford loans to more of the students who are categorized as falling into the middle class we will be renewing our commitment to the middle class and stating that we do believe in their access to higher education. Every Member in this House has heard the complaints about how the middle class student falls between the cracks and is not poor enough to qualify for assistance but not able to afford to pay for all of the costs just out of their own pocket. This provision will set up an unsubsidized loan that, though not as fair as other traditional programs, does serve to provide a needed line of financial empowerment to these students.

Once again we have the renewal of the Perkins loans that provide financial assistance to the more economically disadvantaged students and has a lower interest rate so to reduce the burden of the debt load the students have to carry upon leaving school. This program has been with us for a number of years now but is still able to lead the way in the area of fairness and efficiency.

The direct loan program that Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. FORD proposed and is a demonstra-

tion in the bill is a direct descendant of the Perkins loan model and I feel underscores the value of the low cost loans. The Perkins Loan Program is the direction of the future because of simplifying overhead and the efficiency of effort on the part of the institution. The Federal dollar goes farther because we remove the middle man from the process and use the schools to administer the campus based program. I look forward to the results of the demonstration program but encourage the committee to continue on with the Perkins loans because of the access they provide and the reduction of the interest rates.

There is one issue that I am not in full agreement with as we consider H.R. 4471 and that is the issues surrounding the short-term programs. As I stated earlier I am in 100 percent agreement on the tightening up of the programs to prevent the abuse that has been widely reported on. Unfortunately though we sometimes cross over the line and toss out the good with the bad. By placing the 50-percent limit on tuition coverage and requiring a cosigner we are effectively shutting off access for most, if not all, that would look to these short-term programs as a means of skill improvement.

As chairman of the Employment Opportunities Subcommittee I know that we are facing a massive dislocated worker problem as a result of the military conversion, base closings, GM plant closings, IBM downsizing, and the list goes on. Millions of Americans will be looking for training and education to equip them for the job market. Some would have been served by the short-term programs that will no longer be in business as a result of the changes directed at them in this legislation.

Once again I underscore the fact that if a school is unable to show a substantial success rate in graduations and placements of students then they do not belong in the Federal program. But if they can show their quality then as a part of the overall national training effort we owe it to our dislocated workers to provide them with the maximum number of alternatives. I am hopeful that this issue can be revisited in the conference so that a fair and thoughtful treatment is provided.

I want to once again congratulate Chairman FORD for his unyielding commitment to improving the quality of higher education in our country and improving the quality of life for all Americans. The staff of the Postsecondary Subcommittee has once again provided an exceptional level of service and work in putting together this massive bill. I want to personally thank them for all that they have done in assisting me with the issues that I have particular interest in.

In conclusion I would like to underscore the need for this legislation and request that the House support this bill and allow the Nation's efforts in higher education to move forward.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 3553, the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1992. My amendment addresses a grave injustice that currently exists within the higher education bill. An injustice that if left untouched, would have a dire impact on the entire medical profession.

The current version of H.R. 3553 would eliminate the 2-year deferment period on repayment of educational loans presently ex-

tended to persons participating in residency training programs. My amendment would restore this much needed program.

Serving a medical residency is one of the final components in a physician's formal training and the duration of the residency program varies between 3 and 7 years. These are several years that consist of extremely hard work and long hours. Unfortunately, if my amendment is not adopted, it may also be years of unnecessary and overwhelming economic hardship for thousands of medical residents.

Today, the costs of a medical education are rising at an alarming rate. Currently, annual tuition costs range from \$5,000 to almost \$28,000. Without Federal financial assistance, many excellent doctors would be denied the opportunity to pursue a career in medicine. In 1990 for instance, 79 percent of medical school graduates assumed educational debt owing an average amount of \$46,224. In addition, 12 percent of these 1990 graduates incurred debt in excess of \$75,000. Minority and low-income students, especially, are dependent on borrowed money to complete their medical education. In 1990 minority students incurred an average debt of \$51,000, and 21 percent of them had debts of over \$75,000.

This economic problem is compounded for many doctors who complete their residency within an area of high living costs, such as New York City. This creates a disheartening situation, since large metropolitan areas like New York, have some of the greatest needs for qualified doctors.

As a Representative of Bronx, New York, I speak for the hundreds of medical students currently enrolled at the Albert Einstein School of Medicine. I also represent the thousands of doctors that teach and work at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine and those who serve at the North Central Bronx, Montefiore, and Bronx-Lebanon Hospitals, as well as those physicians in private practice. I have received hundreds of letters from medical students, frantically asking me to do something. Dr. Dawnielle Kerner writes,

As a resident at Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center I take home \$1,800 a month. If the rules change my loan payments will be almost \$1,200 a month. That would leave \$600 a month to cover rent, food, and all other living expenses. My apartment is rent subsidized and I still pay \$500 a month. In New York City \$100 does not go far.

Dr. Mark Kerner, a resident NT in orthopedic surgery at Montefiore Hospital writes,

I come from a middle class family, and though I have been able to pay for part of my education through work/study and scholarships, my indebtedness at this time exceeds \$100,000. My current monthly take-home income is \$1,600. My payments on these loans would exceed this amount. It would be impossible for me to even purchase books.

And Dawn Gangi, a second-year student at Albert Einstein College of Medicine writes,

Not only am I concerned for myself and my ability to repay these loans, but I fear for the future of health care in this Nation. As the incentives to go into medicine become fewer and fewer, and the prospects of struggling for years after school become greater and greater, I can only wonder what caliber of people will go into the field.

I could go on. I have hundreds more letters from physicians and medical students ex-

pressing these same feelings of concern and anxiety. Not only are they troubled by the economic hardships they and their colleagues will face, they are also concerned for the future quality of American health care.

If left untouched, the provision in H.R. 3553 would create numerous problems for the medical field and the American public. First, hospitals would be forced to pay their residents higher wages in order for the physicians to meet higher monthly loan repayments. Even after wage increases and loan payments, residents would be unable to meet minimum living costs. Second, the medical profession will become a field where lower and middle class students will become locked out of the system, unable to meet living costs and towering loan payments. Finally, the provision increases the pressures on medical students to specialize only in lucrative medical fields as opposed to primary care areas where there is great need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The future of the entire medical profession and the economic security for thousands of medical students, residents, and their dependents rely on its passage.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating a bill which is an investment in the future of this country. An investment which may help a future President of the United States, or an investment which could assist our Nation's future astronauts, and an investment which will train our work force to compete in the global marketplace. For many, this legislation will benefit our children and our children's children. Mr. Chairman, there is no better investment in our country's future than investing in education.

The legislation we have before us today will reauthorize the Higher Education Act of 1965. The act originally set out to assist low- to middle-income students in attaining a postsecondary education. However, postsecondary education has changed significantly since the passage of this act. Now it is time for reforms to be put in place to address these changes.

Many citizens in this country are experiencing problems with personal debt. Numerous college graduates face this debt problem because the first thing they face out of college is repayment of student loans. College costs have risen significantly in the past decade and students are unable to adequately meet these rising costs.

College costs have been increasing at an annual rate of between 5 and 8 percent over the last few years. According to the Congressional Research Service, the college board estimates that the annual cost of attendance for a full-time student during academic year 1990-91 was an average of \$5,013 at a 4-year public school and \$12,320 at a private 4-year institution. This compares to \$3,756 at a public 4-year school and \$8,260 at a private 4-year school in the 1981-82 academic year.

What does all this add up to? Reduced access to higher education for a majority of high school graduates, many of whom fall in the middle class and have been squeezed out of the opportunity to attend college due to the cost.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see that changes were made to the bill H.R. 3553. The substitute, H.R. 4471, which we have before us today, is a good bill, one which will benefit

many students and one which addresses the problems the student aid system has encountered over the years. I believe there are several positive aspects of this bill which will address these problems and improve our higher education system.

One such area which has been improved revolves around the needs analysis system. By reforming the needs analysis system, this bill goes a long way to expand the access of student financial aid to the middle class. Under this legislation, home, farm, and small business equity is excluded from determining a student's eligibility for financial assistance. Thus, a student from a family of four with an income of \$49,000 will be eligible for the minimum Pell grant. It also creates an educational savings protection allowance to protect those assets in special targeted savings accounts. This allows families to save during the college years.

The trend in financial aid has changed in the last 10 years. The original intent of the 1965 act was that grants would be the main source of Federal aid, while loans would act as a supplement. However, now two-thirds of student financial aid is in the form of loans. This legislation addresses this problem by increasing the maximum award for Pell grants and improving access.

Another important aspect of this bill deals with simplifying the student aid process. I often hear from students who are dismayed and discouraged at the tedious application process related to financial aid. The current methodology requires students to fill out two complicated forms, one for Pell grants and one for Stafford loans. This legislation has addressed this problem by mandating a free Federal application form and establishing a single system needs analysis process to determine eligibility for all student aid programs under title IV.

This bill also emphasizes improving program integrity. One of the biggest problems that has faced the student loan system in recent years is the ever-increasing student loan default rate. The costs associated with these defaults are at an alltime high. In this economic climate it is essential that our Federal dollars are not wasted because of fraud or abuse in the system. This legislation addresses these problems by enhancing program integrity through a number of provisions which will strengthen and restructure the oversight process of schools that participate in the programs.

I am also pleased with the efforts to promote programs to assist disadvantaged students through Federal early outreach and student services programs. This includes programs such as TRIO, Upward Bound, and educational opportunity centers. I just recently met with students from the Fifth Congressional District in Connecticut who showed me just how important these programs are in helping disadvantaged students attain a college degree and in helping them to realize the importance of a college education.

A provision which I fought hard for in the defense authorization bill is also included in this legislation. The provision provides for new grants to encourage development and expansion of undergraduate and graduate programs in manufacturing engineering. Many companies have recently complained that there is a

lack of technically trained college graduates entering the work force. Engineers and managers, trained in the most up-to-date skills in both fields, would enhance the quality of the work force and foster growth in the manufacturing industry.

Mr. Chairman, while we will debate many amendments today which will enhance this bill further, I am concerned with a few provisions and some amendments which might hurt the quality of this bill.

One area of concern focuses on the direct lending provision of this bill. I was extremely pleased to see that the substitute bill deletes the phasein of a direct lending program with the phaseout of the loan program and instead establishes a pilot program for a Federal direct lending program. However, I am still concerned that this program will have the potential for uncontrolled spending. Therefore, I am supportive of capping the authorized funding at the proposed \$500 million level.

While I believe this bill goes a long way to achieve the goal of increasing access to higher education, there is a proposal called the Idea Act which has merit but will not be considered in this debate. The Idea Act establishes a supplementary student loan program, open to all students regardless of parental income, in which the repayment is based on the borrower's postgraduate income, and collected by the IRS. The basic principle behind the Idea Act is that education represents an investment. Students are investing in human capital and expect a high rate of return in the form of a higher future income.

The bottom line is that the Idea Act allows complete flexibility in loan repayment. Each individual pays according to his/her financial situation after graduation. This proposal would accommodate such life changes as unemployment, death of a spouse, marital breakup, sickness, or anything that may affect the individual's financial situation. The Idea Act would allow many individuals to get started with their future plans right out of school and not be bogged down by the pressure to pay off loans which might not fall within their personal budget.

Mr. Chairman, access to education is one of the most important issues facing our country today. I, for one, am grateful for the opportunity to have attended one of the finest institutions in the country. But, unfortunately, with the high cost of an education, many individuals are not able to have such an opportunity. I believe this legislation opens up many doors for deserving students across this country, doors which give them access to a higher education, and doors which will open the future for our own children.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, my support for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act is deepened by a provision I introduced that is designed to increase the participation of minorities in the Foreign Service. The Foreign Service is an area of Federal service that minorities have found most difficult to penetrate. The most recent statistics show that the total percentage of African-Americans, Hispanics, Asian-American, and American Indians employed in career positions is a mere 12.7 percent, while collectively these groups are about 25 percent of the population.

My amendment would increase participation by people of color in the Foreign Service by

establishing a program for minority Foreign Service professional development. This program would be developed through an undergraduate consortium of universities based at Howard University, here in the District of Columbia. The majority of universities in the consortium have student bodies composed predominantly of minorities.

Features of my amendment include a junior-year abroad program, a Ralph Bunche Fellowship Program providing \$15,000 fellowships for study at the master's degree level, a cooperative program to prepare graduates for the foreign service examination, and the creation of an Institute for International Public Policy at Howard University to concentrate on producing minority international/foreign policy analysts.

Considering the role of our country as a world power, the Foreign Service needs our best and brightest. Unfortunately, many minorities have not had the opportunity to prove that this is exactly who they are. Our provision is intended to remedy this problem. I strongly urge support of reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of which my amendment is a part.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1920

Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mrs. LOWEY of New York] having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3553) to amend and extend the Higher Education Act of 1965, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on H.R. 3553, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LOWEY of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GONZALEZ IRAQ EXPOSÉ

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the extraordinary discussion which the chairman of the House

Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], has been having about the incredible pattern of misbehavior and coverup with regard to Iraq that has been perpetrated by this administration.

Just to quote briefly from the Washington Post article on last Sunday:

Almost every Monday for the past couple of months, Representative Henry B. Gonzalez has been setting the Bush administration's teeth on edge with fiery exposes about its courtship of Iraq before the invasion of Kuwait in August 1990. Gonzalez's special orders are full of excruciating detail that could haunt the White House before this election year is over.

The article in its entirety is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 22, 1992]

GONZALEZ'S IRAQ EXPOSÉ—HILL CHAIRMAN DETAILS UNITED STATES PREWAR COURTSHIP
(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Almost every Monday for the past couple of months, Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez (D-Tex.), the feisty chairman of the House Banking Committee, has been setting the Bush administration's teeth on edge with fiery exposes about its courtship of Iraq before the invasion of Kuwait in August 1990.

So far, hardly anyone has been listening. Gonzalez's "special orders"—as such uninterrupted speeches are called—are delivered to a virtually empty House floor. But they are full of excruciating detail—much of it classified "secret" and "confidential"—that could haunt the White House before this election year is over.

Gonzalez's charges are simple and direct: Senior Bush administration officials went to great lengths to continue supporting Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his unreliable regime long after it was prudent to do so.

U.S. officials insisted in 1989, for instance, on playing down the importance of a scandal involving an Atlanta-based bank and more than \$5 billion in unauthorized loans to Iraq, including \$900 million guaranteed by the U.S. government. They even intervened in the case to prevent indictment of the Central Bank of Iraq while the Persian Gulf War was raging.

Despite stiff opposition from some officials inside the administration, senior policymakers pushed ahead with \$1 billion in fresh agricultural credits for Iraq under a Commodity Credit Corp. program. They also pressed for continued Export-Import Bank financing despite congressional sanctions and kept sharing intelligence information with Baghdad until a few weeks before Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

Then, in the wake of the gulf war when Congress began demanding more information about the prewar conduct of U.S. policy toward Iraq, administration officials tried to hide their embarrassment under a cloak of national security and created what Gonzalez has called a "coverup mechanism" to keep investigators at bay.

Administration officials strenuously contest the accusations of impropriety and illegality, but they plainly would rather not talk about them at all. So far, they have sent only muted complaints to Capitol Hill about Gonzalez, by way of the House Republican minority, even though, House aides say, the Texas congressman has plunked more classified documents into the Congressional Record than anyone since the Vietnam War.

"We have received no formal communication from the administration on the issue," said a spokesman for House Speaker Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.).

The centerpiece of the controversy is the scandal involving the Italian government-owned Banca Nazionale del Lavoro (BNL). It broke open on Aug. 4, 1989, when FBI agents and Federal Reserve officials, tipped off by two bank executives, raided BNL's Atlanta branch and confiscated thousands of documents. The branch had become Iraq's principal source of credit in the United States between 1984 and 1989, a period in which Iraq's eight-year-long war with Iran had turned Saddam's regime into a cash-starved and unreliable debtor.

According to interviews with knowledgeable officials, records made public by Gonzalez and documents obtained from other sources, it was soon apparent that Iraq was involved in a massive fraud to pump billions of dollars in illegal loans and credits out of BNL-Atlanta, far above the amounts reported to the Federal Reserve.

About half of the money allegedly went to finance the purchase of U.S. farm products, including \$900 million guaranteed by the Agriculture Department's Commodity Credit Corp., but investigators said much of the rest had helped fuel Iraq's military buildup.

U.S. Customs Service reports dated Sept. 21, 1989, and Oct. 20, 1989, pointed out that BNL was suspected of financing shipments of industrial machinery, military-type technology and various controlled chemicals to Iraq and providing loans "to various U.S. firms for the illegal export to Iraq of missile-related technology."

Federal prosecutors in Atlanta anticipated quick indictments. In Washington, records show, Agriculture Department officials learned in early October 1989 that the evidence indicated their \$1 billion-a-year CCC program for Iraq was riddled with corruption, including kickbacks and bribes demanded by Iraqi government agencies and questionable consulting fees for Iraqi front companies in the United States.

There were also allegations, still unresolved, that food shipments destined for Iraq under the loan program never got there and may have been diverted to other countries in exchange for cash or goods. Investigators say they now believe some food may have been traded for weapons or Soviet bloc military assistance.

MORE CREDITS URGED

Despite that, Agriculture officials recommended an "interim" \$400 million in additional food credits be granted Iraq under the CCC program, and this was approved by an interagency council Oct. 4, 1989, over the opposition of the Federal Reserve and Treasury representatives. A confidential State Department memo minimized the objections of the two agencies, saying they were made "at the behest" of the Office of Management and Budget, which State suggested was taking its role as "watchdog against scandal" too seriously.

But Iraq rejected the \$400 million as insultingly low—Baghdad had received \$1.1 billion the year before—and said such a relatively small amount would be "widely viewed as a U.S. vote of no confidence in Iraq debt policy." On Oct. 6, according to a secret cable, Secretary of State James A. Baker III assured complaining Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz at a meeting here that he would "look into the matter immediately."

BNL officials in Rome, faced with parliamentary demands for an investigation there, were also getting worried. On Oct. 19,

1989, according to a State Department cable, BNL's chairman and its director-general called on U.S. Ambassador Peter F. Secchia and "suggested that the matter should be raised to a political level." They said they wanted to cooperate fully with U.S. authorities "while at the same time making it fairly clear they want to achieve some kind of damage control."

Sometime that same month, President Bush stepped into the fray, issuing National Security Directive 26 (NSD-26). Gonzalez said the order has been withheld from his committee on grounds of executive privilege, but other documents show that it ordered "pursuit of improved economic and political ties with Iraq." A report to Baker, dated Oct. 26, 1989, cited the directive in recommending approval "on foreign policy grounds" of a \$1 billion CCC program for Iraq, to be paid in two installments in light of the BNL investigation.

The report warned that the bank fraud "may also involve several high Iraqi officials," but emphasized; "Iraq is now our ninth largest customer for agricultural commodities. . . . Our ability to influence Iraqi policies in areas important to us, from Lebanon to the Middle East peace process, will be heavily influenced by the outcome of the CCC negotiations."

BAKER CALLED YEUTTER

Baker called then-Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter and urged him to go forward with the \$1 billion program. Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence S. Eagleburger made similar appeals to Treasury and OMB, explaining in one note that "the CCC program is important to our efforts to improve and expand our relationship with Iraq, as ordered by the President in NSD-26."

The full \$1 billion was approved at a high-level interagency council meeting on Nov. 8, 1989. According to a confidential memo, Treasury, the Federal Reserve and OMB still felt that "allegations of Iraqi wrongdoing in the BNL case, though not backed by evidence at this time, could eventually embarrass the administration." But once again, the State Department representative invoked NSD-26 and said that "to abruptly terminate the [CCC] program would . . . clearly run counter to the president's intention."

Alarmed by Baghdad's human rights abuses such as the gassing of Kurdish villages in northern Iraq, Congress later that month enacted limited sanctions against Iraq, prohibiting Export-Import Bank financing without a presidential waiver. The State Department quickly drafted one and Bush signed it Jan. 17, 1990, declaring that a prohibition on Ex-Im loan guarantees for Iraq—essentially a \$200 million revolving credit line—would not be "in the national interest of the United States."

Around that time, other documents show, prosecutors in Atlanta were planning to bring an indictment in February and wanted to arrange interviews abroad of some "essential witnesses," especially in Turkey. The interviews never came about, for reasons that are not yet clear. Justice Department officials in Washington say they stepped into the case in February 1990 in view of its international implications. Not until a year later—on Feb. 28, 1991, the day after Bush ordered a cease-fire in the gulf war—were charges formally brought.

"It was a very complex case," said Gerrilyn Brill, first assistant U.S. attorney in Atlanta. "There is no connection between any failure to meet our expected dates in the indictment and foreign policy considerations."

Brill is in charge of the case because the U.S. attorney in Atlanta, Joe D. Whitley, appointed in the summer of 1990, disqualified himself. He came from a firm that represented Matrix-Churchill of Ohio, an Iraqi front company and machine tool manufacturer named in the indictment as one of the recipients of BNL loan money.

"It's just a matter of happenstance," Laurence A. Urgenson, acting deputy assistant attorney general, said of Whitley's Matrix-Churchill connection. Urgenson, who worked closely on the case as chief of the Justice Department's criminal fraud section, said "people keep linking things together that don't link. You have no idea how unrelated the war was to what we were doing. We indicted the day we were finished."

CREDITS FINALLY CUT

The Agriculture Department finally halted the CCC loan program in May 1990 as relations with Saddam were deteriorating, but by then, half the \$1 billion in credits had already been used.

Documents indicate the cutoff came after a May 29 meeting of the National Security Council deputies committee. A secret State Department options paper prepared for the session listed other actions that could be taken against Iraq and noted that U.S. intelligence was still providing Baghdad "with limited information on Iranian military activity that would be missed."

It is not clear when that intelligence-sharing relationship was terminated. A knowledgeable official said intelligence sharing was not discussed at the NSC meeting.

Months later, with the BNL indictment imminent, prosecutors wanted to name the Central Bank of Iraq as a defendant, a step they said would allow them to freeze \$1.5 billion in Iraqi assets. Top lawyers from the State Department, the Federal Reserve and other agencies successfully opposed the move as a dangerous precedent that could invite similar action by other countries against the Fed.

In a separate memo, the State Department, apparently anticipating Saddam's downfall, expressed additional reservations, saying the Iraqi central bank "will be an important element in any reconstruction regime." The memo also noted with apparent satisfaction that "contrary to press reports," Saddam's son-in-law, Hussein Kamal, was not on the list of those to be indicted. He has been named, instead, as an unindicted co-conspirator.

The 347-count indictment accused three officers of BNL-Atlanta, two of whom pleaded guilty last Friday, of conspiring with four Iraqi officials in what amounted to a rogue operation to defraud BNL of more than \$5 billion without the knowledge or approval of higher-ups in the Italian bank. According to one Justice Department memo, the main defendant in the case, Christopher Drogoul, who ran BNL-Atlanta, has accused higher-ups in Rome of complicity, but prosecutors rejected his claims as "spurious." The trial is set for June 1.

Simply stated, Mr. Speaker, this article shows a pattern of this administration courting Saddam Hussein, of overruling efforts within the administration to cut off aid to him and, in fact, helping to create the monster that caused us so much difficulty a year and a half ago.

REQUIRING ULTRACLEAN VEHICLES BY THE YEAR 2003

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

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which is admittedly ambitious, but also, I believe, an accurate prediction of what the future must hold in store for us just 10 years from now. This would require ultraclean vehicle emissions, equivalent to those which will likely be achievable in dedicated natural gas vehicles, by the year 2003.

The age of gasoline as we know it is slowly drawing to a close. We can't afford its environmental cost much longer, especially in Utah. The Congress is pushing a transition to cleaner fuels with requirements in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 to produce 150,000 clean vehicles for sale each year in southern California by 1996 and 300,000 by 1999 for each year thereafter. My bill is the natural outgrowth, and next step, of that visionary program.

Two years ago, Congressman WAXMAN led many of us in an effort to include cleaner national emission standards in the Clean Air Act amendments by the year 2003. The final bill ultimately included only a study of such emission standards by the EPA, with the possibility of adopting them.

This winter in Utah a long, dangerous air inversion afflicted my district and Utah County of the South. The skies have cleared to some degree now, as they usually do in the spring, but the pall that hung over our valleys for weeks at a time was not only a serious health threat, but also a constant, nagging reminder that we need to take bold steps to clean our air. The bill I am introducing today will tighten the standards for NO_x [NOX], CO [carbon monoxide], PM [particulate matter], and NMOG [non-methane organic gas] emissions by the year 2003. These standards are even more stringent than those proposed by Congressman WAXMAN. They will stretch the limits of technology, but, after discussions with the natural gas and petrochemical industries and others, I believe they are attainable and a reasonable target. Hearings can give us a clearer picture of whether those stretching goals are the appropriate ones. Any alternative fuel which could achieve these standards, including reformulated gasoline, would be equally acceptable if it could deliver this nearly nonpolluting standard. Natural gas is the likely choice. We have enough natural gas in North America to last for many decades. We do not have to remain dependent on uncertain overseas oil supplies forever. Dedicated vehicles—those manufactured strictly as natural gas vehicles—will be even cleaner than the vehicles we have converted to natural gas today.

Utah experienced at least one significant violation of the ozone standard last summer and probably more. We had numerous violations of the carbon monoxide standard in our Wasatch Front communities. In addition to creating ozone precursors and carbon monoxide, gasoline emissions, NO_x in particular, are also a precursor of PM-10—arguably our most serious air quality problem—and are responsible for about 20 to 30 percent of our PM-10 problem in Utah. Given the serious inversion problems in our high valleys, and given that the number of vehicles on the road will nearly double in Utah in the next 20 years, it is already past time to take additional steps to prevent a filthy and unhealthy future.

Other fuels will eventually and inevitably take the place of gasoline as it is currently formulated. No one disputes that, not even in the petrochemical industry. I believe 10 years is a sufficient lead-time, given the progress that is already mandated by law, to prepare gradually for a switch to essentially nonpolluting fuels for our vehicles. Congress can push that process even further along by acting on this measure I am introducing. We need to take a visionary stand and force a cleaner future.

A recent editorial in the Salt Lake Tribune read:

The Wasatch Front needs nothing less than a change in the habit of relying exclusively on the internal-combustion engine. Not abandoning the automobile, because technology can help by introducing cars that feasibly burn cleaner fuels or are electric or solar-powered. Such ideas can no longer be dismissed as futuristic visions. Rather, they are the ideas that can save Wasatch Front residents from their own air-befouling products. In fact, no solution can be viewed as too futuristic because the air pollution problem is here, now, and getting worse. It needs to be taken as seriously as any health hazard that has been judged "life-threatening."

I will submit the entire Salt Lake Tribune editorial to be printed in full:

"LIFE-THREATENING" AIR POLLUTION BECOMES EVERYBODY'S PROBLEM

During the past week, The Salt Lake Tribune and KUTV-Channel 2 joined to examine air conditions along the Wasatch Front and share findings with the largest possible, directly affected audience. A particularly ugly and coincidental temperature inversion helped illustrate the central point, which is: Air pollution isn't merely an esthetic inconvenience, it's a serious health threat.

Tribune/KUTV investigations determined that parts of this region contain some of the nation's worst measurements for particulate and carbon monoxide pollution; that particulate pollution is causing illness and death to people susceptible to this pulmonary assault; that local air pollution can get progressively worse in 20 more years.

Encouraging, however, were answers to a Tribune/KUTV poll. Thirty-eight percent of those asked said the dirty air is "life-threatening" and another 50 percent found the situation "serious."

This legitimate concern should be translated into necessary action. For instance, state senators should be urged to support

eight bills comprising the Governor's Clean Air Commission legislative package, already ushered through the House of Representatives.

More than that, citizens should demand that legislators get more aggressive on air pollution. As essential as it is, this year's legislative effort can hardly be called ambitious.

The bills include tax incentives for buyers of clean-burning stoves and mandated inspections for vehicles owned by college students from outside Wasatch Front counties—not exactly giant-slayers.

State legislators should consider this year's air quality improvement work as just a beginning. It's a springboard to bolder action and certainly away from HB57, enacted with flaws in 1987. That law unfortunately prevents Utah from imposing regulations more stringent than those outlined in the federal Clean Air Act.

The state requires a flexibility that the Legislature waived five years ago. National standards don't meet all local needs.

Indeed, the Wasatch Front's air pollution is unique, the result of indigenous geography and meteorology. The resulting health risks, especially caused by particulates, are distinct from those of, say, Cleveland, and require controls not justifiable for Cleveland.

Looking ahead, Salt Lake County voters should begin considering the light rail referendum scheduled for November's ballot. By designating a fraction of their sales tax to the Utah Transit Authority's proposed light rail system between Sandy and Salt Lake, coincident with doubling the bus fleet, they would help neutralize an air pollution buildup that could literally choke the valley by the year 2010.

When the public starts thinking about approving and using a light rail system, it will take a critical psychological step: Embracing an alternative to driving cars. And that's what the Wasatch Front needs—nothing less than a change in the habit of relying exclusively on the internal-combustion automobile.

Not abandoning the automobile, because technology can help by introducing cars that feasibly burn cleaner fuels or are electric or solar-powered. Such possibilities can no longer be dismissed as futuristic visions. Rather, they are the ideas that can save Wasatch Front residents from their own air-befouling waste products.

In fact, no solution can be viewed as too futuristic because the air pollution problem is here, now, and getting worse. It needs to be taken as seriously as any health hazard that has been judged "life-threatening."

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD PRINTED ON 100 PERCENT RECYCLED NEWSPRINT

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

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to report to the Congress that a portion of the March 24 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been printed on newsprint containing 100 percent postconsumer-recovered materials. We anticipate that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be printed in its entirety on 100 percent recycled materials around May 1.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, on behalf of its membership and with the support of the House Subcommittee on

Legislative Branch Appropriations, I am proud to say that the Congress is taking the lead in promoting efforts to increase the use of recycled materials in Federal Government printed products. By taking this initiative and expanding beyond the current EPA guidelines, we are showing the paper industry and environmentalists that we are committed to confronting and reducing this Nation's growing solid-waste disposal problems.

The Joint Committee on Printing has directed the Government Printing Office to use postconsumer-waste-content paper for the Government's printing whenever possible and the paper industry is responding enthusiastically to our request.

While even more stringent efforts must be made to reduce the amounts of solid waste placed in our landfills, this announcement, Madam Speaker, is one significant step worthy of our recognition for congressional actions taken to solve one of our most pressing environmental problems.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my special order of today.

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

There was no objection.

IN CELEBRATION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening here in the Halls of American democracy to honor the spirit of freedom that lies at the heart of our political system.

It is the idea of democratic government brought forth by the ancient Greeks and which today sweeps the modern world.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for Greek Independence day, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for organizing today's special order.

On March 25, 1821, the Greek people took arms against four centuries of Ottoman rule, fighting bravely and valiantly to achieve freedom from Turkish domination.

Greek Independence Day has special significance to all Americans. It is the ancient Greeks who formulated the concept of democracy which is the keystone of the American political system. Democracy is but one of the many con-

tributions of the Greek people to the development of civilization. Art, philosophy, science, and law are but a few of the disciplines in which the Greek people have enriched our culture.

The contributions of Greek-Americans to the development of our great Nation are much too numerous to mention. Our distinguished congressional colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. YATRON], the gentlewoman from Maine, [Ms. SNOWE], the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GEKAS], and the gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. SARBANES] are just a few of the current examples of Greek-Americans who have excelled and contributed to our Government.

Through the commemoration of Greek independence, we have the opportunity not only to salute our own Greek-American community for their contributions, but to commemorate the independence of the Greek people.

Madam Speaker, in closing, it is with a hope and a prayer that we may soon see unity and peace on the island of Cyprus.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], whom I have known now for almost 10 years, and this is my 10th year in this august body, who has always been a wonderful friend who all humanity, all people around the world, all Americans, and a particularly strong and faithful philhellene. I thank the gentleman for those wonderful remarks.

It is, indeed, fitting that we celebrate this magnificent concept today because this is the date that people of Greek heritage and the Greek Orthodox faith—as well as freedom-loving individuals everywhere—celebrate the symbolic rebirth of democracy: Greek Independence Day.

March 25, 1992, is the 171st anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from more than 400 years of foreign domination. It was on this historic day that the Greek people began a series of uprisings against their Turkish oppressors, uprisings that soon turned into a revolution attracting wide international support. The Greeks long and arduous struggle against the Ottoman Empire is a perfect example of the ability of mankind to overcome all obstacles if the will to persevere is strong enough and the goal—in this case the dream of freedom—is bright enough.

America, the United States of America, is surely the truest expression of this dream today. It remains an imperfect dream, yes, but still the shining example that oppressed people throughout the world have looked to for generations; have gained strength from in their struggle to overcome their oppressors. This dream of democracy—born so long ago in Greece—and

its greatest tangible expression in our great democratic republic, Madam Speaker, forms the common bond between our two nations. Furthermore, it is a bond that has stretched throughout history, from ancient times to the present day.

In ancient mythology, fire was brought down from Mount Olympus and offered to the Greeks as a gift, a gift that transformed their lives. Similarly, the gift of democracy was offered to the world by the ancient Greeks and it too was a transforming gift; in fact, it continues to transform the world with stories of heroes and remarkable events. The history of the Greek War for Independence also is filled with heroes and heroism, remarkable events by many peoples in a common cause. It is partly the story of the Klephtes, who descended upon the invaders from their mountain strongholds. It is also the story of the Hydriotes, seafarers from the island of Hydra who broke the Ottoman naval blockage; and it is the story of the Philhellenes, who took these tales of courage to Europe where their significance was not overlooked.

These stories woven together formed the fabric of a free and independent Greece, of democracy returned to the cradle where it was born, and defended by the defiant cries of the Greek patriots: "Eleftheria i Thanatos"—liberty or death. It is happening again. Today—over and over the story is repeated—redrafting the world map faster than cartographers can redraw the lines. Germany is whole again, the Soviet Union is no more, the Baltic Nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, long captive Republics, are free. Each and every one of the former Soviet Socialist Republics now are members of the commission on security and cooperation in Europe. Just this past weekend, in Albania, once one of the most repressive regimes in the Balkans, democrats won a landslide victory with 62 percent of the vote. Once dark, the Balkans are lighting up again.

However, democracy, which places the hands of the common man on the wheel of destiny, brings with it dangers, as well. Freedom often brings with it old antagonisms, nationalist disputes that must be reconciled, and the old truism that warfare is only an extension of diplomacy is not better demonstrated than in the Balkans. Yugoslavia—cobbed together out of many competing ethnic factions and for years held together by the force of communism—is fragmenting, often explosively. Fighting continues over Croatian and Slovenian independence and in Yugoslavia's southern region an old dispute threatens the cradle of democracy, Greece itself.

The Greek Government protested when, in 1945, Yugoslavia's Communist dictator, Tito, usurped the name Macedonia for a province carved out of

southern Yugoslavia to diminish the power of Serbia. This served only to inflame competing interests in a region stretching well beyond the borders of Yugoslavia and unstable since the days of Alexander the Great. While this province now understandably seeks its freedom, the concept of Macedonia must in no way be restricted within the borders of this tiny land. To recognize this province as an independent nation under the name Macendonia would, I fear, unleash antagonisms already bubbling at the boiling point. European leaders, among them Greek President Constantine Karamanlis, himself a Macedonian, are voicing frantic concerns to the European Community over the Republic's request for recognition as an independent state. As recounted in the *New York Times*, constitutional language regarding a future union of the wider lands of ancient Macedonia, which reach into Bulgaria, Albania, and Greece, spark resentments and suspicion. Promises to protect the cultural, economic, and social rights of Macedonians in surrounding countries are equally ominous.

More blatant still are maps circulating in the region and bearing the seal of the Macedonian national liberation army; maps that depict the envisioned nation of Macedonia with borders reaching into eastern Albania, southwestern Bulgaria and a full quarter of mainland Greece. Frequent radio broadcasts from Yugoslavia's Macedonian province call for the unification of Macedonia and for the freeing of millions of oppressed Macedonians in Greece.

In short, Madam Speaker, there is much more at stake here than a name. Rushing in with official recognition could add another Serbo-Croat-type conflict to a region already suffering from widespread violence. As Greek and other European officials recognize, freedom is indeed a magnificent thing, a precious gift, but unless existing differences are peacefully reconciled now, very dark days could lie ahead. Democracy is a goal worth the effort in ensuring its peaceful attainment. Indeed, in these very special times for democracy and freedom, with the elimination of the Berlin Wall and the lifting of the Iron Curtain, we should reflect on the democratic principles offered by ancient Greece.

The ancient Greeks forged the very notion of democracy, placing the ultimate power to govern in the hands of the people themselves. The dream of self-rule was made reality as our founding fathers drew heavily on the political and philosophical experience of ancient Greece in forming our government. For that contribution alone we owe a great debt to the Greeks. In the American colonial period, during the formative years of what would be our great republic, no feature was more prominent than the extent to which

Greek and Roman sources were cited by the Framers of the Constitution. The very basis of our Constitution derives from Aristotle and was put into practice in ancient Rome, in 18th century England and in the early State constitutions, before it was given its national embodiment by the convention of 1787.

The overriding appreciation was for Aristotle's sense of balance, since the delegates viewed the tyrant and the mob as equally dangerous. Indeed, both James Madison and John Adams emphasized what Aristotle had written in "The Politics," that "the more perfect the mixture of the political elements, the more lasting will be the state." Through the recognition of the idea of a separation of powers, a system of checks and balances was instituted in American Government. Thus, as another of the ancient Greeks, Polybius, foresaw and wrote, "when one part, having grown out of proportion to the others, aims at supremacy and tends to become too dominant * * * none of the three is absolute * * *."

Our Founding Fathers were eager to relate the American experiment to the efforts of the ancient Greeks to establish a balance of powers. Such a relationship, it was hoped by the Framers, would allow America to escape the disintegration of government that had proven inevitably fatal to other political systems throughout history. It is the example of the ancient Greeks that we celebrate each March 25, that and the return of democracy to Greece on this day of glory for the Greek people. The spirit of democracy and of this day lives on in the defense of the principles for which so many of the free world's citizens have given their lives.

Madam Speaker, today we celebrate together with Greece in order to reaffirm the democratic heritage that our two nations share so closely. These principles are not uniquely Greek or American, but they are our promise to the world, and they form a legacy that we cherish and have a responsibility to protect and defend. "Democracy," in the words of the American clergyman Harry Emerson Fosdick, "is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people." It calls upon each and every one of us to rise above ourselves, to understand that freedom requires sacrifices both large and small and to recognize that the common man is capable of magnificently uncommon actions.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues in honoring today, March 25, as Greek Independence Day. This day celebrates the centuries old ideals of democracy and justice, founded in ancient Greece.

More than 2,000 years ago the early Greeks formed the first democratic republic, where power was placed in the hands of the people. The Greeks believed that man was capable of bringing good government and justice to a people and a nation. This was born of a trust

in human excellence and man's unique ability to think and act rationally.

The ingenuity of the ancient Greeks has made a lasting impression upon the history of the Western World, and has paved the road to modern democracy. For this contribution alone, people across the globe are indebted to the Greeks.

America is one of the most fortunate beneficiaries of this democratic legacy. Thomas Jefferson, the architect of our Declaration of Independence, noted that Americans "are indebted to Greece for the light which originally led ourselves out of Gothic darkness." And as the great poet Percy Bysshe Shelley wrote: "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece."

Like the Greeks, Americans recognize and cherish the virtues of democracy. Democracy provides an environment for high human achievement and active and responsible participation in one's own government. We enjoy the fruit of democracy because we continue the hard work and perseverance necessary to preserve it.

Today marks the 171th anniversary of the signing of the Greek Declaration of Independence; when Greeks broke free from the Ottoman Empire to reclaim their democratic heritage. In celebration of this day, we acknowledge the triumphant history of democracy and look forward to continued friendly relations with Greece and her people.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 390, I am happy to join my colleagues today in honoring Greek Independence Day: A national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy. The Greek people 171 years ago, rose with the love of honor—Greek *philotimo*—to fight and win freedom for its people from 400 years of oppressive Ottoman rule.

During the past decade, we have seen a great resurgence of democracy in Asia, Eastern Europe, South and Central America, and in the former Soviet Union. It is unquestionably one of the most significant events of our time.

For 2000 years Greeks have played a key role in changing the global attitude toward self government; and their philosophy is as influential today. In Nicholas Gages' novel, "Eleni," he depicts the story of this mother's execution by Greek Communists for her efforts to reunite her family in America. President Reagan stated, and I quote, that Eleni's final simple words—"My children"—inspired him to seek an arms agreement "for all the children of the world." Today more than 36 percent of the world is governed by freely elected leaders.

America's mutual admiration and respect for democracy dates back to the late 18th century when our Founding Fathers looked to ancient Greece as a model in creating our own Declaration of Independence. Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson persuaded a noted Greek scholar, John Paradise, to come to the United States for consultation on the political philosophy of democracy.

On March 25, 1821, Alexander Ypsilanti proclaimed Greece's independence inciting the 8-year battle for freedom. His people in turn

imported and translated our Declaration of Independence and studied the American experience of our own revolution to guide their nation through its pursuit of self rule. Poorly equipped and disorganized, their courage and dedication to an ancient idea of freedom, justice, and liberty for all inspired three notable American philhellenes—Lt. Gen. George Jarvis, Col. Jonathan P. Miller, and Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe—to join Lord Byron to fight with the Greek insurgents. In support of Greece, President James Monroe declared “a strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the world.”

The Greek people continued their struggle against the threat of nondemocratic regimes into the 20th century. At the height of World War II, when Nazi forces appeared to soon overrun Europe, the Greek people fought courageously on behalf of freedom at a cost of a half a million lives. Prime Minister Winston Churchill declared: “in ancient days it was said that Greeks fight like heroes, now we must say that heroes fight like Greeks.”

For the past four decades, Greece has withstood many trials. Recognizing Greece's commitment to the resistance of communism, President Harry Truman included Greece in his economic and military assistance program—the Truman doctrine. In 1952, Greece joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In 1960, Greece's commitment to freedom and democracy was again tested when Russia threatened to pulverize the Acropolis unless Greece abandon the NATO alliance. Greece stood firm.

When Kuwait endured a hostile takeover of its peaceful nation, and the United States sought assistance from our allies to oust Saddam Hussein from Kuwait, Greece firmly enforced the United Nations embargo against Iraq and sent troops.

Today is the sixth year we reaffirm our alliance with Greece and our dedication to our common democratic principles by celebrating Greek Independence Day. It is also a day to honor Greek-Americans who have made such invaluable contributions to our national strength and pride. Over 700,000 Greeks have crossed these shores seeking a better life. Two out of three have made America their permanent home. They brought with them their descendants and heritage—the beginnings of Western civilization—and tempered by the strife of a new world, placed themselves among the most highly successful and educated ethnic groups in America.

Their achievements have been numerous and diverse. To name just a few: In politics, Luca Miliades Miller, the first Greek-American congressman; in theatre and entertainment, Elia Kazan and Maria Callas; in journalism, Ike Pappas; in medicine, George Papanicolou; and in business, a few of my own constituents, including George, Demo, and Gus and Chris Zourzoukis, and Nick Dimetrios and Victoria Angelis who have been responsible for bringing this year the 48th Annual Greek Convention to Asheville. I'm privileged to be hosting this event.

Madam Speaker, today we salute Greek-Americans for their contributions to the United States, and especially to Eleni Chamis, another Greek-American from North Carolina,

who at age 14 developed the idea for the enactment of this most worthy commemoration.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank our colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for calling us together today to commemorate the anniversary of the struggle for Greek independence. Without our country's historic relationship with Greece, American society would be greatly diminished.

More than two centuries ago, those who sought to create a new nation of the American colonies, free and democratic, studied ancient Greece. There, more than two millennia earlier, the first theories of and experiments in democracy flourished.

The nascent Americans built an independent nation guided by the principles of reason and fairness learned from the Greeks. Jefferson and Mason championed one of the first human rights documents in history, The Bill of Rights; Madison and Hamilton, the Federal structure of our Government. All of these men were students of the ancient Athenian democracy of Pericles.

Greece, inspired by the United States Declaration of Independence from Great Britain only 45 years earlier, began its 11-year struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire on this date in 1821. The struggle for Greek national liberation drew many of the great artistic and intellectual minds of the 19th century who admired the small nation fighting to secede from a mighty empire.

Freedom was achieved at great cost and has always been difficult to preserve. Nearly 100,000 Greeks were slaughtered by the Ottomans at Chios, an event memorialized by Delacroix's romantic masterpiece. During World War II, occupied by hostile Nazi forces, over 600,000 Greeks lost their lives along side American and other Allied troops in the fight for the preservation of democracy.

As the then chairman of the U.S. Committee for Democracy in Greece, I was overjoyed when democratic government superseded dictatorial rule in the 1970's. However, seeing the birthplace of democracy ruled by dictators reinforced my own conviction that democracy is not an accomplishment, but a process which must be guarded constantly by the people.

The mutually constructive relationship enjoyed by the United States and Greece is evident not only in our shared histories, but in the role Greek-Americans play in our society. Prominent scientists, athletes, entertainers and civic leaders of Greek descent are readily visible role models for Americans.

Modern history is still being written. Let us continue to support those new states struggling for freedom who would guarantee the inalienable rights of their citizens. They too draw inspiration from Greece and the United States.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend my esteemed colleague from Florida for organizing this special order, as he has on so many years, in order to commemorate Greek Independence Day.

This day celebrates the return of democracy, 171 years ago today, to the land that gave the world the concept of democracy so long ago. I might add, Madam Speaker, that Mr. BILIRAKIS is one of the prides of the Greek-American community, and carries on in a Greek tradition of democracy that is more than 2,500 years old.

It was on March 25, 1821, that the Greek people, under the banner and leadership of the Bishop of Patras, rose in insurrection against the Ottoman Turks who held the Greek people in both physical and cultural slavery for nearly 400 years.

This day of revolution was not chosen at random, Madam Speaker. In the Orthodox Christian faith, March 25 is the Feast of the Annunciation. This feast marks the beginning of the plan of salvation that we celebrate during the Lenten season, culminating in the Feast of Easter in 3 weeks.

Greek independence today, however, has a special meaning, and with potentially ominous overtones. I speak, Madam Speaker, of the breakup of Yugoslavia, and once again the rise of the Macedonian question.

No one would contest that the people of Yugoslavian Macedonia, in the tradition of democracy established in Greece so long ago, have the right to independence and self-government.

However, their insistence in retaining the name Macedonia, a 20th century phenomenon, based on a kingdom that existed more than 2,000 years ago, is of great concern to the country of Greece, and peoples of Greek descent throughout the world.

The Kingdom of Macedonia encompassed areas of modern day Greece, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. The country of Greece is justifiably concerned with the possible expansionist aims of an independent Yugoslavian Macedonia, with no direct relation with the ancient kingdom, which would be in violation of international law on the integrity of international borders.

The history of the Macedonian question would indicate that the United States, and the international community, should be very careful in dealing with the independence wishes of Yugoslavian Macedonia, and should go to great lengths to guarantee that any expansionist aims by Yugoslavian Macedonia be nipped in the bud. This should start with the changing of Yugoslavian Macedonia's name, which the European Community already has indicated should be the first step in the recognition process.

But let this not detract from today's celebration. I thank the distinguished Member from Florida for arranging this special order today, and it gives me great pleasure to join with our own Greek-American community in this country, and with people of Greek descent around the world, in celebration of the return of freedom and democracy to the Greek people.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, March 25, 1992, marks the 171st anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On this day in 1821, the Greek people declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire after 400 years of foreign domination.

As I look back upon the great unfurling of history, I am especially struck by the endurance of the ideas that sprang forth from Greece. Over 2,500 years ago, the ancient Greeks conceived the democratic principles that form the basis of our Declaration of Independence, Constitution, and Bill of Rights. As Thomas Jefferson said, “to the ancient Greek * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves, America, out of Gothic darkness.”

In turn, the United States became the role model for the Greeks as they valiantly fought for independence during the 1820's. The Declaration of Independence was translated and used by the Greeks as their own. Greek commander in chief, Petros Mavomichalis appealing to the United States stated,

Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom we are drawn toward you by a just sympathy since it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode. * * * Hence, honoring her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you * * * It is for you, citizens of America to crown this glory.

Since then, the two nations have stood side by side as beacons of freedom in the modern era. In World War II America and Greece worked together to defeat Hitler and the rise of fascism. Over 600,000 Greeks—9 percent of the population—died fighting on the side of the allies.

During the past few years, the ideals of ancient Greece once again demonstrated their transforming power as millions of people demanded their freedom in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Today, both America and Greece can rejoice in the triumph of freedom and democracy.

But the Greeks have not only given us their ideas, they have also made major contributions here in America. From medicine, to entertainment, to public service, Greek-Americans have helped shape the social fabric of the United States.

In Detroit, Greektown is a vital section of the city that attracts a multitude of visitors every year who enjoy the fine food and entertainment available there. In the 12th District of Michigan, there are a number of Greek churches that perform a tremendous amount of community service and contribute to the rich diversity of the area.

Madam Speaker, I join the people of Greece and those of Greek ancestry around the world in celebrating Greek Independence Day. I salute all of them for the contributions to freedom and human society.

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 171st anniversary of Greek independence. I also want to commend my Florida colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for holding this special order.

Over 2,500 years ago, Greece began an experiment called democracy. This noble experiment, founded on the principles which Americans now take for granted, has wound its way in history with destiny and purpose.

We are fortunate to live in an age where, for the first time, democracy has taken on worldwide proportions. The crumbling of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Berlin Wall were not remote events unrelated to other trends.

They were, in fact, preordained by those courageous Greeks thousands of years ago. Now these newly free nations are using the Greek example, just as the United States did 200 years ago.

While many Americans know the pivotal role Greece played in the formation of democracy, many are unaware of exactly how deeply this vein runs in our society.

It is not just the thought of individuals governing themselves that has been passed on, but the nature of the institutions themselves.

In their papers, writings, and speeches, such great American founders as Thomas Jefferson and James Madison clearly credit the Greeks for being the basis of many of the founding principles of our American form of democracy.

Ancient Greeks strived for a sense of balance in their government, and sought to include elements of kingliness, aristocracy and the people. This later became the basis for the U.S. President, Senate, and the House of Representatives.

Another form of this balance has resulted in one of the major tenets of American Government—the separation of powers. Ancient Greeks clearly foresaw that one branch of government could become dominant, and usurp power from the people.

To preclude this possibility, our founders instituted a system of checks and balances between our executive, legislative, and judicial branches that maintains the balance Greeks knew to be so important.

As I mentioned earlier, democracy has, unfortunately, not been one common thread through history, but a pattern of fits and starts that serve to remind us of how fragile our democratic institutions really are.

The Greek people are all too aware of this by their experience, as they remained under the control of the Ottoman Empire from 1453 to 1821. However, once again, the Greek nation rose from tyranny to govern themselves.

Ironically, as the Greek people searched for examples for democracy in a modern world, they looked to the United States. In fact, their Declaration of Independence was a direct translation from the U.S. Declaration of Independence.

Given Greece's commitment to democracy, it can truly be said in this case that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery.

Since their independence, Greece has shown time and time again her commitment to democracy around the world, along with her friendship with the United States.

In peace, Greece has shown a true desire to further the cause of freedom and democracy. In war, Greece was willing to sacrifice 600,000 individuals in World War II to end the threat of fascism. She was then determined not to allow Communists to pervert her democratic ideals in the years following the War.

Following the Communist rebellion, President Eisenhower said "Greece asked no favor except the opportunity to stand for those rights in which it believed, and it gave to the world an example of battle * * * a battle that thrilled the hearts of free men and women everywhere." A finer compliment could not be given to any Greek.

My Florida colleague, Mr. BILIRAKIS, exemplifies this Greek and American ideal. His decision to devote a portion of his life toward his work in Congress helps to carry on this long tradition of a commitment to democracy. I congratulate him for his work on designating today as Greek Independence Day.

Madam Speaker, it is clear that the destinies of Greek and American democracy are forever intertwined. I am pleased to rise in this descendant of the Greek ideals, the U.S. House of Representatives, in celebration of Greek Independence Day.

Mr. ATKINS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day

and to pay tribute to the important role Greek-Americans have played in our democracy.

Massachusetts' Fifth District, which I represent, is especially proud of its Greek community. The past glories of Lowell, the largest city in the fifth district, have been restored as a result of the Lowell plan, which was formulated by Paul Tsongas on the back of a place mat at a Greek restaurant. This reconstruction is consistent with the proud immigrant heritage of Lowell which continues today. This morning, I joined the Greek community in celebrating this heritage as the flag of Greece was raised in front of Lowell's city hall.

The wisdom of the Greeks have had a significant impact on modern society. This year we celebrate the Olympic Games, born in Greece. The Olympics have not only provided a competitive arena for sportsmanship amongst the world's great athletes, they have also given us the opportunity of ensuring a peaceful international forum of goodwill between nations. The very concept of a democracy, Madam Speaker, is the greatest gift that the Greeks have provided modern society.

Greek Independence Day, March 25, marks the anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greeks from the Ottoman Empire. Greece lived under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire from 1453 until the Declaration of Independence in 1821. Just as Americans spoke out against that oppression, so must we continue to speak out against Turkey's illegal occupation of the northern half of the island nation of Cyprus.

Today I join my colleagues, just as I joined the Green-American community in Lowell this morning, in celebrating this freedom and the heritage that Greece has provided the world and that Greek-Americans, in particular, have shared with all of us.

Mr. GUARINI. Madam Speaker, today, people of Greek heritage all over the world are celebrating Greek Independence Day. On this day in 1821, the Greek nation began its brave and arduous struggle in pursuit of independence from foreign rule. March 25 also marks the celebration of the Enunciation of the Blessed Mother, a day of feasting and celebration for members of the Greek Orthodox religion. Many of my distinguished colleagues have spoken about the political and religious significance of this day to Greek people, however, I wish to point out that March 25 also offers a wonderful opportunity for all Americans to celebrate the important role that persons of Greek origin play in our country.

There are approximately 3 million Americans of Greek origin living in America today. Approximately 245,000 of the 12 million immigrants who passed through Ellis Island during its 62 years of operation were from Greece. Many settled in the New York Metropolitan Area, drawn by the hope of cultural acceptance and financial success. This pattern continues today, as over 4,000 Greeks, many of them newly arrived, populate the Jersey City area in my district. As Father Karloutsos, of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in New York put it, "wherever you find the marketplace, you will find Greeks."

In fact, Greek immigrants to the United States have always embraced the American dream. Most major American cities boast a thriving Greek community, active in economic,

political, and cultural areas. Individually, Greeks rank higher in number of years spent in school than any other ethnic group. Not surprisingly, many prominent Americans are of Greek origin.

Today, in my district, members of the Evangelismos Greek Orthodox Church and the St. Demetrios Greek Orthodox Church will meet at the old courthouse building in Jersey City. They will be joined by officials of the local and State governments of New Jersey, the Ambassadors of Greece and Cyprus, and members of AHEPA, [the American Hellenic Educational and Progressive Association]. The group will celebrate Greek Independence Day with a flag-raising ceremony at 12 noon, followed this evening by an ethnic festival with traditional Greek food, music, dancing, and poetry recital.

On a sad note, Father Paul Koutoukas of the Evangelismos Greek Orthodox Church and a respected leader in Hudson County, is recovering from surgery and will not be able to attend this year's Greek Independence Day celebration. I would like to join with the many others in the Hudson community in wishing Father Koutoukas a speedy recovery.

Madam Speaker, March 25 is a day when Greeks and Greek-Americans celebrate their culture, their religion, and their heritage. Let us join them in celebration, for Greek Independence Day is an opportunity for all Americans, not only those of Greek origin to rejoice.

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support today's special order in recognition of Greek Independence Day.

Democracy eluded Greece and its people for nearly 400 years—from the fall of Constantinople in 1453, until Greece declared its independence in 1821, and finally gained its freedom from the Ottoman Empire nearly 10 years later.

Yet, it was in Greece that the concept of democracy—the people's government—was born. As the poet, Percy Bysshe Shelley declared, "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece." And as Thomas Jefferson noted, " . . . to the ancient Greek . . . we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

Greek Independence Day acknowledges this contribution. Moreover, it is a celebration of that day in 1821, when Greece launched its struggle for emancipation. Greek Independence Day is a tribute to the courage, determination and perseverance of the Greek people, and to their love of and commitment to freedom and democracy. It is a symbol of the mutual respect and shared values between our two countries.

Again, I am honored to participate in this special order. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for calling the order, and I thank my colleagues for their involvement.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for calling this special order to commemorate Greek Independence Day. As in past years, I rise today with my colleagues to pay tribute to the anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from more than 400 years of foreign domination.

Today marks the 171st anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which ultimately re-

sulted in independence for the Greek people. During the 400-year period of foreign domination, the Greek people were subjected to every hardship. Deprived of their civil rights, their schools and churches were closed, and their children were sometimes kidnaped and raised as Moslems to serve the sultan. In 1822, the Greeks mounted an offensive to finally free themselves from years and years of foreign tyranny. Their brave actions resulted in a liberal Republican constitution, and brought them international support, including volunteers from the United States who sailed to Greece to participate in the struggle for freedom.

This 171st anniversary follows a year of international events which precipitated new freedoms and democratic ideals in government for peoples of many countries. The collapse of the Soviet Union was a tremendous victory of the will of the people over the physical and economic tyranny of hard line Communist rule. The struggle for freedom is alive today all over the world. The Greek revolution that began 171 years ago continues to instill in us a sense of pride, and gives us hope for present and future fighters of tyranny and oppression.

San Francisco, with its proud, ethnic diversity, has a vibrant Greek community which greatly contributes to the unique fabric of the city. Over 3 million Greek immigrants have come to the United States, and have made significant contributions to all aspects of American life since their first migrations to this country. Our country, and all of Western civilization, is deeply rooted in the principles of Greek civilization. As Shelley wrote, "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece."

Again, I thank my colleague for calling this special order to recognize March 25 as Greek Independence Day.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I join with my colleagues in celebrating Greek Independence Day. This day has been billed as a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy and it truly is a celebration of the bond between the two nations.

The Founding Fathers of the United States had a strong grounding in the classics and were very familiar with the tenets of Athenian democracy and Greek history. The founders read from Demosthenes, Aristotle, and Polybius and writers of political tracts at the time often took the pseudonyms of ancient Greeks. In works opposing the highly popular postwar practice of persecuting loyalists, Alexander Hamilton used the name of Phocion, after the Athenian general who was celebrated for his magnanimity toward defeated enemies and his efforts to protect prisoners of war. These types of literary allusions to Greek democracy were not lost on the American colonists. Thomas Jefferson said, ". . . to the ancient Greeks we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of Gothic darkness."

Here in Washington, DC, we have concrete proof—of the link between our form of government and ancient Greek ideals. You need simply look around Washington, DC, to see the strong Greek influences in the Government buildings that were constructed in the early days of the Republic, including the very building in which we stand. Coincidentally, when

the Greeks were fighting for their independence in the 1820's, they used the United States revolution of 1776 as inspiration and translations of the United States Declaration of Independence were circulated among the Greek freedom fighters.

Greece remained under the control of the Ottoman Empire from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 until the declaration of Greek independence in 1821. It is that event, 171 years ago, that we celebrate today.

Let me take a moment to speak more generally about political freedom. The past 3 years have seen the greatest expansion of freedom in history. Over one-third of the nations on Earth, encompassing nearly 30 percent of the world's population, have consciously decided to alter their political systems in favor of more open and democratic forms of government. Freedom House, a New York-based human rights monitoring group, now counts an alltime high number of nations it designates as free: 75. Freedom House counts 89 democracies and 32 other nations in democratic transition, for a total of 121 of the world's 171 nations. There were 44 democracies in 1972 and 56 in 1980. The ideals of democracy developed in Greece 2,000 years ago and the example of United States democracy that exists today are directly responsible for this transformation of so many nations to freedom.

This is a historic time. All of the effort the United States has expended during the cold war is paying off and democracy is marching across the world. We cannot now lose our vision and let our commitment to democracy lose out to the political atmosphere created during an election year. We must not shirk our responsibility and our historical obligation to further democracy at this crucial time. I urge the President to resist the demagog who would have the United States draw back and allow the seed of democracy to wither in many nations overseas.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for calling this special order and I am pleased to be included in this celebration of Greek Independence Day. I urge all Members to take this opportunity to reflect on the history of democracy and to also reflect on the future of democracy and America's obligation to promote government by the people the world over.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support for House Joint Resolution 58 to commemorate Greek Independence Day. This special day marks the anniversary of the beginning of the Greek struggle for independence in 1821.

The United States owes much of our democratic heritage to the ancient Greeks. Our Founding Fathers drew heavily upon Greek philosophy and democracy in crafting our own Government. The foundations of our own democratic system, such as the supremacy of the individual as the basis for state power, the equality of all citizens and the strong belief in the rule of law, were born in the land of Aristotle and Pericles. These basic principles miraculously survived in Greece under centuries of foreign domination. The new Greek state even adopted the American Declaration of Independence as their own. It is certainly fitting to celebrate this day together with Greece

in order to reaffirm the democratic heritage that the United States and Greece share.

I also would like to commend the countless contributions of the many Greek emigrants and their descendants to our great society. Their accomplishments have blessed us all and certainly have made them one of the most successful ethnic groups in the United States.

I am proud to be able to state that my lineage includes Greek ancestors.

It is my hope that the current fighters for democracy and basic human rights throughout the world find inspiration in both the independence struggle of Greece in the 1820's and that of the ancient Greeks to establish the very first democratic system against the autocratic rulers of that time. Hopefully all the world's peoples will soon be able to share in those basic principles of Greek democracy that we take for granted today.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise today in honor of Greek Independence Day. On March 25, 171 years ago, the birthplace of democracy and Western culture rose to free itself from the bonds of Ottoman despotism. Those who loved freedom flocked from around the world to support Greece's struggle in its 7 year war of independence against the Ottoman Empire. The English poet, Lord Byron, was one of those. In 1821, he wrote:

The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free.

He died in 1824, fighting for Greece.

The very word for politics comes from the Greek word "polis", meaning city-state. And it was in the Greek city-states, especially Athens, that the foundation of our form of government was laid. In Greece, was invented the concept of democracy—the idea that all citizens should have a voice in determining governmental policy.

Just as our Founding Fathers were inspired by ancient Greek philosophy and political ideals, the Greeks were inspired by America's war for independence against Britain. The Greeks translated our Declaration of Independence and used it as their own.

The other contributions of Greek culture to Western civilization are too numerous to mention. They include mathematics—the invention of our system of geometry, architecture—including the design of our Capitol building, and law. It is impossible to go through a day without using a legacy of ancient Greece.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the gentleman from Florida's legislation recognizing Greek Independence Day. It is more than appropriate that March 25 is known as a celebration of Greek and American democracy. For the experiences of Greece and America are so intertwined that they cannot be separated.

Mr. FASCELL. Madam Speaker, as in the past, it is an honor for me to join with my colleagues in commemorating Greek Independence Day. This recognition is especially important today, considering the collapse of the Soviet empire and the nascent growth of democratic institution building that is occurring within the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. It is equally important considering the indelible ties of democracy that permanently link Greece with the United States.

If future historians note that the 20th century ended with the demise of the ideological division of the world and rise of democratic movements worldwide, they will also make reference to the fact that the origins of such movements arose in Greece long before the rise and fall of the Berlin Wall. We as Americans know this to be true because as Americans we recognize that our country's most cherished heritage—a free and open political form of Government—would not have been possible without the historical contributions that Greece has made toward the development of such a form of government and its inherent institutions.

Those contributions have contributed to the permanent fabric of United States-Greek relations. It is equally clear, that those contributions bind United States foreign policy interests to those of Greece in seeking to achieve greater stability and security in the Eastern Mediterranean. These ties have been assembled through mutually beneficial security cooperation efforts that were evidenced throughout the ordeal of not only the cold war but most recently that of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm where Greece permitted United States aircraft to fly through Greek airspace, granted United States and allied ships the right of passage through Greek waters, allowed for the restationing of United States aircraft at the Souda naval base on Crete and allowed the West German and Belgium Governments to station naval ships at Greek naval facilities on Crete. Clearly, each and every one of these steps was an indication of the Greek Government's commitment to the integrity of internationally accepted norms of state relations, as well as to maintaining friendly and strong relations with the United States.

In light of these facts, the United States remains thankful for Greek cooperation not only in the second gulf war, but aware of the many contributions Greece made during the ordeal of the cold war. In this regard, Greece has been, is and will remain a valuable friend and reliable ally as we face continued security questions and challenges in the future.

In my view, the current foundation of United States-Greek relations remains on firm ground. Clearly, our relations will change and evolve as we move ahead in the post-cold-war world. Nevertheless, the underpinnings of this foundation remain sound and will serve to ensure that United States-Greek relations will continue to flourish and grow with the same richness that our nations have grown accustomed. These foundations rest upon our common commitment to strengthening democratic principles and institutions worldwide, our shared willingness and responsibility to take steps to defend those principles and institutions, and the deep cultural ties that have been forged between our peoples by Greeks, Americans and people of Greco-American extraction. Taken together, these elements will continue to contribute to the excellent state of relations that persist between the United States and Greece as we congratulate the Greek people upon the anniversary of their Independence Day.

Mr. DWYER of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. BILIRAKIS for reserving time today so that we can commemorate Greek Independence Day, a national day

of celebration of Greek and American democracy.

All of us participating in today's special order are aware that March 25th marks the anniversary of the beginning of Greece's struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire from more than 400 years of foreign domination.

We in the United States and around the world owe a great deal to the ancient Greeks who first developed our democratic principles over 2,500 years ago. The ancient Greek concepts directed our founding fathers as they formulated the guidelines which have become central to our democracy as we know it today. Now, many of the freedoms that we Americans possess provide inspiration for the millions of people who have fought for their rights all over the world.

I believe it is particularly pertinent and valuable to celebrate democracy in this way, at a time when the democratic goal is appreciated and upheld as never before. World events in recent times have demonstrated the force of the political sweeping changes that have occurred in such diverse areas as Eastern Europe, Central America, and South Africa. But the overriding common theme of all of these upheavals has been the continual struggle for the basic political rights and human freedoms which are central to democracy and a tradition passed down from the Greek people.

Although democracy has proven to be an invaluable contribution to our world today, it is only one of the numerous contributions the Greek people have made toward the development of civilization. Art, science, philosophy, and law are even just a few of the areas in which the Greek people have enriched our culture.

Madam Speaker, I join the people of Greece and those people of Greek descent around the world celebrating Greek Independence Day. I honor them for the tremendous contributions to freedom and human dignity that they have made.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure and pride that I cosponsor House Joint Resolution 390, designating March 25 as Greek Independence Day.

As democracy triumphs around the globe and the forces of totalitarianism abandon their failed political philosophies, the contributions of the ancient Greeks become all the more laudable. The early Greeks fought and died to gain the blessings of freedom and democracy. This date marks the 171st anniversary of their revolution against the Ottoman Empire. They paid dearly for the final victory; their lasting gift is democracy, a system of government that gives the ultimate power to govern to the people. Perhaps the United States' greatest contribution to humanity will be our leadership in promoting the democratic system among the nations of the world.

The Greeks of old also gave Western civilization art and literature, architecture, science, and philosophy. We need only look at the lovely buildings in this great city to see the legacy of the architects of ancient Greece whose genius still stands in the modern world. For these contributions, we are greatly indebted to the Greeks.

Greek-Americans have also given much to this Nation. They value learning and are one

of the most highly educated ethnic groups in this country. Sons and daughters of Greece have proudly served the United States in Government, the military, the arts, and the private sector and have distinguished themselves in their adopted land.

The common heritage we share has forged a close bond between Greece and the United States and between our peoples, for we are all children of the ancient Greeks. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution that pays tribute to the contributions of the Greeks, both past and present, which have greatly enriched American life.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, this day marks the 171st anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Greek nation on the occasion of the Feast of the Annunciation in 1821. This began the 7-year struggle which resulted in the independence of the Greek state.

The efforts of the Greek revolutionaries captured the attention of the world, and their commitment to freedom inspired many people from the United States and Europe to leave their respective homes to join the revolution. Even now we are inspired by the spirit and vibrancy of the Greek-American community and its many and varied contributions to the social and political life of our country.

This historic day will be celebrated across the country by people of Greek descent. At the State House in Boston, as well as at the White House, ceremonies will be held to commemorate Greek independence and the historic relationship between Greece and the United States. In my congressional district, Greek churches and schools will host events which will celebrate Greek culture and heritage. This Sunday, St. Demetrios Church in Fall River, MA, will have a special program following regular Sunday services, where children will recite poems and sing Greek songs as well as perform traditional dances. Father James Kyriakakis of St. Demetrios, a leader of the Greek community in Fall River, has been steadfast in his commitment to the celebration and preservation of Greek culture and heritage, and I know that during Sunday's services he will be making special mention of this important date.

Madam Speaker, we owe the Greek people a great debt of gratitude, both for their role as the founders of the very first democracies, and for the contributions of all Greek-Americans to our society. Let us then join in the recognition of this day which is celebrated by Greek-Americans with joy and reverence.

Mr. YATRON. Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida, Congressman BILIRAKIS, for initiating this very special order on Greek Independence Day. On March 25, 1821, after four centuries of Ottoman rule, Greeks rose up in arms, fought valiantly, and finally achieved a dream centuries old—freedom from Turkish domination.

The ancient Greeks created the very notion of democracy, in which the ultimate power to govern was vested in the people. As Aristotle said:

If liberty and equality, as is thought by some, are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost.

It was this concept that the Founding Fathers of the United States of America drew

heavily upon in forming our representative government.

Constitutional democracy has made the American way of life possible. For that contribution alone, we owe a heavy debt to the Greek people. But the contribution of democracy was not the only contribution made by Greek patriots to American society. The ancient Greeks contributed a great deal, both to our cultural heritage, as well as to European culture, in the areas of art, philosophy, science, and law. In the preface to his poem "Hellas" Shelly wrote: "our laws, our literature, our religion, our arts have their roots in Greece."

Greek-Americans have followed the rich tradition of their ancestors. They have made their mark in many professions including medicine, science, law, and business, among others. The welfare and progress of the Greek community, both here and abroad, is of great importance to all of us.

Madam Speaker, Greek Independence Day was a model for a new nation, and continues to be an inspiration for all those living in the darkness of oppression.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day.

On this day many years ago, the Greek people rose up and began the struggle to throw off the yoke of more than 400 years of Turkish oppression. The uprising we commemorate today developed into a full-fledged revolution, garnering international support, and eventually leading to independence for the Greek people.

As I commemorate Greek Independence Day, I am reminded of the many traditions which the Greek and the American people share. Both nations fought revolutions to oust a foreign ruler and secure their own independence. We both continue in the proud tradition of democracy first established in ancient Athens more than 2,000 years ago. These shared values have led to many years of friendship between the Greek and the American peoples.

Together with many Americans, Madam Speaker, I wish all the very best to the people of Greece as they celebrate their independence.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Madam Speaker, March 25 marks the 171st anniversary of Greek Independence Day. I believe this date is a milestone that deserves recognition from the House of Representatives.

We in the United States share a great tradition of democracy and independence with the nation of Greece. Our Founding Fathers, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and James Madison, drew upon the democratic tradition of ancient Greece when they established the United States of America.

By the early 19th century, the people of Greece had suffered for nearly 400 years at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. In organizing their independence movement, the Greeks looked to popular revolutions in France and America for their inspiration.

On March 25, 1821, Greek freedom fighters initiated an uprising against the Ottoman Empire. In confronting the numerically superior Turkish forces, the Greeks fortified themselves with a deep longing for freedom and justice. After innumerable sacrifices of blood and toil,

the Greeks regained their independence from the Turks in 1829 following the signing of the Treaty of Andrianople.

Madam Speaker, the struggle for freedom revealed a love of liberty and self-rule that our Greek friends share with the people of the United States. It is no accident that our two countries have this common bond. The United States owes a great debt to the ancient Greeks who established the foundations of our modern philosophy, architecture, mathematics, drama, physics, literature, and other disciplines. More importantly, we own homage to the Greeks of ancient Athens who developed a working democracy in the sixth century B.C.

Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 390, which designates March 25 as Greek Independence Day, I am pleased to join my colleagues in marking this special anniversary, and as we approach the 21st century, it is reassuring to note that these strong foundations of the past will help to resolve the economic and social challenges of the future.

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pride as a Greek-American to join with my colleagues in commemorating March 25 as the 171st anniversary of the Greek people's war of independence from the Ottoman Empire that had ruled Greece for nearly 400 years.

From the fall of Constantinople in 1453 to the revolt of 1821, the Greek people withstood the oppressive and difficult Turkish rule, passing from generation to generation the yearning for independence. On March 25, 1821 Archbishop Germonos and a small but determined group of Hellenes raised their banner in rebellion and initiated a decade of struggle for freedom.

The bold and daring struggle lasted 8 long, hard years. The struggle captured the imagination and soul of foreign peoples, statesmen, and intellectuals. Support for the revolutionaries was offered from Russia, Britain, France, and the United States.

We should not forget that the Founding Fathers of our own country were inspired by the ancient Greeks who laid the cornerstone of Western democracy with their early cultural and political ideals of equality, freedom, and democracy.

The Greeks fought bravely, and on September 14, 1829, the Ottomans were forced to recognize Greece's demand for sovereignty, freedom, and unification.

The Greek struggle and consequent victory for national pride and independence is an excellent example to all governments, both democratic and those striving to be. Moreover, March 25 is a day of celebration not only for the Greek community, but for the global community as people all over the world strive relentlessly to preserve and expand the principles of freedom first established in Greece.

For Americans, Greek independence symbolizes the historical beginning of a unique, symbiotic relationship between the world's first democracy, Greece, and the world's greatest democracy, the United States of America. The intricate bonds between the two countries continues to flourish, as do the ideals of democracy brought forth by the ancient Greeks, fought for by the rebellious Greeks of 1821, and cherished by all committed to freedom

and equality. Therefore, not only do we congratulate the Greek nation on their national holiday of independence, we thank them for creating the foundation that all existing democracies are based upon.

Mr. PICKETT. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to join my friend and distinguished colleague from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, in participating in this special order to commemorate Greek Independence Day.

Greeks and Greek Americans will observe with pride this important occasion that marks the 171st anniversary of the revolution which freed Greece from the Ottoman Empire. History records the oppression and deprivations of human liberty to which the Greeks were subjected during the period prior to the revolution. But they were able to emerge from this period of their history and quickly reestablish their national identity and continue intact their cultural and religious institutions. It is a tribute to the spirit and determination of the Greek people that they prevailed in their struggle for liberty after such a long period.

Greek Independence Day is not, however, just a Greek holiday. It is a time to observe and reflect on the meaning of the word democracy itself. It was the Greeks who introduced the notion of democracy into the political theories of the day. The ancient Greeks were the first to advance the principles that people should be equal before the law, that majorities should respect the rights to minorities, that men can govern their own affairs, and that merit should determine a person's place in society.

Much of our own constitution is based upon the ideas and theories recorded years ago by Pericles, Plato, Aristotle, and other philosophers of ancient Greece.

In more modern times, the Greeks have continued to cherish their liberty and democratic institutions. More than 600,000 Greeks lost their lives fighting on the side of the Allies in World War II. Greece continues to this day its fundamental commitment to freedom and individual liberty.

In our own country, Greek-Americans have forged their own niche in our culture and society, making notable achievements in government, the arts, commerce, science, medicine, and other pursuits too numerous to mention.

So on this anniversary of Greek Independence Day, I join with people of goodwill everywhere in recognizing the successful struggle by the Greek people to gain their independence, and in what their successful struggle means to freedom loving people throughout the world.

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to report that I cosponsored the resolution (H.J. Res. 390) to designate March 25, 1992, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy." I welcome this chance to extend best wishes to my constituents of Greek heritage, Greek Americans around the Nation, and all freedom-loving Americans.

As we all know, Greek Independence Day commemorates March 25, 1821, the day the Greeks began their long struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire, which had ruled Greece for almost 400 years. Greek freedom from the subjugation of the Ottoman Turks had been the hope of many generations

before Alexander Ypsilanti (1792–1828) proclaimed Greece's independence in 1821, thus beginning the wars which lasted almost a decade before freedom was at last obtained.

The interrelationship of our democracies is well shown in the words of the Greek commander in chief of the Revolutionary War in 1821. He described the new democracy they were forming by saying, "In imitating you [America], we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in re-sembling you."

For 7 years Congress has marked this occasion by adopting a commemorative resolution in recognition of Greek Independence Day. In Greek-American communities, this occasion has been celebrated for decades. But I believe every American should take time to reflect on the importance of this date to the historic and future ties between the United States and Greece.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the resolution commemorating Greek Independence Day and I want to commend the bill's sponsor, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], for sponsoring this special order.

Greek Independence Day is not just a celebration for the people of Greece or for only Greek-Americans. It is really a celebration for all Americans, because throughout our society we see daily examples of the Greek influence on American culture. For those of us in Congress, our lives are spent in the workplace of democracy, a form of government invented by the Greeks. It was the Greek example that our Founding Fathers looked to in developing our own plan for constitutional government.

Today, our two countries enjoy close political, economic, cultural, and even family ties. Thousands of Americans visit Greece every year and many Americans trace their roots to this beautiful country.

As one who follows the United States-Greek relationship very closely, I was very enthusiastic about the growing cooperation between our two countries over the past few years following the turbulent period we witnessed during the 1980's. Prime Minister Mitsotakis made good relations with the United States a high priority in Greek foreign policy and the Bush administration has been very responsive. I applauded the President's visit to Athens, the first by a United States President since the 1950's, and the helpful statements he made regarding the Cyprus issue.

My concern today however is over the fast-changing events in Yugoslavia. The push for independence of the former Yugoslavian Republics is one that merits our support. However, that support must be tempered by the history of this volatile region. The Government of Greece is deeply concerned over recent moves in the direction of recognizing the Republic of Macedonia. For Greeks, Yugoslav-Macedonia is a creation of Marshal Tito, an amalgam of differing peoples including Serbs, Albanians, Turks, and Vlachs. Tito sought to frustrate Bulgarian claims to the land as well as lay the groundwork for a possible opening to the Aegean Sea—through the northern third of the Greek Mainland.

For those who perished in the Greek civil war, the fight over Macedonia is not ancient history. Propaganda now appears in Skopje

asserting claims to Salonika, Greece's second largest city—one telling example is a leaflet depicting Yugoslav-Macedonia's future currency with a picture of the 15th century White Tower of Salonika. These concerns are not just over the name of the Republic, but over threats to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Greece.

I am told that administration now considers possible recognition of Yugoslav-Macedonia on a separate track from other Yugoslav Republics. I believe that this is a very wise step, for the United States has a tremendous amount of influence in these matters, but we often do not have to live with the immediate consequences of such a decision. The nation of Greece—our ally and good friend—faces this issue today and will have to face the consequences of whatever action is taken by the international community. We should respect those views and work with Greece to find a solution that accommodates their concerns and those of her neighbors.

As we celebrate Greek Independence Day today, we celebrate the closeness of our two peoples and our two nations. I am confident that the ties that run so deep between our two countries will serve to guide and sustain us through the years ahead. I once again want to salute my friend, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for his leadership on this resolution and the special order and I look forward to continuing our work together on these important issues.

Mr. MANTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day. As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 390, legislation to designate March 25, 1992, as Greek Independence Day, it is an honor to join my colleagues, Mr. BILIRAKIS, in this special order. I am proud to be a cosponsor of legislation to designate this special day honoring our national friendship with Greece.

Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, March 25, the people of Greece will celebrate the 171st anniversary of the beginning of the resolution which freed the Greek nation from the Ottoman Empire of tyranny and oppression. It is appropriate for Americans to celebrate Greek Independence Day because of the important role the nation of Greece has played in fostering freedom and democracy throughout the world. The concept of democracy was first conceived by the ancient Athenians 2,500 years ago. All of the free nations in the world are indebted to the Greeks for this important tradition.

The relationship between Greece and the United States is one based on mutual respect and admiration. When our Founding Fathers gathered to frame a constitution for the new America, they looked to the ancient Greeks for their inspiration and guidance. The democratic principles by which we remain committed to today were born in ancient Greece. It was thus fitting in the 1920's, when the young nation of Greece began its fight for independence, that the Greek people turned to the United States as a role model. When Greece needed their own declaration of independence, Greek intellectuals translated the United States Declaration of Independence into Greek and utilized it as their own.

Madam Speaker, the friendship between Greece and the United States has remained strong through peace and wartime. In World

War II, the people of the United States and Greece fought side by side to defeat the Axis Powers. More than 600,000 Greek soldiers died during this war, about 9 percent of the entire population of the nation. After the war, Greece faced another challenge when Communist rebels threatened Greece's democracy. Fortunately, democracy prevailed and Greece emerged strong and victorious.

Madam Speaker, as the Representative of the Ninth Congressional District of New York, which has perhaps the largest Greek-American population in the United States, I am pleased to join my constituents in marking Greek Independence Day. On this special day, I urge my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the wisdom of the ancient Greeks, the friendship of modern Greece and the important contributions Greek-Americans have made in the United States.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, 171 years ago the banner of rebellion was raised over Greece as Archbishop Germanos led his nation in revolt against the tyrannical hold of the Ottoman Empire. This banner, a blue cross, represented the aspirations of generations of Greeks who had suffered under Turkish occupation. In victory Greece recaptured her democratic legacy and rich Hellenic Tradition. It is a great honor for America that the nation that gave birth to democracy translated and used the Declaration of Independence in her fight for freedom.

She also appealed to the minds and hearts of Americans when a Greek commander said "Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn to you by a just sympathy since it is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode, and by you that she is as prized as by our fathers. Hence, honoring her name, we invoke yours at the same time, trusting that in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you * * * it is for you, citizens of America, to crown this glory * * *"

And the entreaty did not pass unheeded: Americans, still celebrating their recent independence, made the lengthy journey to fight for Greek independence in a war that would last 7 years.

President James Monroe himself spoke in support of Greek independence, stating that "A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence, and resume their equal station among the nation on Earth."

Thus, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate the anniversary of Greek independence, and to honor the spirit of freedom that marks the Greek nation. The Greek heritage is rooted deep in the ideals of freedom and democracy. It was in Greece that democracy first arose: Given life by the reforms of Cleisthenes during the 6th century B.C. It was this spirit that led to the independence of both Greece and the United States, and has led today to the freedom of nations around the globe, from Nicaragua to Lithuania.

It is with a heavy heart that I must also note that one region of Hellenic tradition remains occupied and divided even today. Cyprus continues to suffer under subjugation, denied her democratic tradition. It is my fervent hope that peace talks during this coming year will lead to an equitable and peaceful solution of the

crisis before it marks its 20th anniversary of turmoil. Mr. Speaker, we must call on all sides to make a sincere effort to bring peace to this troubled island.

□ 1950

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join the Greek people in the celebration of the 171st anniversary of their independence.

On March 25, 1829, Greek patriots began their struggle for freedom and independence from the Ottoman Empire. Though the intervening years have been filled with trials and tribulations, the ultimate success of democracy in Greece is a testament to the courage and fortitude of her people.

For more than three millennium, Greece has led the world in cultural innovation, intellectual pursuits and scientific inquiry. From the Homeric tradition to Alexander, through the birth of the Socratic method, Aristotelian logic and countless artistic and architectural endeavors, the Greek people have left an indelible impression on civilization.

Of all the positive contributions Greeks have toward the betterment of mankind, their most enduring achievement is democracy. It is fitting that we, the United States of America, should have found the wellspring of our Nation's laws and ideals in the democratic traditions of Athens and the other Greek city states. Likewise, it is also appropriate that our own American Revolution should have inspired the Founding Fathers of contemporary Greece to dedicate their lives to the noble ideals of their ancestors.

I am proud to be able to congratulate the Greek people on their achievement. They have withstood all that the horrors of the 20th century could bring. Fascism, communism and rightwing totalitarianism have all been washed away by the persistent tide of democracy. The love of freedom and devotion to democracy shown by the Greeks is an excellent example to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. In this time of renewed commitment to democracy throughout the world, may their example be a lasting inspiration to all of us.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. NICHOLS. Madam Speaker, I'm DICK NICHOLS.

I'm a freshman Member of Congress. I have been here for 15 months.

I left my job as a bank president in McPherson, KS. My family made that sacrifice with me. But I did it because there were things wrong in Washington that I believed I could help fix.

During the campaign I emphasized three issues:

First, balance the budget.

Second, limit congressional office terms.

Third, reduce the national debt.

After I won I was concerned about comments from people who said "What

can one man do? What can any one person do?" But I thought, one person can ultimately be a majority if you're so invested with the proper principles and the judgment and enthusiasm of the people around you.

As I began to get settled, Connie and I went through the adjustment to Washington, DC. I had that sense of excitement about working in this most recognized of all buildings—the U.S. Capitol.

Late one night, I walked along East Capitol Street in the mist with Connie. We stopped, marveling at the Capitol at night looking up at that gleaming alabaster dome—in the dark, with the intense spotlights on it. And I felt the greatness of America, and of the challenge facing me, and the privilege to serve my country, and I was choked with emotion.

After being in Congress 15 months. I'm still choked with emotion, but, for a different reason. The abuses of power, the arrogance of Members, and the disgrace of Congress give us all reason to choke with emotion. Somehow, the idealism and the struggle and the desire to make this country great has bogged down in the muck and the mud of politics. Somehow, Congress has lost touch.

I get no pleasure out of finding fault with things. I'm an incurable optimist. I do not know whether to attribute that attitude to a good, solid middle-America upbringing here on the Kansas prairie or maybe it's genetic. Frankly, I think most people are optimistic. Most people want to believe things can get better.

As a freshman Member of Congress. I'm an incurable optimist. I've devoted my energy to doing the best job possible. I wanted to make a difference. When I first came to Congress, I was so filled with idealism one newspaper headline read, "Is Dick Nichols Jimmy Stewart in Disguise?"

I remember when I was young watching the movie, "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," portraying then the abuses in Congress. I know it was just a movie, but it has a ring of truth today.

Like Mr. Smith, I came to Congress hoping to find a body of people dedicated to good government, sacrificing their own good for the sake of the country. I did find some of those people, but not nearly enough. My impression of Congress as a whole is not good. I find the Congress of the United States to be arrogant, power hungry, morally and ethically corrupt, and so politically driven that the welfare of the country is routinely sacrificed for political expediency.

I understand the seriousness of my charges and I stand by them. If what I have said scares you, it should. It scares me.

I think Americans have been getting a pretty clear picture of what Congress

is truly like the past couple of weeks with the check bouncing scandal. Like you, I've watched Members of Congress admit they haven't told the truth. They've tried to cover it up in what is called the Ethics Committee.

But, some of us—and the plain fact is they were mostly new Members of Congress like me—wouldn't buy it. The cover up failed. Now those who said "No, no, no, we didn't have any checks bounced," are saying, "Yes, yes, yes". Or what was 1 check became 3 or 4 or 30 or 40 or a 100 or more. Only when the check bouncers were caught did they 'fess up.

What is especially disheartening about the check scandal is that only after the threat of full disclosure did most Members of Congress scramble furiously to acknowledge their abuses and admit their wrongdoing. Those Members of Congress didn't need to open that House bank account in the first place.

I was encouraged to open a bank account when I came to Congress. In fact, I was encouraged very strongly to open a bank account. When they explained the bank situation to me I didn't like the way it was set up. Over their objections, I asked them to send my payroll check to my hometown and stated I did not need an account. I said, "no."

But, look what I have here.

They even sent me preprinted personalized checks hoping I would write one and thereby they would open the account. I know why they wanted to do that; they wanted my money. Could they have needed it to help cover other Members' bouncing checks?

But you know what? I said, "no." Other Members likewise could have had their deposits sent to New York or California or South Dakota or Alabama or wherever they are from. They did not need this House bank. They could have said, "no."

No. Two letters: N-O. And these are two letters that many Members of Congress seem unable to say about a whole lot of things. About their personal accounts and about flagrant wasteful spending.

The thing that you should be angriest about is that some of these Members show no remorse for what they have done. One Member from New York who wrote 972 bad checks, claims it wasn't even his fault. He says he was misled, bilked, and betrayed by slipshod accounting practices, and then thrown to the wolves by the House Ethics Committee. He took absolutely no blame. Whatsoever.

I am skeptical when some Members of Congress say they weren't warned about the practice. I have a copy of a letter, right here, dated January 3, 1978, warning Members not to overdraw their accounts. The last sentence of the letter reads "This will help us with our workload and save any embarrassment for you." Too bad that warning wasn't heeded.

These check bouncers are the people who were especially elected to guide and formulate the destiny of this country. How can we ever balance the budget if our Members of Congress cannot balance their own checkbooks?

What compounds the problem is that the House bank scandal is not the only scandal. We now have the problem of the House post office. An audit shows gross mismanagement and criminal conduct by some staff members including embezzlement by postal clerks and possible cocaine trafficking. Now they're discovering a few Members of Congress were cashing checks at the post office and making illegal loans to their own campaigns.

Add to these, scandals involving unpaid restaurant bills, and the allegation that the Speaker's wife was involved in covering up an investigation of the House post office. All serve to increase public outrage and deservedly so.

A few weeks ago Congress began voting on four different budget proposals. The most costly would have run up a 1-year deficit of \$393 billion. The least costly still would have run up a 1-year deficit of \$338 billion. The others ranged somewhere in between. Add that to the \$4 trillion debt we already have.

I voted against all four of these proposals. I said, "no." "No-no-no-no." Sometimes you have to say, "no" over and over to make a point. This Government is too big and spends too much.

As I said earlier, I am by nature a positive person. And while there are many negative aspects about Congress, there is hope we can and must move forward to correct these faults. I believe in the institution of Congress.

First, we must balance the Federal budget. On two separate occasions I have introduced legislation that allows no money to be appropriated for specific projects until we have a balanced budget. We can no longer spend what we can't afford.

Second, we must give the President a line-item veto. This would give him the authority to strike any spending item he feels we can't afford. Forty-three Governors already have this power. A recent GAO study revealed that if the President had line-item veto authority for 6 years, and used that authority wisely, he could have saved the taxpayers of this country \$70 billion.

Third, we must limit the terms of Congress. We must return to the type of citizen legislators our forefathers envisioned.

Think for a moment about the First Congress. It organized itself, set up the entire Government, department by department, passed laws on exports, patents, copyrights, the census, and yes, Government salaries. And they chose the location for the Capitol.

It is significant to note the First Congress paid themselves far less than

the salaries they set for Cabinet officers and Supreme Court Justices.

What that clearly shows is that they really did think of themselves as part time or citizen legislators, entitled to some compensation for their services but not engaged in legislating as a career. There is one other remarkable thing about that First Congress. They managed all their accomplishments and noble deeds without the benefit of a single incumbent.

They still regarded themselves as citizen legislators, as making a sacrifice to serve their country for a limited period of time.

I, too, view myself as a citizen legislator. I have promised not to serve longer than 12 years in the House of Representatives and I will keep that promise. Why do we need lifetime professional politicians?

I have introduced legislation setting a 12-year limit on the House of Representatives and also on its staff members. Unlike other legislation to limit terms, my legislation means Members who have been in office for 12 years, must leave office at the end of that term when this bill becomes effective.

Fourth, pay raise reform. I am a co-sponsor of legislation requiring increases in Representatives' salaries to be considered separately from any other appropriations bill and must be voted on by a recorded vote. If a pay raise is agreed to, it can take effect only after the next election.

In 1989 when Congress last passed a pay raise they gave themselves a pay raise of nearly 40 percent and fixed it in such a way that every year they get an automatic raise. This year Congress got a \$4,400 pay raise under the guise of a cost-of-living adjustment—a COLA. They say as inflation goes up we'll get a cost-of-living adjustment. Who is responsible for inflation? Congress is rewarding itself for not balancing the Federal budget.

Well friends, I am not taking that cost-of-living pay raise. I'm giving it back to the U.S. Treasury and I am earmarking it to help reduce the national debt. I am only one person, but if all the Members of Congress followed my example we would cut almost \$3 million from the deficit.

Additional savings can be reached through cutting the office allowances of all Members of Congress and committee staffs. This past year our office turned back to the Federal Government over \$200,000 in office expense allowances we did not spend. Even though one would think this would go to the U.S. Treasury, it was instead returned to the majority party in Congress to be reallocated for special projects of their choosing. And what did the majority party in Congress do with that money? Could it have been used to lay marble floors in congressional elevators? What a disgraceful waste of your money.

Let me give you a couple of other ways I have tried to reduce runaway spending. Recently, the House voted on creating a national monument at the Mansanar National Historic Site in California. That is 1 of the 10 relocation sites where Japanese-Americans were held during World War II. The bill would have established a 500-acre national park on the site at a cost of approximately \$4 million over the next 5 years and then \$300,000 per year after that.

I have nothing against such monuments, but I voted against it, because the Federal Government has no business spending money on such projects until the budget is balanced. I voted against it. Only 12 of my colleagues joined me; 400 voted for it.

Let me give you another example. Undoubtedly one of my most difficult votes I had to deal with was the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument. This would have established a national park in the Flint Hills in my district at a cost of some \$6 to \$8 million. Again I voted "no" and called for private initiative to get this done.

I have repeatedly made fiscal conservative votes, based on Kansas common sense and my commitment to reducing the deficit. The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste named me a Taxpayer Hero—their highest award. I have also been recognized as the most conservative member of the Kansas delegation because of my tough stand on fiscal spending.

I am taking steps to bring about change.

- A balanced budget amendment.
- Term limitations for Congress.
- Term limits for staff members.
- Line-item veto for the President.
- Pay raise reform.

Office allowance cuts for congressional offices.

- Office allowance cuts for committees.
- Tough choices on spending priorities.

Last year one of the most difficult tasks I had was to attend and speak at the funeral of Desert Storm victim Marty Davis of Salina. Marty had graduated only the year before from Salina Central High School.

As I sat there in the high school auditorium, looking at his fellow students, his track uniform with the spiked shoes, his mother, I wondered if I could utter the proper words about this 19-year-old boy who believed in America.

After the funeral I talked with his mother. His life, she knew, was given to preserve the freedom our democracy provides. He was proud to serve his country.

As we grapple with the problems of Congress in Washington now, somehow we must rekindle that spirit with the same dedication and resolve that our troops had in Desert Storm. They were proud of their country. They had a job—a tough job to do. And they did it.

Surely, we are capable of carrying out reform measures to bring us back to the standards of our Founding Fathers.

There is much to be done.

As my wife Connie and I travel throughout Kansas, we admire many things. The small towns, the farms, the openness and friendliness of the people and the sweep of the land. And often we have spotted that distinctive bird of our area, atop the highest tree, perched on a fence post, or soaring majestically. The Kansas hawk.

What do we need in Congress?

Like the Kansas hawk, we need vision. Vision to solve problems, vision to chart a course. Like the Kansas hawk, we need wings.

Wings to fly higher and accomplish more than ever before.

And like the Kansas hawk, we need strength. Strength to soar into a future, bright as a Kansas sunrise, beautiful as a Kansas sunset and promising as a Kansas spring.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted:

Mr. COSTELLO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of emergency in family.

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. BILIRAKIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. RHODES, for 60 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each day, on May 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. DREIER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes today, and for 5 minutes on March 26.

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

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes today, and on March 26 and 27.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSE, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. WELDON.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. EMERSON in two instances.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. BAKER in two instances.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

Mr. SUNDQUIST.

Mr. ALLEN.

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. EWING.

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

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. FOGLIETTA.

Mr. PALLONE in two instances.

Mr. STARK in four instances.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. HALL of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. APPEGATE.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. CARR.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. ERDREICH.

Mr. MARKEY in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. YATRON.

Mr. EVANS.

Mr. LEVINE of California.

Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

Mr. ATKINS in two instances.

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas.

Mr. WHEAT.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 1992, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3160. A letter from the Vice President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(1); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3161. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-170, "Bail Reform Amendment Act of 1992," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3162. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the Youth Conservation Corps Program in the Department for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1705; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3163. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting notification that the Commission has extended the time period for issuing a final decision in Docket No. 40365, National Stratch and Chemical Corp. versus the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., et al., by 45 days to May 21, 1992, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 11345(e); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3164. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Thomas R. Pickering, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to India, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3165. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the list of all reports issued or released in February 1992, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3166. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(2); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3167. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting notice of a proposed new Federal records systems, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(r); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3168. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the report and recommendation concerning the claim of Mr. Terrill W. Ramsey for reimbursed relocation expenses, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3702(d); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3169. A letter from the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the Girl Scouts of the United States of America 1991 annual report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 37; 36 U.S.C. 1101; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3170. Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the annual report on international activities in science and technology for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656c; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Science, Space, and Technology.

3171. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reduce regulation of motor carriers and interstate water carriers, to sunset the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

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. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mrs. LLOYD):

H.R. 4559. A bill to enhance U.S. energy security, provide for environmental improve-

ment, and encourage U.S. industrial competitiveness, through enhanced research and development, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 4560. A bill to create the office of Delegate for U.S. Citizens Abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4561. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act for children born to U.S. citizens abroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the types of foreign source income which may be excluded from gross income by individual citizens and residents of the United States living abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERMAN:

H.R. 4563. A bill to amend the False Claims Act to provide certain limitations on Federal employees filing qui tam actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 4564. A bill to prohibit the provision to Members and employees of Congress, at Government expense, of services and other benefits that are not typical benefits of employment or are not otherwise necessary to the performance of their office; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration and Rules.

By Mr. DREIER of California (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LENT, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 4565. A bill to repeal the tax increases contained in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado:

H.R. 4566. A bill to prohibit the provision to elected and appointed officials and employees of the Federal Government and others, at Government expense, of services and other benefits that are not typical benefits of employment or are not otherwise necessary to the performance of their office, or of benefit to the Government; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, the Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 4567. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to implement a royalty payment system and a serial copy management system for digital audio recording, to prohibit certain copyright infringement actions, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 4568. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to provide grants under the community development block grant program for partnerships between States or units of local government and institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FAZIO:

H.R. 4569. A bill to require that presidential campaign contributions be used only with respect to the election and the candidate for which such contributions are made; to the committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GEKAS (by request):

H.R. 4570. A bill to amend the Civil Liberties Act of 1988, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4571. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to ensure that resident and community interests are fully considered during corrective action at hazardous waste sites, to assist affected residents in better understanding health risks posed by hazardous waste sites, to add additional requirements and authority to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HALL of Ohio (for himself, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCEWEN, and Mr. ECKART):

H.R. 4572. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to waive certain requirements under the Medicaid Program during 1992 and 1993 for health maintenance organizations operated by the Dayton Area Health Plan in Dayton, OH; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. LENT):

H.R. 4573. A bill to provide that a conveyance of certain lands located on Long Island, NY, that are part of the National Wildlife Refuge System shall not be valid unless the deed of conveyance prohibits the commercial development of the lands; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLLOWAY:

H.R. 4574. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on a-Isopropyl-a-(N-methyl-N-homoveratyl)-g-aminopropyl)-3,4-Dimethoxyphenyl acetone nitril-Hydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4575. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 2-Hydroxy-4-Methoxy Benzophenone Sulfonic Acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON:

H.R. 4576. A bill to provide improved access to health care, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H.R. 4577. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from tax any gain on the sale or exchange of property acquired from the Resolution Trust Corporation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4578. A bill to provide for the provision of United States agricultural commodities to the former republics of the Soviet Union in exchange for petroleum products provided by such republics; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah:

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to strengthen automobile emission standards; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PACKARD:

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for retirement savings for individuals who are active participants in other retirement plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 4581. A bill to amend the International Financial Institutions Act to advocate and promote policies to encourage developing countries to reduce military and military-related expenditures and to dedicate an equitable allocation of resources for health and education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 4582. A bill to provide for comprehensive health care access expansion and cost control through standardization of private health care insurance and other means; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Rules.

By Mr. ROE (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. CLINGER) (all by request):

H.R. 4583. A bill to provide for the continued improvement and expansion of the Nation's airports and airways, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SARPALIUS:

H.R. 4584. A bill to permit adequately capitalized savings associations to branch interstate to the extent expressly authorized by State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JAMES, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 4585. A bill to establish procedures for national criminal background checks for child care providers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 4586. A bill to prohibit the importation of goods from any country that does not adhere to certain standards with respect to the employment of minorities, older individuals, and individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. ORTON):

H.R. 4587. A bill to establish a right-of-way corridor for electric power transmission lines in the Sunrise Mountain in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 87: Mr. HAYES of Illinois and Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 88: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.R. 117: Mr. STUMP and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 246: Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 299: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 434: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 441: Mr. TORRES, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 608: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 609: Mr. SWETT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 784: Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri.

H.R. 1007: Mr. AU COIN.

H.R. 1048: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 1168: Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 1322: Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1406: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1445: Mr. MCDADE.

H.R. 1472: Mr. HYDE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1536: Mrs. MINK and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1860: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BARNARD, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 1930: Mr. PICKLE.

H.R. 2083: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 2106: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.R. 2272: Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 2363: Mr. AU COIN and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 2452: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2726: Mr. OWENS of New York.

H.R. 2755: Mr. GILCREST.

H.R. 2782: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. AU COIN, and Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 2808: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2872: Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 2966: Mr. JONES of Georgia.

H.R. 3082: Mr. WOLPE, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 3146: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 3164: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

H.R. 3253: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3281: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3299: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 3380: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3395: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 3473: Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 3491: Mr. FISH.

H.R. 3517: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3570: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3598: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3725: Mr. PENNY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BERUTER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GALLO, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. OLIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. LUKE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. BYRON, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. STARK, Mr. BEILENSEN, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 3803: Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 3809: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3826: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 3838: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. DICKINSON.

H.R. 3908: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3953: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 3956: Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. TALLON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MFUME, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. YATES, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3961: Mr. WEISS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 4034: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 4051: Mr. ORTON.

H.R. 4057: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 4100: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 4104: Mr. AU COIN, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 4176: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 4206: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 4212: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 4222: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. STARK, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 4234: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 4303: Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 4312: Mr. HORTON, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COLORADO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4319: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 4343: Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4354: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 4377: Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 4381: Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 4405: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. MOODY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KOLTER, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.R. 4406: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. INHOPE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 4430: Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 4434: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WEISS, Mr. YATES, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 4471: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4491: Mr. HORTON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. BERUTER.

H.J. Res. 5: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GILCREST, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.J. Res. 351: Mr. ENGEL.

H.J. Res. 378: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 380: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 388: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mrs. MINK, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.J. Res. 399: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.J. Res. 411: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.J. Res. 421: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BACCHUS, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.J. Res. 423: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 431: Mr. WEISS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. FALCOMAVAGA.

H.J. Res. 433: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ATKINS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. YATES, Mrs. MINK, Mr. UPTON, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. LONG, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LUKE, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. JONES of North Caro-

lina, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LENT, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H. J. Res. 439: Ms. HORN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ROE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. HASTERT.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EWING, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. REED, and Mr. ALXANDER.

H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCGRATH,

Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SARFALIUS, and Mr. SWETT.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. TALLON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. WELDON.

H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. SANDERS.

H. Con. Res. 278: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LENT, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. WALSH.

H. Con. Res. 281: Mr. GREEN of New York and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 297: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. YATES, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BEILINSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Res. 244: Mr. RITTER.

H. Res. 347: Mr. SANDERS.

H. Res. 359: Mr. VALENTINE.

H. Res. 372: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LENT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ROE.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

The bill is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain distributions from a trust for a minor child of a decedent who is a nonresident alien, and for other purposes. The bill amends section 642(g) of the Code to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien. The bill also amends section 642(g) to provide that such distributions shall be treated as if they were made to the minor child of a decedent who is a resident alien, and shall be subject to the same rules of law that apply to such distributions in the hands of a resident alien.

This bill was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, on March 25, 1992. It was passed by the House of Representatives on March 25, 1992. It is now in the Senate.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

POTENTIAL FOR UNITED STATES
PRIVATE SECTOR ACTIVITY IN
ANGOLA

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues attention to the following testimony that was submitted to the Foreign Affairs Subcommittees on Africa, and International Economic Policy and Trade at our March 3, 1992, hearing on the "Potential for United States Private Sector Activity in Angola."

The testimony was prepared by Equator Bank Ltd., which operates Equator Management Services in my State of Connecticut. The Equator Bank has 13 years of experience in Angola.

POTENTIAL FOR U.S. PRIVATE SECTOR
ACTIVITY IN ANGOLA

(Statement of Franklin H. Kennedy, president and chief executive officer, Equator Bank Limited)

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Franklin Kennedy. I am Chief Executive Officer of Equator Bank Limited. I thank you for the opportunity to share, from our thirteen years of business experience in Angola, our views on trade and investment prospects for U.S. private sector companies in that country.

EQUATOR

As Equator Bank is not a household name in the banking industry in the United States, permit me first to provide you with brief background information on our organization. Along with two sister operating companies, Equator Trade Services Limited and Equator Advisory Services Limited, Equator Bank Limited is a wholly owned subsidiary of Equator Holdings Limited which, in turn, is 83% owned by Wardley Holdings Limited, the 100% owned merchant banking arm of the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Limited. The other shareholder is a Connecticut based partnership comprised of individual members of Senior Management of the Company, known as Equator Management Services, Incorporated in Nassau, Bahamas, the Equator Group of companies has offices in the United Kingdom and the United States as well as in Angola, Kenya, Nigeria and Zambia. Equator operates as a merchant bank and is responsible for the development of the HongkongBank Group's business in Sub-Sahara Africa. The HongkongBank Group ranks among the 30 largest banking groups in the world with a staff of over 54,000 and a network of over 1,300 offices world-wide. The published capital of the Group is in excess of USD 10 billion.

Established in 1975, Equator in its seventeen plus years of operations has provided aggregate financing on the order of USD 3 billion to support merchant banking and

trading services in some 30 African countries through specialized products such as trade finance, project investment, correspondent banking, cash management and debt management services. In many instances, Equator has worked with various official export credit agencies and political risk insurance organizations both in the United States and other OECD countries. Equator manages, on behalf of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIIC) and five U.S. Corporate Shareholders, the Africa Growth Fund, the first private sector venture capital fund for the Sub-Sahara African region.

EQUATOR AND ANGOLA

Equator first visited Angola in 1976, and completed its first deal there in 1979. Equator has been there ever since and has provided, through our prime client relationship with Banco Nacional de Angola, financing in excess of USD 700 million to support a wide range of trade transactions. Of this amount, some USD 150 million was in support of goods and services sourced from over fifteen U.S. Companies including Boeing, Caterpillar, Motorola, Continental Can, Redicon, St. Augustine Shipyards, Beech Aircraft, Mack Truck and others.

Prior to 1985/86 when coverage for Angola was suspended, Equator had arranged the financing of many of these transactions with the support of Eximbank. Lucky to have been incorporated in the Bahamas, Equator has been able to continue to do business in Angola since the U.S. suspension.

ANGOLA GENERAL

Mr. Chairman, Angola has come a long way since my first visit in 1983, and I have witnessed a great deal of change over the forty visits I have made to Luanda over the past nine years. We have seen the emergence of a market oriented economy from the virtually barter system which prevailed in the 1980's. More recently, Angola has introduced wide ranging economic reform measures including devaluation of the local currency, the Kwanza. Given conditions of permanent peace, only well managed investment in infrastructure is required for rapid recovery of the economy, well endowed with a wealth of natural resources. Already, businesspersons from several regions in the world are beginning to assess and take advantage of this enormous economic potential.

SPECIFIC ISSUES

And now Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a number of specific questions raised in your letter of February 21, 1992.

(1) Is Equator financing commercial transactions in Angola? If so, for which countries and in which sectors is the bank financing commercial transactions?

Since 1979, Equator has been and continues to finance commercial transactions in Angola.

Beneficiaries of Equator financing/letters of credit opened on behalf of Banco Nacional de Angola over the years have been domiciled in Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Hong Kong, Italy, Japan, Mozambique, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United States and Zambia.

Transactions financed by Equator have covered a wide cross section of the economy

including fishing, agro-industrial, industrial, transportation including aviation (helicopters and light aircraft for the petroleum services sector as well as passenger and cargo jet aircraft for the National Airline), road transportation, vehicle rehabilitation, banking, education, forestry, commerce, insurance, electricity, ports, ship repair and telecommunications. Given the extent of the financing over the years, almost all sectors of the economy were covered with the exception of military armaments for which EQUATOR has a policy of non involvement.

(2) Are there significant business opportunities in Angola for the U.S. private sector? If so, for which sectors?

There are enormous business opportunities in Angola for the U.S. private sector. Angola is rich in oil, diamonds, fish/seafood. It has been a major producer of coffee and cotton. It has vast quantities of land for cattle and general agricultural produce. It possesses an exciting tourism potential. Moreover, Angola's war-torn environment with virtually no investment in basic infrastructure over the past 16 years represents a great potential in projects of physical reconstruction. In addition, in a geographical context, Angola's potential is enhanced by regional cooperation in terms of trade, investment and tourism in a new and developing Southern Africa.

(3) Does it make more commercial sense for U.S. businesspersons to wait until after the September elections to initiate business contacts in Angola? Why or why not?

The race to do business in Angola is a long term race—a marathon—26 miles, and only those who prepare early will be able to compete with those who already have a 6 mile head start. Good business prospects take time to develop and to prepare for implementation. The U.S. private sector is very competitive and should not be disadvantaged by processes which in fact amount to holding the runners back at the starting line.

(4) Which countries would be our greatest competitors in Angola and what are they doing to further trade relations with Angola?

There are probably three countries already well ahead in doing business in Angola:—

Portugal with strong colonial and linguistic ties, and with the added advantage of being an EEC member and the broker of the peace accord in Angola. Angola has already taken steps to invite Portuguese businesses and families to take back property and business interests previously nationalized or abandoned at the time of independence.

Then there is Japan, using its good positioning from production bases in South Africa to capitalize on opportunities in large construction and rehabilitation projects and in fishing, and in general trading of vehicles, heavy equipment and the like. While to date, it appears that Eximbank of Japan has provided little in the way of medium term financing, MITI insurance cover has been available from time to time for supplier credits.

There is also South Africa itself. According to a recent survey by the South African Foreign Trade Organization (SAFTO), 74% of the largest South African exporters classified Angola as the key African market for future opportunities. South African banks have al-

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

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

ready opened lines of credit to Banco Nacional de Angola. Their export credit agency, CGIC, is providing some export insurance cover. South Africa has exchanged commercial representation with Angola and they are planning reciprocal airline flight arrangements. South African businesses have participated in the emergency supply program to "get a foot in the door". Angolans and South Africans are busy forming joint venture relationships with private sector partners to take advantage of technical assistance contracts and other future commercial opportunities.

Other countries which continue to strengthen their commercial positions as a result of uninterrupted trading over the past ten years include Brazil, Belgium, Great Britain, France, Italy and the Netherlands.

(5) Is there a need for a stabilization program for the Kwanza?

I believe this question has been addressed when describing the economic environment currently existing in Angola. My personal views are that, given the unique conditions existing in Angola over the past ten years, a timely and well managed structural adjustment program will bring the value of Kwanza in line with free market forces more rapidly than in many other African and/or Eastern European economies which have distortions of the same magnitude.

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to mention a comment I heard which was made by a member of the foreign diplomatic community in Luanda when I was there two weeks ago. CNN is now aired in Luanda and following a business report which focused on the current Japan-U.S. trade issues, this gentleman commented to me, and I quote: "no wonder there is an overall trade crisis in the U.S. if what they are doing in Angola is representative of their foreign trade policies".

It is the considered view of all of us who do and have continued to do business in Angola that U.S. private sector business interests are not being encouraged in Angola. They are being discouraged. This discouragement serves only the competitors of U.S. businesses and does little to broaden the prospects for the Angolan economy and the benefits to the Angolan people.

IT'S TIME TO CLOSE THE HEALTH-AND-RACKET CLUBS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, for anyone who thinks we can't cut health costs in this country without cutting health, I commend the following article by Dr. William R. Phillips from the February 3, 1992 issue of Medical Economics entitled "It's Time To Close the Health-and-Racket Clubs."

With this kind of health care, no wonder health is consuming 13 percent of our GNP—about 50 percent more than the next closest industrialized nation.

IT'S TIME TO CLOSE THE HEALTH-AND-RACKET CLUBS

(By William R. Phillips, M.D.)

We have a "sports-medicine center" in our community, as I'm sure you have in yours. The one I know talks of big-time profes-

sional athletes while it treats high-school heroes and wounded weekend warriors.

No bump or bruise is too small for the full-court press: physical therapy, nutrition counseling, Cybex rehab, plus pre- and post-treatment underwater weighing. Video gait analysis usually documents the need for an expensive pair of orthotics for every pair of shoes the patient owns. The patient improves, but not as quickly as the clinic's bottom line.

I usually steer my patients away from this muscle mill, but one workman with a simple back strain pleaded to go to the "sports specialist" he'd seen advertised so much. With unspoken reservations, I assented, and the patient was subsequently, as they say, "lost to follow-up." Although my letter of referral went unanswered, I presumed that a few weeks of conservative care had cured his complaint. Almost a year later, I ran into the patient in a convenience store and inquired how he was doing.

"Not so good, Doc," he replied. "I haven't been back to work since I saw you last."

"Didn't you go to the sports center?" I asked the man with some concern.

"Sure, I've been there three times a week for over 10 months now," he told me.

"Really? That must be expensive," I said.

The patient agreed: "I'll say! I'm lucky the state Department of Labor & Industries is paying 100 percent. The bill runs well over 28 now."

I was surprised at the figure. "Over \$2,800?"

"No, \$28,000."

Another example: We have a large allergy clinic that specializes in insured children. Good doctors; great businessmen. They do a fine job with kids with severe asthma. But the waiting room is usually filled with snotty kids and their worried parents.

The clinic's glided-lily approach to patient care is so standardized that their progress notes are all on one printed form with the blanks filled in by the nurse. For every patient, every problem: sinus X-ray series, PFTs (pre- and post-bronchodilator), nasal smear, blood tests, audiogram, tympanogram, and a double-barreled battery of skin tests. Some tests are repeated at every visit. For complicated cases, like hives, they may add a treadmill exercise test, chest X-ray, and histamine challenge test. All this on a 6-year-old with hay fever!

Occasionally the expensive testing contributes something to the patient's management. Usually, however, the diagnosis and therapy aren't exotic: rhinitis and Dimetapp. Parents go home with printed instructions on vacuuming drapes and wrapping mattresses. Of course, the insurance claim form carries a long list of diagnoses to balance the list of procedures performed. In this clinic, CPT stands for Conspicuously Profitable Testing. The clinic staff told the parents of one patient I referred that their policy was to bill insurers directly but never to release a copy of the bill to the parents. Wise policy, that. I recently learned that this clinic's average bill for a patient visit is more than \$370.

Glitzy new services seem to call irresistibly to medical profiteers. Colonoscopy, for instance, is a valuable (if overpriced) technique that many OBGs and FPs have incorporated into their practices.

Now there's a male equivalent. Last year, I got a promotional mailing from a urologist who was soliciting referrals for his new service of "comprehensive androscopy." That's right: He was hot to scope out the male member at 20X in search of the wily wart. But that's not all. His letter declared that 40

percent of all sexually active men in my practice needed his services.

But wait! That's still not all. He offered this new service to our community at the "low introductory price" of \$180. For the poor fellow who was HPB-positive but insurgence-negative, the doctor offered a sliding scale. Maybe he proposed to charge them by the inch.

Sleep clinics are becoming popular cash cows. Hospitals and their chosen consultants are turning ZZZs into \$\$\$ at an alarming rate. Move over, eating-disorder centers and substance-abuse programs. After they perform all the billable tests while the patient is awake, they repeat them while the patient is asleep. That's even more lucrative, since the monitoring goes on all night. Then they add a few high-tech patient evaluations, such as Polaroids of the slumbering patient's nocturnal erections. REM now means Revenue Enhancing Medicine. Novel treatment recommendations usually follow, such as "lose weight" or "breathe oxygen."

Another tried-and-true road to riches is the executive physical. One large multi-specialty clinic in our city has been pushing this profitable line for years. Many local white-collar hopefuls consider an invitation to "take a physical" a sign of ascent up the corporate ladder, like a key to the executive washroom.

In palmier days, the executive physical required a two-day hospital stay. In these leaner times, the patient stays next to the clinic in a European-style hotel. The drill is always the same: H&P by the internists, rectal exam by the urologist, endoscopy by the gastroenterologist, treadmill by the cardiologist, bloodletting by the lab, and X-rays of this and ultrasound of that by the radiologist. (The endoscopy chosen seems to alternate between upper GI and colonoscopy—perhaps depending upon whichever scope is clean and ready to go). Then there are the PFT, ECG, CBC, etc. Occasionally they throw in a CT or MRI for the good of the corporate image.

Never mind that no physician sits down with the patient at the end of this gauntlet to explain the findings or provide counseling. The executive is mailed a full report, fresh from the word processor and complete with designer letterhead and a personalized binder.

These specialists are skilled diagnosticians, aided by a sophisticated computer billing program that generates a diagnosis to justify each examination. In that system, ICD stands for Insurance Compatible Diagnosis.

It's not simply the expense that riles me. Patients confuse these physicals with genuine medical care and often take home the wrong messages. One of my middle-aged male patients came in recently with acute bronchitis. I began urging him to quit smoking when he interrupted, "I just had my executive physical at the clinic, and they did everything—chest X-ray, breathing tests, everything—and they said my lungs are in fine shape; no sign of any damage from smoking."

Other doctors in our city are exploiting the current diagnoses of choice: PMS, EBV, CFS, TMJ. Perhaps insurers should limit coverage for the diagnosis and treatment of abbreviations. Many physicians are hassling with preferred provider organizations while their greedy colleagues are in hot pursuit of preferred patient payment groups. Some cosmetic surgeons specialize in deformities of the rich. Occupational-medicine programs serve the doubly insured worker. Weightloss centers cater to fat cats.

We used to joke about certain doctors and their favorite lucrative tests, or "wallet biopsies." Now many entrepreneurial physicians save time by dealing only with patients known to be biopsy-positive. The next step, of course, is radical removal of the entire organ.

The phenomenon is fueled by many patients' unreasonable expectations and the cure-at-any-cost approach. As Osler observed in an earlier age, man is distinguished from the animals chiefly by his desire to take medicine. That desire has turned into a demand for immediate, expensive, high-tech solutions for all human problems.

One 48-year-old patient recently demanded that I refer him to a new orthopedic surgeon for his fifth repair of a torn anterior cruciate ligament from an old-sky-diving injury. "Life would be unthinkable if I had to bear any limits on my extremely active lifestyle," whined this never-say-die workoutaholic. Modern medicine has no cure for narcissism, but patients sure enjoy the treatment.

The other day, my partner told me another tale of marketplace medicine gone mad. The details don't matter. You hear the same stories every day. "Unbelievable," he concluded.

"No," I countered. "The problem is that it's all too believable."

"I guess we're just in the wrong racket," he observed.

"No," I said. "We're not in a racket. We're family physicians."

How can we help stop these medical misadventurers? It won't be easy in these days of antitrust paranoia and brash marketeering, but we must. We primary-care doctors must stop talking among ourselves and start talking to our colleagues, our patients, and our politicians.

Our health-care system is about to collapse under the growing burdens of paperwork, price, and profits. We're already rationing medical care, in fact if not in name. Every day we have to do without for some patients while we bestow luxurious care on others. The government and insurers limit the care physicians can provide and then make it look like the doctor's fault. We must make it clear to our patients and our politicians that good care costs money, money is limited, and together we must learn to "just say No." Our appetites must be curbed to fit our budget, and care must be served in appropriate portions.

We should support the initiatives to develop clinical guidelines against which we can evaluate doctors' patient management. We must continue the push for the original intent of RBRVS, to increase payment for cognitive services relative to tests and procedures.

I believe we should encourage the question, "How much is a doctor's time worth?" The bureaucrats are already asking that question, and they will tell the bean counters to answer it by balancing last year's budget. As the new payment system takes hold, I would like to see physicians getting paid for their work rather than subsidizing their incomes by ordering excessive tests and treatments.

Every patient should have a primary-care physician who sees him or her first for almost every problem. The best way to avoid inappropriate specialist care is to avoid specialists when using them is inappropriate. We primary-care doctors should encourage good consultants to do honest work for fair fees, and then reward them with referrals. We should artfully tell our patients that we are not comfortable sending them to the

medical mill at the mall. Our patients trust us; most will get the message and heed the warning.

Let's tell those physicians who seem to have lost their chosen path on the way to the bank that our patients, our system, and our consciences simply cannot tolerate their wasteful ways. Perhaps we can save a few of our colleagues from their own avarice. At least we can save some of our patients from inappropriate care and excessive fees. We must get greedy doctors out of our health-care system before they give all of us a bad name.

A TRIBUTE TO NIKKI BOUDREAUX AND HER INSPIRED POEM "STALLIONS"

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Nikki Boudreaux, daughter of Ronald and Lynn Boudreaux, submitted her winning poem, "Stallions," while an eighth-grade student at St. Thomas Moore. Miss Boudreaux was 1 of 100 student winners in the seventh annual Young Writer's Contest. More than 18,000 poems, essays, and short stories were submitted to the Young Writer's Contest by students from all 50 States and the U.S. territories and Department of Defense and American community schools abroad. Her entry was published in the anthology "Rainbow Collection: Stories by Young People." The book will be distributed to Ronald McDonald Houses. Ronald McDonald Children's Charities and Falcon Press donated \$250 to St. Thomas Moore in Miss Boudreaux's name.

STALLIONS

The beasts rest in silence at the oasis.
Stallions! So calm, so solemn, so content.
Their heads bowing in the breeze—
Stallions! So magnificent, God's beasts,
heaven-sent.
No other creature was there over told,
To be so mysterious, so picturesque, so bold!
The beasts gallop briskly across the barren
desert.
Stallions! So graceful, so poised, so free.
Their manes flowing in the wind—
Stallions! So exquisite, so beautiful, so holy.
O, how I love these creatures of the wild.
Their temper flaring, never mild!

THREE RIVERS COMMUNITY COLLEGE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the national junior college basketball champions who are from my congressional district—the Three Rivers Community College Raiders from Poplar Bluff, MO.

On Saturday night, Coach Gene Bess led his troops into a victorious battle—a shootout that wasn't decided until the final play of the game. Allow me to re-create the scene.

The Three Rivers Raiders are taking on Butler County Community College of El Dorado,

KS. A packed house of 7,000 fans are on hand to witness this championship game at the Hutchinson, KS, Sports Arena. Of the multitudes anxiously awaiting tip-off in the stands are at least 500 supporters who made the 8-hour journey from Poplar Bluff.

The game itself is a nailbiter—both teams deserve plenty of credit. This is the pinnacle of college basketball at the junior college level and anyone watching and cheering could easily see that none of the players want to let themselves or their fans down. School pride, community pride, and a national title are all on the line.

Mr. Speaker, according to Poplar Bluff's local newspaper—the Daily American Republic—"two of the heroes in the end were players who until the final 30 seconds were having off nights."

The first was a small guard from Bernie, MO, which is also in my Eighth Congressional District. Five-foot, ten-inch Anthony Beane drilled a 3-point bomb with 21 ticks left on the clock to put the Raiders ahead 78-77. Still, Butler County had plenty of time to get down the court and pump in a couple of points. However, with just a couple of seconds left, the second hero emerged—6-foot, 7-inch freshman Justin Wimmer, who had just entered the game off the bench. Off of an in-bound pass, a Grizzlies' player pump-faked and got Wimmer in the air, but the Three Rivers' freshman recovered to block that final shot as the buzzer sounded.

They call this time of year March madness because of all the basketball tournaments at all levels of play. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today expressing my pride and respect—as well as that of the rest of the folks in Missouri's Eighth Congressional District—to everyone involved with the Three Rivers Community College Raiders. A season record of 35-3 is indeed an accomplishment in itself; a national championship banner and trophy are icing on the cake. As I promised them, I would make sure that my colleagues in this Chamber and the rest of America would know who the No. 1 junior college is both on and off the court.

Congratulations to Coach Bess who now has a second national championship in his trophy case, as well as that of being named this year's Coach of the National Junior College Tournament. Coach Bess' 23 years with Three Rivers—22 as head coach—are unmatched and much appreciated. Just ask the fans who pack the Bess Center year in and year out. Other personal accomplishments that led to the team's effort include sophomore Shon Peck-Love who was named the tournament's most valuable player and sophomore Anthony Beane who was named outstanding small player of the tourney.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, again hats off to the Three Rivers Community College Raiders of Poplar Bluff, MO. After months of training, practicing, and playing, the Raiders can lay claim as the best junior college basketball team in the land. Furthermore, Coach Bess and his players did it as scripted, the old-fashioned way—as a team. They set their goal at the beginning of the season and are reaping the benefits now after accomplishing it. They are truly demonstrating part of the success stories emerging from Three Rivers Community College and Poplar Bluff.

Go Raiders.

COMMUNITY AND RESIDENTS EDUCATION AT HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES OF 1992

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Community and Residents Education at Hazardous Waste Sites Act of 1992 [CARE] to provide high quality health assessments to citizens living near hazardous waste sites and to support the development of alternative treatment technologies to clean up contaminated sites. I am pleased that Congressmen RICHARDSON, MARKEY, and TOWNS have joined me in this effort.

Thousands of hazardous waste sites in the United States pose threats to human health and the environment, through contamination of groundwater, air and soil. Over 40 million Americans live within 4 miles of a Superfund site. Superfund sites, which number approximately 1,200, are just the tip of the iceberg. As many as 5,000 active hazardous waste sites are regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act [RCRA]. Many of these sites are leaking, causing contamination and potential treats to human health.

In spite of the potential danger that these sites pose to public health, health studies generally are not performed at RCRA sites. Congress created the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry [ATSDR] to evaluate the risks of hazardous waste sites to human health. While ATSDR performs health assessments at Superfund sites, ATSDR has limited authority to review health threats at RCRA sites. ATSDR has performed studies at only 28 such sites.

In recent years the administration has had a reputation for producing studies that fail to respond to community concerns. The initial attempt by the administration to meet Superfund deadlines produced over 950 studies of mostly poor quality. While there has been some improvement, a recent GAO study of Federal health assessments found that the majority of our health assessments continue to have deficiencies. GAO reported that Federal studies were often abbreviated reviews that left questions about health risks unanswered.

Many citizens have found that ATSDR has not made sufficient efforts to respond to the concerns of affected communities or to adequately explain the health threats facing residents living near hazardous waste sites. For example, an assessment at one site noted that six wells a little over 1 mile from the site had been closed, but failed to explain EPA's order to close the wells. The citizens were left in the dark about the site's potential health risks.

The public has a right to accurate, objective analysis of the health risks posed by RCRA hazardous waste sites.

To address this concern, the CARE at Hazardous Waste Sites Act of 1992 authorizes ATSDR to review RCRA sites whenever ATSDR suspects a public health risk may

exist. The bill requires ATSDR to perform studies at 25 hazardous waste sites by mid 1993. It requires ATSDR to report to Congress about the health threats posed by these sites and the Agency's progress in responding to community concerns. The legislation requires this report prior to our consideration of the Superfund reauthorization legislation.

The central focus of the legislation is to foster increased responsiveness to community concerns. The bill stresses the need to provide more opportunity for citizen input in health studies. For example, the bill requires ATSDR to hold a public meeting to explain the proposed study before initiating it. The bill encourages ATSDR to explain the results of its studies at public meetings and requires comment periods prior to adoption of studies.

CARE takes other steps to increase the Government's accountability to citizens. The CARE bill establishes a citizen review board to review ATSDR's efforts to increase public involvement. This board would make recommendations to the Agency and Congress. The legislation also establishes health education grants to enable communities to hire experts to explain complex health issues. Modeled on the Superfund technical assistance grant [TAG], this assistance can help citizens better understand potential health risks.

I believe with proper accountability to citizens, ATSDR can be a strong, effective guardian of public health.

Finally, the CARE bill takes steps to improve future cleanups of hazardous waste sites. Last year, citizens concerned about dioxin incineration at Times Beach, MO, requested an independent review of dioxin treatment technologies. The Office of Technology Assessment performed a study, which confirmed that some destruction alternatives are very promising and worth further attention. The CARE bill supports the development of new and better hazardous waste treatment technologies. CARE provides grants for the field demonstration of promising, nonincineration technologies capable of treating dioxin and other contaminants. The grants will ensure that these promising alternative technologies get the attention they deserve.

Community education—and empowerment—are vital to our Nation's hazardous waste cleanup effort. This bill will help the administration produce high quality health studies that better serve the public. I urge my colleagues to support it.

COMMUNITY AND RESIDENTS EDUCATION AT HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES ACT OF 1992

Purpose. To amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act (RCRA) to ensure that resident and community interests are fully considered during corrective action at hazardous waste sites, to assist affected residents in better understanding health risks posed by hazardous waste sites, and to add additional requirements and authority to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

SECTION 1: TITLE—COMMUNITY AND RESIDENTS EDUCATION (C.A.R.E.) AT HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES ACT OF 1992.

SECTION 2: ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND AUTHORITY FOR AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY.

Additional authority to conduct health studies at sites regulated under RCRA. Authorizes Administrator of ATSDR to conduct

appropriate health studies at any site regulated under RCRA. If a health study finds that there is a release or substantial threat of a release into the environment of any pollutant that may present a potential risk to human health, the Administrator of ATSDR shall notify the Administrator of EPA and the State. The Administrator of EPA (or the State) shall order the facility to eliminate or substantially mitigate these threats.

Enhanced public involvement and review. To ensure that the health studies address community health concerns, this section requires ATSDR to obtain citizen input before conducting health studies:

Requires ATSDR to notify local populations before health studies are started in order to explain the nature of the wastes present, the purpose of the study and how the public can comment on or otherwise review the conduct of the study.

Requires ATSDR to hold a public meeting before commencing its study to discuss scope, methodology and nature of studies with members of the public, to consider public comments in the formulation of those studies, and to respond to the concerns of the public and local health officials.

Requires ATSDR to provide opportunity for 30-day public comment on proposed design and protocols of all health studies before such studies are begun, and to provide a copy of those protocols to the Peer Review and Citizen Review Boards.

Requires ATSDR to notify the public about the availability of the study and to provide copies to interested individuals of the public.

Requires a 30-day public comment on the study before it is adopted.

Allows modification of the public comment periods if necessary to protect public health.

Petitioned health studies: additional requirements. Citizens may petition ATSDR to perform health studies at any RCRA site. ATSDR must respond within 120 days. If ATSDR does not perform such health study, it shall explain in writing the reason for not pursuing a study. Copies of all responses to citizen requests shall be provided to the Citizen Review Board.

Enhanced public protection at sites presenting health risks. If ATSDR determines that a site presents potential risks to public health, the Administrator shall notify the Administrator of EPA, the State and affected citizens of actions needed to eliminate or substantially mitigate health risks. The ATSDR also shall notify the Citizens Review Board and publish its recommendations in the Federal Register.

Data collection. Authorizes ATSDR to collect public health data necessary for the completion of health studies at sites or to request EPA to collect environmental data. Expands ATSDR's authority to contract with universities or the private sector in order to collect or analyze data necessary for health studies. ATSDR shall not release data that can be used to identify a particular individual without that individual's permission.

Definition of health studies. Defines health studies to include research programs, health assessments, pilot studies, epidemiological studies or other appropriate health studies.

Authorization. Authorizes an additional \$5,000,000 in fiscal years 1993 through 1998 for RCRA health studies.

Additional health studies at RCRA sites and review of performance prior to reauthorization of Superfund legislation. Requires ATSDR to perform health assessments at 25 RCRA sites the Administrator believes pose the highest risk to human health by July 31,

1993. ATSDR shall report to Congress by July 31, 1993 on the danger posed by these sites to human health, the actions taken to reduce those risks, and the agency's efforts to improve its responsiveness to community concerns.

By September 30, 1993, the Peer Review Board shall submit to Congress a report on the overall scientific quality of ATSDR's studies.

By the same date, the Citizen Review Board shall submit to Congress a report on ATSDR's responsiveness to community concerns.

SECTION 3: PEER REVIEW BOARD

Peer Review Board: This board would review ATSDR studies to review the quality of the science and judge their scientific quality and usefulness to public health officials.

Membership: Director of ATSDR shall appoint 3 Members from health professionals and other experts, representatives of the academic community, public health officials. In addition, the heads of NIEHS and the National Academy of Sciences will each appoint 2 Members.

SECTION 4: CITIZEN REVIEW BOARD

Citizens Review Board: Establishes a Citizen Review Board whose duties shall be to review ATSDR's performance and recommend to ATSDR and the Congress ways to improve ATSDR's communication with citizens and ensure that its work is responsive to the concerns of citizens.

EPA and ATSDR shall make available to the Board all relevant materials requested by the Board including, but not limited to, copies of health education grant applications, all studies, petitions for health studies and Agency responses.

Membership: Membership shall consist of six individuals who live adjacent or nearby hazardous waste sites and/or who have been actively and substantially involved in community efforts to respond to hazardous waste problems. Provides for compensation, hiring of staff, child care expenses, etc. Two Members appointed by Speaker and Senate Majority Leader, one by each Minority Leader.

SECTION 5: HEALTH EDUCATION GRANTS

Authorizes ATSDR to make available grants of up to \$50,000 to enable groups of citizens who may be affected by a release or threatened release at a facility where ATSDR is performing a health study, to obtain advice and assistance from epidemiologists, toxicologists, or other health professionals. Grants may be used to obtain information about potential and actual health threats arising from the site and clean-ups, interpret ATSDR and other health studies, prepare public comments and property design community health surveillance. Local grant recipients would be required to contribute 10% of the total costs. This cost-share requirement would be waived for communities that have already received Superfund TAGs or whose income is lower than the average per capita income. The cost-share requirement also could be waived or reduced by the Administrator.

The Agency is directed to use the least burdensome application requirements practicable (e.g. the small purchase method) so as to allow citizens to take full advantage of the program.

SECTION 6: ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT TECHNOLOGY GRANTS

Authorizes the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make available \$500,000 in FY 1993 for demonstration of technologies capable on a commercial scale

of destroying dioxin through the use of non-incineration technologies identified as promising by the Office of Technology Assessment in its study *Dioxin Treatment Technologies*. Authorizes an additional \$1,000,000 in FYs 1994-1998, for demonstration of alternative treatment technologies for the cleanup of hazardous wastes.

WHAT THE ADMINISTRATION'S GAG RULE LANGUAGE REALLY MEANS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 20, 1992, the Bush administration released its guidance directing compliance with the title X family planning gag rule regulations. The administration said that it would modify the gag rule to allow limited advice by doctors. However, under these regulations, doctors cannot refer women to abortion clinics, and other health care professionals cannot counsel or provide information about abortion or its availability. This editorial from the New York Times accurately comments on what the guidance on the gag rule really means and what the implications are. Once again, it is primarily poor women who will be the victims of the politics of this issue. I strongly urge my colleagues to read this editorial.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1992]

CLOSING THE DOOR TO ABORTION

Last fall a 23-year-old West Virginia woman named Mary Jiveden had a date. The man's sexual advances were unwelcome—"it was kind of like date rape," she says. Several months later, during a routine medical checkup, a doctor told her she was pregnant. What happened next, as reported by The Times's Tamar Lewin, seems incredible in a country where women have had the right to end a pregnancy since Roe v. Wade in 1973.

Ms. Jiveden, who is divorced, out of work and the mother of a 2-year-old, called the local health department and several hospitals for a medical referral, but was refused. The main reason she got nowhere was the "gag rule," a regulation that forbids family-planning programs which receive Federal funding to discuss abortion or refer patients to clinics that perform them.

On Friday, the Bush Administration said it would modify the gag rule to allow limited advice by doctors. But Federal officials said doctors could not refer women to abortion clinics, and nurses and other personnel still could not discuss abortion. The modifications are so narrow that they will make little difference to women like Ms. Jiveden.

After countless calls, Ms. Jiveden was told by a doctor's receptionist to look for abortion clinic ads in a big-city newspaper. But by the time she located a clinic in Charleston, four hours away, she was told she was just over the clinic's 16-week time limit. Referred to a Cincinnati clinic that had an 18½-week limit, she was told she was 21 weeks pregnant and sent to Dayton. To pay the Dayton clinic's \$1,675 fee, she refinanced her car and borrowed the rest.

At that point, the Dayton clinic described her as high-risk for the procedure and referred her to Wichita. Unable to afford the

flight and the Wichita clinic's \$2,500 fee, Ms. Jiveden had no choice but to continue the pregnancy—not knowing how she'll make a life for herself and the kids.

That thousands of such women can't get abortions that are their legal right evokes the days of coat-hanger surgery and surreptitious trips out of town. Making abortion safe, accessible and affordable would seem a vital part of health care in the United States. But not the Federal Government, nor to an increasing number of physicians.

In South Dakota, only one doctor will perform abortions, and then only in a bullet-proof office. At Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, fully half the fourth-year students reported they wouldn't perform the procedure. Only 13 percent of the residency programs in obstetrics and gynecology require training in first-trimester abortions.

Some physicians, of course, have moral and ethical reservations about abortion. Others are too young to have seen the vaginal lacerations, infections and deaths that were commonplace before Roe v. Wade. Many fear losing patients who will not patronize a doctor who performs abortions.

One might assume that a civilized government would compensate for medicine's refusal to provide a basic service. Not the U.S. Government, which is doing its best to turn a legal right into a dirty, seemingly illicit act.

Far too many Americans, doctors among them, have remained silent while two Administrations bargained women's reproductive rights for votes. If that vicious trade is ever to be ended, they must speak out. Calling Friday's changes in the gag rule what they really are—an effort to kick sand in the public's eye—is a fine place to start.

WARREN I. CIKINS; BRINGING THE THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT TOGETHER

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the following article in the February, 1992 issue of the Third Branch, a newsletter of the Federal court system. The article is a colloquy with Warren Cikins of the Brookings Institution who for the past 15 years has been instrumental in inspiring a meaningful communication between the various branches of government concerned with the administration of justice in this country. I applaud Mr. Cikins' continuing efforts and believe that the cooperative efforts outlined in the article symbolize just the kind of positive attitudes that this country needs in this era of negatives.

WARREN I. CIKINS; BRINGING THE THREE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT TOGETHER

(Warren I. Cikins has been a senior staff member of the Brookings Institution for more than 15 years. He enjoyed a long career in public service, during which he worked for three members of Congress and two presidents, and also as a consultant to the Supreme Court and the Federal Judicial Center. Among the areas he has concentrated on at Brookings are criminal justice, corrections, prison industries, and the administration of justice. Cikins has held annual seminars for the three branches since January of 1978.)

Question. How do you view relations between the three branches on administration of justice matters at this time?

Answer. I feel quite comfortable about the present situation, but fearful that serious stresses might develop unless we employ eternal vigilance. We've come a long way since we began the Brookings administration of justice seminars in 1978, when the conditions between the branches might have been characterized as reflecting compartmentalism, bickering, inertia, and drift. Under former Chief Justice Burger's initiative, several persons, such as then Assistant Attorney General Dan Meador, then Administrative Assistant to the Chief Justice Mark Cannon, then Chief Counsel of the House Judiciary Committee Alan Parker, and myself, came together to structure an effort to build bridges between the three branches.

Tribute also should go to my great hero and former employer, the late Congressman Brooks Hays of Arkansas. While the general prevailing wisdom was that the Judiciary should be separated from the other branches by a wall, Congressman Hays said it was latticework, and you should reach through it.

While we held the first seminars with a feeling of considerable trepidation that we might be breaching that crucial wall of separation, we gradually gained confidence that we were performing an invaluable and constitutional function. The creation of a climate of goodwill and reciprocal forbearance has led to the resolution of many potential conflicts between the branches.

Question. Why is communication between the branches of government so important?

Answer. Judges must realize that they have a greater obligation than to simply sit in the court and make decisions. They also have an obligation to make the system work, to help other branches understand their problems, and to understand each branch's role. How can you possibly function unless you have a sense of how the entire process works? There is some aura of separation of powers that must be maintained. It's a kind of twilight zone. Certainly there is a fine line, a sense of understanding the rules of the game, and of what is required in terms of how far you can go before you're making an excessive intrusion into the legislative process. The work of the Judicial Conference reflects this sensitivity. It has become more successful in educating Congress in a somewhat more activist role in recent years.

Question. What has been the role of Chief Justices Burger and Rehnquist in this area?

Answer. It has been a great pleasure to have worked under the direction of these two chief justices. Chief Justice Burger put his full prestige behind the implementation of this bridging concept, even though at the beginning there were those who felt that any outreach was improper. He was convinced that nothing but good could come from an informal exchange of views between members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, senior Justice Department officials, and members of the federal Judiciary.

Chief Justice Rehnquist has given continued support to these meetings, and has reshaped them in a manner that appears to maximize their importance. The seminar at the beginning of each Congress is now the gathering for the principals involved, with the next year being the gathering primarily for senior staff. To enable all to participate fully in the deliberations, Rehnquist has urged the utilization of discussion groups on each topic considered. He has indicated his satisfaction with the willingness of Congress

to address the problems identified by the Judiciary and has gone on to emphasize that communications between the branches are open, free-flowing, and abundant.

Question. Have the Brookings programs been of value to Congress and the Department of Justice?

Answer. Support has been expressed by many members of Congress and attorneys general. Former House Judiciary Committee Chairman Rodino was present at creation and attended as many meetings as possible before his retirement. Ranking Republican Senate Judiciary Committee member Thurmond has not missed a single meeting (where principals were involved) and has praised Brookings for providing an informal setting for gaining greater knowledge of the needs of the Judiciary and the proper role of Congress. Four attorneys general have attended regularly, with one stating that the Founding Fathers would have greatly approved of this effort. I think these statements indicate that participants from the executive and legislative branches recognize the value of this interchange.

Question. Are there still problems of communication among the branches?

Answer. Despite obvious evidence that the three branches have established valuable channels of communication, there are those who still attempt to find evidence of alienation. While the Judiciary has clearly experienced difficulties through the enactment of certain legislation, there is also evidence of great legislative improvements in the work of the Judiciary accomplished by respected members of Congress. One great example is former Congressman Robert Kastenmeier, who was acclaimed by AO Director Ralph Mecham as one who listened, understood and acted.

Congressman William Hughes, who has succeeded Congressman Kastenmeier as chairman of what is now the Judiciary Subcommittee on Intellectual Property and Judicial Administration, has attended many Brookings seminars and has stated that, "They have done more to foster interbranch cooperation than any initiative that I am aware of." All members of Congress do not need to have the level of comprehension of a Bill Hughes to follow his respected leadership in continuing the improved interbranch cooperation.

Question. Are there current examples of the importance of interbranch communication?

Answer. Evidence that there is still work to be done in improving Congressional understanding of judicial difficulties is presented in Chief Justice Rehnquist's 1991 year-end report on the federal Judiciary. As the chief Justice put it, "Modest curtailment of federal jurisdiction is important; equally important is self-restraint in adding new federal causes of action. New additions should not be made unless critical to meeting important national interest..." By speaking out as the Chief Justice has done, he has heightened congressional awareness of his concerns. While Congress has yet to fully respond to these warnings, it is reassuring to know that the channels of communication are open, and that there is reason to believe that there will be some appropriate response. Several pieces of pending legislation could be modified, including provisions that provide for federal prosecution of virtually any case in which a firearm is used to commit a murder.

Question. How do you see the future of three-branch relations, and what role do you see the Brookings Institution playing?

Answer. One can only be optimistic about the future of interbranch relations. While Congress may exercise its right to enact legislation that overturns court decisions, these actions do not seem to be adversely affecting the cooperative relationship that has been established in the field of administration of justice. The creation by the Judicial Conference of a Committee on Long Range Planning bodes well for the improvement of congressional understanding.

The development of carefully reasoned analyses of the appropriate roles of the federal Judiciary can only serve to assist all branches to cooperate more effectively to achieve common objectives. It is obviously to the advantage of all Americans that the federal court system is able to operate effectively. Chief Justice Rehnquist has reminded us that the federal court system is a resource that is both precious and exhaustible. While there may be disagreement on all the appropriate steps needed to prevent such an exhaustion, the forums exist to reconcile the differences.

Much of what the Brookings seminars were designed to accomplish has already been achieved. The key principals and senior staff personnel seem much more relaxed about in formal interactions, and the novelty of such exchanges has worn off. But there are always new issues.

For example, the agenda for the March 1992 meeting includes the following: implementation of the 1990 Civil Justice Reform Act; the work of the new judicial discipline commission; the status of crime legislation; the work of the long range planning committee; and the status of bankruptcy legislation.

Sharing knowledge of these issues should be of great advantage to all branches. The continued turnover of relevant personnel enables these seminars to still serve as a vehicle for building bridges. As one of those who launched this effort in 1978, I am pleased with its accomplishments. The better relations between the branches should be cherished. There are those who moan that the congressional and judicial cup is half empty, but I exult that it is half full and rising.

CTB CRITICAL TO STEMMING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive test ban [CTB] has always been good arms control and environmental policy. Today, it is also critical for achieving U.S. nonproliferation objectives.

With the cold war over, and the Soviet Union disbanded, nuclear proliferation is now the leading threat to United States national security.

The United States has overwhelming conventional military superiority over any other country—nuclear weapons add little to our strategic position. In contrast, a small conventional power, like Iraq or North Korea, becomes a much larger threat if it acquires the bomb.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is up for extension in 1995. In order to successfully extend and strengthen the treaty, the United States will have to give something in return. U.S. acceptance of a CTB would help get

other countries to adopt stricter export controls and tighter safeguards and inspections—measures that would slow proliferation. A CTB could also help bring countries like India and Pakistan into the treaty.

The technology exists to verify a CTB down to a very low threshold. Leading U.S. scientists have demonstrated that testing is not necessary for warhead maintenance. And, with the end of the cold war, we certainly don't need to further modernize our nuclear arsenal.

Let's not delay any longer. A CTB is in our national interest.

HEROISM DURING THE HOLOCAUST

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, all too often acts of heroism and courage go unnoticed. Though there were too few of these to save 6 million Jews who perished in Hitler's Holocaust, many courageous acts still took place. One of these, which took place in Berlin almost 50 years ago, is described in a recent issue of "The Week in Germany," a publication of the German Information Center.

The article details what took place on one day at one location, recognizing that passive resistance and the commitment to speak out in the face of almost certain death can succeed. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my colleagues' review:

[From *The Week in Germany*, Mar. 13, 1992]
WOMEN'S RESISTANCE TO GESTAPO TO BE
COMMEMORATED IN STONE

Fifty years after its occurrence, a memorial is to be placed at the site of one of the most astonishing events of the Second World War: Rosenstrasse 2-4, where, on February 28, 1943 and for several days thereafter, a group of unarmed, non-violent women took on the Gestapo—and won.

The Rosenstrasse is a dead-end street in what was once, and is now again, the middle of Berlin. The building at number 2-4 was once a welfare agency for the Jewish community, then a Nazi office for "Jewish questions," then a Gestapo deportation center and finally a heap of rubble. Today, only an empty space remains.

On February 27, 1943, Joseph Goebbels had given the order to rid Berlin of all remaining Jews; in response, 5,000 Jews were arrested. About 2,500 were sent to the Rosenstrasse. These were so-called "privileged Jews," men and some women with non-Jewish spouses, and their children. One day later, a large group of women (estimates by witnesses vary from 600 to 6,000) gathered before the building. Unarmed and described by survivors as "unpolitical," they called "Give us back our husbands, our fathers, our children." As journalist Ruth Andreas Friedrich noted in her journal at the time, "they stood hour after hour, night and day, like a wall."

Efforts by SS men brandishing machine guns to break up the women's protest were unsuccessful. According to a participant, "at this point, we didn't care what happened to us. We yelled 'Murderers!'—And then the totally unexpected happened: the machine guns were removed. Silence engulfed the crowd in front of the building, only isolated

sobbing could be heard." Stymied by the resistance of the women, Goebbels gave the order to release the husbands of "Aryan" women, which entailed recalling 25 men who had already been sent to Auschwitz. Goebbels noted in his diary: "There have been unpleasant scenes . . . in which the population actually took the part of the Jews. I will tell the security forces not to continue the evacuation of the Jews at this critical juncture."

The women's resistance in the Rosenstrasse has been largely ignored, but this is to change. For four years, 77-year-old sculptor Ingeborg Hunzinger has been working on a memorial for the Rosenstrasse women. The project was conceived of before the demise of the German Democratic Republic and was planned to have been completed by the 50th anniversary of the action in 1993. Due to difficulties in obtaining materials, however, completion will probably be delayed. Two porphyry blocks are finished; one is a frieze of male figures, the other of women. They bear the inscription: "The strength of civil disobedience and the strength of love defeat the violence of the dictatorship."

BREASTFEEDING PROMOTION ACT OF 1992

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, Ms. MOLINARI, the gentlewoman from New York, and I are introducing legislation that will direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to promote breastfeeding as the best method of infant nutrition. This bill is intended to foster wider public acceptance of breastfeeding in the United States. The bill will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to provide funds to public and private entities for the purpose of breastfeeding education and to assist such organizations in the distribution of breastpumps and similar equipment to breastfeeding women.

During infancy, breastfeeding provides the best nutrition to the baby. According to the National Center for Health Statistics, in the United States, approximately 37 percent of all women breastfed their infants at 1 month of age. However, only 26 percent of all low-income women were still breastfeeding at 1 month of age. By supporting promotional and educational programs reaching all economic levels this legislation is intended to improve these statistics.

For the past several years USDA has carried out many significant efforts to promote breastfeeding in the WIC Program. USDA has established various regulatory provisions to encourage WIC mothers to breastfeed; developed breastfeeding education materials to help local agency staff teach WIC participants about breastfeeding; participated in cooperative efforts with other Federal agencies and organizations, such as Healthy Mothers and the Healthy Babies Coalition; and have fostered the creation of State breastfeeding promotion coordinators throughout the Nation. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for the women and children of this Nation and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS— ADDED SPUR FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HON. BEN ERDREICH

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to make partnerships between State or local governments and institutions of higher education eligible for Community Development Block Grant funding. Colleges and universities represent a great resource of information, talent and energy, and can play great roles in the development of communities. The CDBG program is our most successful community development program, and this modification will provide a new catalyst for improving our communities, involving institutions of higher education. I want to encourage more involvement by our colleges and universities in our communities, to help expand jobs, improve our neighborhoods, and spur more community development.

My bill would do two things. First, it makes clear that States and entitlement communities may use their CDBG allocations to work with a college or university to engage in CDBG eligible activities. These would include providing technical assistance to local governments and communities, undertaking neighborhood revitalization projects, creating jobs for low-income individuals, and rehabilitating housing for low-income families.

Secondly, it would earmark a small amount of CDBG funds for the next 2 fiscal years, just as we already do for other important activities, to allow the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to encourage the development of these community-university partnerships.

Last October, I took my Policy Research Subcommittee to Birmingham to hold a hearing on the role of universities in economic and community development. We heard from my own University of Alabama at Birmingham, from Marquette University in Milwaukee and Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond, and from those representing colleges and universities nationwide who have the resources, ability, and desire to contribute to their local communities.

Many urban universities are already playing positive roles in community and economic development, and localities recognize the great potential of these institutions. To cite some examples, in addition to the Center for Urban Affairs at the University of Alabama at Birmingham, there is the Detroit City-University Consortium at Wayne State, the Ohio Urban University Program headquartered at Cleveland State, the Florida Center for Urban Design and Research and the Center for Urban Transportation Research at the University of South Florida, the Research and Technology Park of the University of New Orleans, the National Center for University-School Collaboration at the University of Houston, and the Urban Field Center at the University of Rhode Island.

My bill would also tap into the great resources of traditional land grant colleges and universities, like my alma mater at the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa.

I am including for the RECORD an article from the Reader's Digest, entitled "The University that Saved a Factory," about the pivotal role played by the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa in saving over 200 jobs at a General Motors plant in Tuscaloosa and the related infusion of \$7 million annually into the local economy. As an Alabamian, I was proud of the University of Alabama for coming to the aid of that factory, the people who worked there and their families, and, of course, the community that depended on the economic role of the plant.

I am also including an article from the August 1991 New York Times, entitled "Universities Become Full Partners to Cities in South", describing the work of my own University of Alabama at Birmingham in the Birmingham community. This too is an example of what can happen today if community-university partnerships are given the encouragement they deserve. Finally, I am including for the RECORD the testimony received by my Policy Research Subcommittee from Dr. William A. Sibley, Vice President for Academic Affairs for the University of Alabama at Birmingham.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

THE UNIVERSITY THAT SAVED A FACTORY

(By Joseph P. Blank)

The recession had hit the Tuscaloosa, Ala., plant of General Motors' Rochester Products Division, and no one seemed to know what to do.

Opened in 1978, the plant employed workers who assembled replacement carburetors, emission-control components and carburetor-service kits. When demand for the products plummeted in 1980, nearly one-third of the United Automobile Workers (UAW) employees were laid off, but the plant still needed to cut costs by \$2 million a year to remain competitive. In the spring of 1982 GM sent in teams of experts to study the problem.

The difficulty did not lie with the unionized workers. In fact, the divisional general manager considered the Tuscaloosa team "one of the best employee groups in GM." The workers pitched in with management to improve productivity and reduce costs. Workers even criticized one another for not being productive enough. Together management and employees found dozens of ways to save money, but still came up with an annual \$470,000 shortfall. On August 17, 1982, GM reluctantly announced that it was phasing out the plant.

With unemployment already about 17 percent, Tuscaloosa (pop. 73,000) could ill afford the loss of some 200 GM jobs and the almost \$7 million a year that the plant, at its peak, had been spending on wages and local purchase of supplies. Despite its announcement, GM wanted to avoid the closing. It sent in two more of its management experts to explore last, desperate measures. No option seemed feasible.

On the advice of local businessmen, the GM experts decided to approach the University of Alabama. Somebody there might have useful ideas. The university—Tuscaloosa's largest employer—also was having financial problems with reduced appropriations and layoffs. But its president, Joab Thomas, believed a state university should become involved in the state's economy.

By the first week in January 1983, local industrial-development boards had agreed to give the university a grant of \$75,000 to seed

research. But a lot of university money would be involved. When Prof. J. Barry Mason, chairman of the university's management and marketing department, was asked to lead the university team, he wondered if President Thomas had something of the riverboat gambler in him. How could professors and students solve problems that stopped GM, with all its expertise? Failure would play havoc with the university's reputation.

Mason assembled a half-dozen colleagues—specialists in management, engineering and energy. He asked them to review the plant's operations and systems, and to tell him if the university could cut operating costs by the \$470,000 a year needed to save the plant.

Their answer: "We can do it."
The assurance contained some bravado. "I found it a little scary," recalls Joseph Millichamp, professor of management science, who had agreed to look into the plant's inventory.

Representatives of the university, GM and the UAW hammered out a three-year contract. The university agreed to pay GM \$470,000 a year for the opportunity to use the plant as an applied-research facility. That took care of GM's shortfall. Additional savings instituted through the university would be deducted from the \$470,000. One-shot saving didn't count; economy measures had to result in a permanent annual reduction in the plant's operating costs.

GM agreed to give the university and the union access to the plant's books. It also pledged \$250,000 a year in fellowships and scholarships for the university, regardless of the outcome. Plant employees accepted a payroll deduction of \$55.20 a week to be used, if necessary, by the university to finance research. GM agreed to return this money to the employees eventually, whether or not the project succeeded.

A task force, soon dubbed The Gang of Twelve, was set up, with four members from the union, four from the university, four from GM. Its unanimous approval was required for each cost-saving proposal.

Enthusiasm for the project wasn't universal. After the January 1983 press conference at which the GM-university contract was announced, a UAW employee approached Barry Mason, who had been introduced as the leader of the university team, and said, "Okay, hotshot, you've had your moment in the sun. Now we'll see what you can do!" But newly appointed plant manager Tom Gilligan was hopeful something would emerge from the university's fresh point of view combined with GM's experience. He showed his confidence by having the plant's interior repainted.

Meanwhile, the university team—undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty members—began exploring the plant and listening to ideas. Mason questioned a longstanding contract for shipping parts from Rochester, N.Y., to Tuscaloosa. A faculty member studying the contract saw ways to reclassify the auto parts for better interstate-shipping rates. Then the company submitted the new structure to various truck companies for competitive bids. The result: savings of \$88,000 a year.

Collaboration between the university team and company specialists produced lighter, less expensive containers for shipping parts and products. This saved more than \$60,000 a year.

Some office employees wondered if the company was losing money by leasing equipment such as teleprinters and photocopiers. The team found that buying the equipment could save \$23,000 a year.

Every aspect of energy use was scrutinized under the guidance of Lee Richey, campus energy manager. Some workers complained that the gust of air from huge blowers in the production area was too strong. On Richey's advice, a change of pulleys reduced the flow of air by half, also reducing the power used by the fans. The pulleys cost \$440.

The savings: \$13,000 a year.
The air-conditioning system in the cavernous warehouse area was replaced with a system of fans. "It made sense to us," said Grady Cook, the UAW shop chairman. "Fans could keep our people comfortable enough, so why throw away money on chilled air?" Installation of the ventilation system cost about \$20,000. The savings: \$30,000 a year.

Geology expert Prof. C. Everett Brett knew that the Tuscaloosa region had beneath it an aquifer—sand, gravel, and porous rock—that held tremendous amounts of water, and tests showed a 60-foot-thick mass only 20 feet below the plant. He proposed a series of wells, with cool water pumped out during the winter and run through a cooling tower. The chilled water would then be stored in a second set of wells and used to cool the plant in hot months. That process would raise the temperature of the water, but still return it to the storage wells at a lower-than-normal temperature, thus requiring less energy to cool it the second time. The system will cost some \$300,000, and the saving in energy expenses is estimated at over \$80,000 a year.

Professor Mellichamp computerized the inventory-control system, programming it to make five-year forecasts of needs in order to clean out the dead inventory and avoid premature disposal of saleable products. The system cost about \$165,000 but promised an immediate one-time saving of \$414,000 which, under the terms of the contract, did not count against the \$470,000 deficit. But the Mellichamp system's continuing savings of at least \$135,000 a year did count.

Each time The Gang of Twelve approved a verifiable cost-saving project an announcement was posted in the plant's conference room. Employers cheered each new notice. And they worked. No department—production or clerical—had an efficiency rating of less than 100 percent.

The task force achieved the goal of \$470,000 in savings in just eight months. For its efforts, the university was guaranteed a minimum of \$750,000 in scholarships over the life of the contract, which is still in effect. In addition, it could reasonably assure GM of at least another \$500,000 in annual savings to come. It did not use a penny of the money put into trust by the employees. Each was returned \$1600 well before Christmas 1983.

University president Joab Thomas, who had staked his professional reputation on the contract, says, "We have shown business and industry the practicality of using the talents and resources of a university." At GM's Tuscaloosa plant, shop chairman Grady Cook exults, "We worked together as a team and we turned this plant around. The university people weren't outsiders. They were here with us, working to make things better." And GM's Tom Gilligan adds, "The success was the result of a concept that nobody else had ever tried. I believe what happened here will open a new way of thinking about doing business and being competitive."

[From the New York Times Tuesday, August 13, 1991]

UNIVERSITIES BECOME FULL PARTNERS TO CITIES IN SOUTH

(By Karen De Witt)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—When the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa opened an extension

here in 1936, it was designed to be just that—a small offshoot in the city, offering courses to students who could not attend the main campus.

But today, it is the University of Alabama at Birmingham, not its parent institution, that is the state's hotbed of ideas and progress.

U.A.B. is now the largest employer in the state. It runs the state's most comprehensive hospital, which recently opened a \$104 million clinic designed by I. M. Pei and it counts its economic impact on the region at about \$1 billion a year.

The story here has been repeated across the South, as urban universities have become the economic generators in their cities. As their economic importance has grown, these universities—in New Orleans, Charlotte, Atlanta and other cities—have also increased their roles as community leaders, attacking social problems, preserving cultural institutions or generally filling a leadership role once played by business leaders.

And they have played an equally important role in changing the character of the population around them, not only by providing employment but also by making a college education more accessible to poor inner-city residents.

TRANSFORMING CITIES

"U.A.B. just simply took Birmingham into the First World economically," said H. Brandt Ayers, editor and publisher of the Anniston Star, in Anniston, about 70 miles to the east.

Educators and sociologists say this is part of a broad trend, apparent for some years in the Northeast and now reaching its full impact in the Middle West and especially in the Sun Belt.

As textile, shipping and manufacturing industries that fueled cities like Birmingham and New Orleans began to shrink or die over the last 20 years, the public urban universities increasingly replaced them as major employers and shapers of the new urban landscape.

"Urban universities are doing for the cities in the 1990's what the land-grant colleges did for the rural areas in the 1800's," said Greg O'Brien, president of the University of New Orleans, which is part of the Louisiana State University system.

TAKING IT TO THE PEOPLE

Land-grant colleges and universities were developed to bring public higher education to the country, with a mandate to focus on agriculture and mechanical arts. Now urban universities, created for the most part less than 40 years ago, have also changed the socio-economic profile of people who get college educations.

The classic pattern in the South and Middle West, where the big state universities were in small towns, was that only those urban youngsters with solid family incomes were likely to go off to college for four years. The urban universities have brought the classrooms to the population centers, eliminating travel and boarding from the cost of a college education.

It seems a simple truth, but the concept that education dollars ought to be spent where people live seemed hard to grasp for Southern legislators, who were attuned to spending their higher education budgets mainly in towns like Tuscaloosa, Oxford, Miss., and Athens, Ga.

When money and students began to flow into the new urban universities, it changed not only local economies but also the edu-

cational pecking order within many state university systems.

HOUSING, RACE RELATIONS AND MORE

"We are in the midst of a transfer in our economy from an industrial economy to sophisticated service industry," said Marguerite Barnett, president of the University of Houston, which has established an institute to help revitalize Texas school districts. "With most of our people living in cities, a diverse new population, it is the urban university that is on the cutting edge of change."

Ivory-tower isolation and the traditional town-gown divisions common to small university towns have begun to change, too. Although most university administrators insist they are nonpolitical, many have used the weight of their payrolls to push local governments for improvements in public services and race relations.

Otherwise, the educators argue, they cannot attract the faculty members they need to sustain their reputations and lure the hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal contracts and grants that enrich the local economy.

For example, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte chose a site north of Charlotte and created a new town, University City, which has attracted numerous corporations and improved the region's economy. Georgia State University in Atlanta has a partnership with the local school system to train teachers and administrators, and is working with a mayoral task force to develop residential housing downtown.

PARTNER TO THE CITY

As the profiles of urban universities have risen so has their ability to attract the kind of star talent that only the more prestigious regional universities, like Vanderbilt in Nashville and Emory in Atlanta, had lured for years. After persuading the Coca-Cola Company to endow a jazz chair at its institution, the University of New Orleans got Ellis Marsalis, a highly regarded teacher who is the father of the jazz musicians Wynton and Branford Marsalis, to be the first to hold it.

The university also helped resuscitate the New Orleans Symphony after it was closed for nearly a year, a typical example of the community-university links that have developed.

"Very few public urban research institutions will simply be located in their cities in the 21st century," Dr. Barnett said. "They will have to be a partner in their cities if they're going to continue to thrive."

One theme at these universities in the Deep South is that the painful passage through the civil rights struggles of the 60's gave some communities a more open attitude toward diagnosing and treating other community problems.

"History and truth are so close to the surface here that we live with a great sense of reality in the South," said Tennant S. McWilliams, vice president of academic affairs at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. "We've got problems, but the only way to get out from under them is to confront them."

OPENING DOORS FOR BLACKS

U.A.B. reaches deep into the public life of Birmingham, providing assistance to 90 public schools, research to a burgeoning number of small businesses and design for a model school in a new industrial research park.

To tighten the political bond between the university and the city, U.A.B. gave leave to one of its faculty members to work on the staff of the city's first black Mayor, Richard Arrington Jr.

"It sits right in the middle of the black community, and in its scope, sensitivity and comprehensive commitment to urban life, I doubt there is another university that can match it," Mayor Arrington said.

Because Birmingham once represented segregation at its most monolithic, U.A.B.'s impact is sometimes most easily measured in its impact on educational opportunity for blacks.

TIGHT-FISTED LEGISLATURE

Twenty-five years ago, the city had no accredited public college that admitted blacks. Today one-fifth of U.A.B.'s 16,500 undergraduates are black, the highest percentage of black students at any predominantly white institution in the state.

Twenty-five years ago, blacks were barred from what was then the state's only medical school, and they could not get nursing or paramedical training in Birmingham. Today 14 of the 165 first-year students at U.A.B.'s medical school are black, and four of them ranked in the top 10 percent of their undergraduate classes.

The university is also deeply involved in the effort to build a civil rights museum here.

Such activities can create strains between urban universities and their state legislatures. The Alabama Legislature, historically hostile to Birmingham, is one of the nation's most tight-fisted with education spending. While most state universities draw half of their operating budgets from their legislatures, U.A.B. received only 25 percent, or \$162 million of a \$633 million budget for the 1990-91 school year.

Thus, though Birmingham reaps enormous benefit from U.A.B., it is Federal tax dollars in the form of grants and contracts, scholarships and fees from its hospital services that sustain the university.

CULTIVATING ITS GARDEN

That local business leaders recognize the benefits of the university is evident, however, in a recent capital fund-raising drive. Some of the city's top corporate executives led it and helped raise \$67 million, a noteworthy development in a city whose business executives have seldom exerted the kind of leadership exhibited by counterparts in Atlanta, Charlotte, Houston and other Sun Belt cities.

The struggle to raise money is mirrored in a kind of bootstrap approach to academics that flies in the face of political efforts to end affirmative action and may be unique to U.A.B.

When the university here decided to boost its number of minority faculty members, for example, it eschewed raiding other universities in favor of a long-term effort to develop its own pool of talent. It has a 10-year, multilevel program that provides support for high school students through post-doctoral candidates. Short-term needs are supplied through visiting professorships. The program costs \$850,000 a year.

"That's hard state money, and we take it right off the top," said Charles A. McCallum Jr., the university's president. Largely because of the program, U.A.B. has 44 black doctoral students in mathematics and science.

In some states, legislatures have recognized the enlarged role of urban universities in sustaining cities. An urban college consortium in Ohio got its Legislature to reinstate \$30 million in state financing for its programs after initial cuts, by showing the economic advantages the colleges bring the state.

At the Federal level, Congress may finance the Urban Grant University Program of the Higher Education Act for the first time since it was enacted in 1980. The program would provide financing for just the kind of city-university partnerships that have been growing across the country.

"Urban universities form a very special function in education, and that role can be expanded as one city after another undergoes transition," said Representative Thomas Sawyer, Democrat of Ohio, who along with Senator Mark O. Hatfield, Republican of Oregon, has proposed \$10 million in financing for the program. "That same engine that drove the economy of this nation during the shift from agriculture to urban industrial dominance has the same potential in an urban setting."

REMARKS OF DR. WILLIAM A. SIBLEY

It, indeed, is my pleasure to welcome you, Congressman Erdreich, and the members of your staff, to The University of Alabama at Birmingham. I bring special greetings from President Charles McCallum. He deeply regrets that a previous commitment prevents him from attending. I know that I speak for UAB, the people of Birmingham and many others when I say that this focus upon the issues of city life and urban education represents a critical development for our country. It is my hope that this Hearing is indicative of a new wave of interest within the United States Congress, a wave of interest which will result in urban issues having an appropriately high priority as American society moves into the post-cold war era. As the Congress knows well, Land Grant Universities have been and will continue to be a great boon to our society. Now we need an urban university emphasis.

A key contextual point for these hearings comes from history. Cities and universities emerged as complimentary institutions some 700 years ago. The University of Paris and the University of Heidelberg are but two examples. Today the relationship between urban development and higher education is even more important. Times have changed. People live predominantly in cities. Our population swells daily. Our economy is tied inextricably to others in the world. All people in our society have a right to political and economic opportunity and access to education.

These changes in society make for both a complicated and exciting future in education. One positive way we are responding to this complexity is through cooperation and the pooling of private and public educational resources through urban universities. In attempting to achieve better housing, education, transportation, economic planning and environmental solutions, the urban setting can focus a myriad of people to use available talents on a problem. The advent of high technology for manufacturing, transportation, communication and education helps make this pooling an even more effective experience.

Let me give you an example. The UAB community has been asked by the community of Titusville, which is on the outskirts of Birmingham, to assist with the schools. One might think this would just involve our School of Education helping teachers to be better equipped for the teaching process, assisting with special reading programs and so forth. That is a part of the approach, but we are undertaking a more holistic procedure for helping the Titusville schools. A broad part of our UAB family is involved in working with the Titusville community. Our Optometry School has gone in to do vision

checks. They have found that 20% of the children had difficulty seeing the blackboard. Our Dental School has become involved by helping with dental checkups, a procedure most of the children had never had. Study is currently underway to see how we can help with prenatal care, and thought is being given to classes on parenting. Special counseling help is available for children expressing anger and hostility and having a tendency for violence. As you can see, our help crosses a broad spectrum of disciplines at the university. I must point out that the community must invite us to help, we then work together to find solutions to the problem. It is an exciting program. This is one prime example of education and the community working together. Another is the Civitan International Research Center with its emphasis on learning disabilities. UAB is a major research university with research expenditures that place us in the top 35 universities nationally. Yet you find here a group of caring scholar who can help people because of our combined talents and our urban setting.

The city and the university represent a critical mass of educational uplift for the economic development of all people. In this critical mass one finds the modern strategy of combining and collaborating. Our society must adopt this approach for the twenty-fifth century.

Certainly we believe that The University of Alabama at Birmingham exemplifies this way of the future. We are delighted to have joining us in testimony representatives from Virginia Commonwealth University, Marquette University and others who likewise are in a position to delineate what urban universities can accomplish for society with appropriate congressional attention.

No domestic priority is greater than the cities, for in the urban existence one finds the pressing of the twenty-first century. All urban universities must be ready for the future. We are delighted to have you back in your home town to discuss these vital developments.

Given these general remarks, Congressman Erdreich, I will be happy to answer questions and then refer you to my colleagues and others who are present for discussion of this important topic.

TRIBUTE TO DEVON LYN CROXTON

HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Miss Devon Lyn Croxton, a high school senior in Sparks, NV. Miss Croxton recently won a script writing contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the topic of "Meeting America's Challenge". In her eloquent and intelligent statement, Devon accurately delineated the challenges that face us every day as we strive to become better Americans and to uphold the ideals that have made this country an example to the rest of the world. Devon is herself an embodiment of those virtues and I feel that with young people such as Devon ready to help guide America into the future, I have no doubt that America will be able to meet its challenges. Once again, I would like to congratulate Devon Croxton on her achievements and the example she provides.

MEETING AMERICA'S CHALLENGE

(By Devon L. Croxton, Nevada winner, 1991/92 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program)

The challenge America presents to us as citizens of the United States, is the same today as it was over two hundred years ago when this nation was being born. Being a nation, is in itself, a challenge. One that cannot be defined by one aspect of a population, but, one that incorporates all aspects of the population.

America is the land of the free, and the land of opportunity. A place so diverse, with so many different cultures and lifestyles, that it seems amazing that a people with so many differences can come together as a nation to help each other and also help other nations. But we do. But not without the help of all Americans. Everyone, no matter what their business or trade contributes to the intricate framework that holds this nation together. Whether they are bankers or social workers, gas station attendants or store clerks, secretaries or our service men and women.

The challenge is presented to everyone, everyday. But in different ways. Raising a family and teaching are two things that seem to be getting harder and harder to do. Trying to raise responsible, trustworthy children, and educate them to contribute to our nation is no small task. Yet it is one that is met head-on by many Americans, without whom our nation could not survive.

Legislation and finance are also vital in keeping America intact. Without some kind of order and an economy this nation would not be stable enough to stay intact.

Another way this challenge has been met is through battle by those men and women who believe in and are willing to fight for our way of life. They met that challenge in World War II, Korea, Vietnam and just last year in the Middle East. The absence and loss of so many of our citizens is a strain on all of America. Whether they are directly involved or not, every American is affected. Those at home have just as tough of a time during war as those fighting it do. Our country pulls together at these times of need to help each other and to ensure that our service men and women will have a place to come home to.

Meeting America's challenge is no easy task. It has taken hard work. And it has taken the belief and sacrifice of so many people. The belief and appreciation of our freedoms and individual liberties which are established by our government and protected by those who serve in our armed forces. It is this appreciation of what America stands for, that makes America what it is today: A place where a child can dream and make that dream come true. A place where people are free to decide what makes them happy and what they believe in. And, it is a place where a person can express their feelings and opinions freely.

There are some of the reasons that I am proud to say that I am an American, and I am contributing to "Meeting America's Challenge" today.

A TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE MICHAEL W. MORRIS FOR HIS OUTSTANDING SERVICE

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Detective Michael W. Morris has been selected to receive the annual Outstanding Police Detective Award for the year 1991. The award is presented in memory of Sgt. Joe Sanchez who was killed in the line of duty June 6, 1986.

The award was presented to Detective Morris for outstanding ability, leadership, and dedication to duty as well as initiative and investigative work while serving as an officer with the police department of the city of Baton Rouge.

Between January and November of 1991, Detective Morris made 65 felony arrest while working in the armed robbery and burglary unit and thereby cleared 54 armed robberies and 33 other miscellaneous cases pending and outstanding in the files of the Baton Rouge Police Department.

Detective Morris is hereby commended for his excellent work and the exceptional ability that he has shown and will continue to show as a police investigator. Detective Morris upholds the finest traditions of police service and demonstrates that he is truly deserving of the award as Detective of the Year.

NATIVE AMERICAN TEENAGERS

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, through Public Law 102-188 (S.J. Res 217, H.J. Res. 342), Congress and the President designated 1992 as the Year of the American Indian. This law pays tribute to the people who first inhabited the land now known as the continental United States. Although only symbolic, this gesture is important because it shows there is sympathy in the eyes of a majority of both Houses of the Congress for those Indian issues which we as a Congress have been struggling with for over 200 years. In support of the Year of the American Indian, and as part of my ongoing series this year, I am providing for the consideration of my colleagues an article from today's Washington Post reporting yet another study indicating the poor condition of this country's American Indians. This study, comparing American Indian teenagers to other minorities and the overall teenage population is consistent in many respects with other similar studies. Mr. Speaker, if one out of five Indian girls and one out of eight American Indian boys have attempted suicide as reported in this study, this Nation's current system of addressing the problems of American Indians is not working and must be changed.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 1992]

SURVEY PRESENTS BLEAK CIRCUMSTANCES OF NATIVE AMERICAN TEENAGERS

(By David Brown)

Thousands of Native American teenagers inhabit a world so filled with alcoholism, violent death and personal despair that by the end of high school 1 out of 5 girls and 1 out of 8 boys have attempted suicide.

Those were among the bleakest statistics of a generally bleak survey of more than 13,000 Indian and Alaska Native teenagers published yesterday in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

"This is the most devastated group of adolescents in the United States," Michael D. Resnick, an epidemiologist and one of the authors of the survey, said at a news conference yesterday.

Though certain risky behaviors—sexual activity and drinking in the late high school years, for example—are no more common among Native Americans than among some other racial groups, the total constellation of stresses on Native American teenagers seems to be greater, the survey suggested.

"For every risk factor with the exception of homicide, the Native kids are in far worse shape than African-American kids," said Robert W. Blum, a pediatrician and coauthor of the study, citing a population of adolescents thought to be under severe stress.

Other studies have shown that Native American teenagers have approximately twice the death rate of teenagers in any other racial group. In 1986, the rate for Indians and Alaska Natives between 15 and 19 years old was 190 deaths per 100,000 population, compared to 81 per 100,000 among all U.S. teenagers.

In the new study, University of Minnesota researchers gave a 162-item questionnaire to Indian and Alaska Native youngsters in 7th through 12th grades. All the respondents lived on reservations or in predominantly Native American communities in dozens of states. Urban populations were not surveyed, nor were high school dropouts.

The researchers compared some of their results with those from a similar survey of white, rural teenagers in Minnesota. Among the findings:

Eleven percent of Native American teenagers reported that one or both of their parents were dead, compared to 5 percent of the Minnesota teenagers.

About 46 percent reported living in dual-parent homes, compared to 87 percent of the Minnesota sample.

About 22 percent of 12th grade girls reported having been victims of sexual abuse. About 19 percent of similar girls in the Minnesota sample reported sexual abuse.

About 27 percent of 12th grade youths reported drinking weekly or more frequently. This is not significantly different from the Minnesota sample. However, among Native Americans, drinking begins at a younger age, with 9 percent of the 8th graders drinking at least weekly, compared to 5 percent of their Minnesota counterparts.

About 31 percent of teenagers in the 7th through 9th grades reported using marijuana, with usage rising to 50 percent in the 10th through 12th grades. A national survey of teenagers last year showed that 42 percent of all 12th-graders has used marijuana at least once.

About 22 percent of the female Native American respondents, and 12 percent of the males, reported attempting suicide. Thirty percent of teenagers whose families had a suicide history had attempted suicide.

Among U.S. teenagers as a whole in 1990, 10.3 percent of girls and 6.2 percent of boys had attempted suicide at least once.

Eleven percent of the Native American sample reported knowing someone who had committed suicide.

Almost one-fifth of the students said that they had been knocked unconscious by another person at least once.

The survey was answered anonymously. The researchers did not attempt to verify any of the answers, though certain statistical maneuvers were performed to eliminate clearly bogus responses.

Resnick acknowledged that many of the teenagers who said they had attempted suicide may not have actually performed a life-threatening act, but that the message from the survey was nevertheless clear.

"It is the teenagers' definition of the situation that is really critical. Young people who view themselves as having attempted suicide are a far more distressed group of kids," the researcher said. "Whether or not an adult could question the veracity of the attempt misses the point. It is a warning signal."

The rate of death by suicide among Native American youth is 26.3 per 100,000 compared to 12.4 per 100,000 for the teenage population as a whole.

ANNIVERSARY OF BYELARUSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Byelarusian-Americans and lovers of freedom of all nationalities to commemorate an important anniversary.

Seventy-four years ago on March 29, the Byelarusian people declared their independence and the creation of the Byelarusian Democratic Republic. This Republic was founded on principles of democracy and freedom which all of us here in the United States hold very dear. Two years later, however, the Bolsheviks rode into Byelarus and dashed cherished hopes for an independent, democratic state.

Seventy-four years later, the people of Byelarusia once again have the opportunity to realize their hopes for democracy and independence. The oppressive Soviet system has finally fallen, but the legacy of repression and economic disarray left by decades of Soviet domination are still felt in Byelarusia.

Byelarusia faces many challenges in the near future. This small nation stands at a historic crossroads. It is my hope and my belief that Byelarusia will meet with success. I wish the Byelarusian people all the best on the anniversary of their proclamation of independence.

TRIBUTE TO MARCUS HOOK, PA

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my hometown, Marcus Hook, on

the occasion of its centennial. This year marks the 100th anniversary of the incorporation of the borough of Marcus Hook and I am honored to have the opportunity to take part in the celebration.

The borough has scheduled a banquet on Saturday, March 28, 1992, at 7 p.m. at the Marcus Hook Fire Company Hall to begin the year-long centennial celebration. As one who was born and raised in Marcus Hook, March 28 will be a proud day for me.

Marcus Hook has enjoyed a long and storied history. The borough's roots can be traced back to the 1640's when Swedish settlers developed the town as a trading outpost and colonization site.

In December 1891, 51 residents of the town of Marcus Hook petitioned the Delaware County Court for incorporated status. In March 1892, the court ruled in favor of the petitioners and the town of Marcus Hook was designated as the incorporated borough of Marcus Hook. The borough's subsequent growth is attributed to the people and industry they developed which placed Marcus Hook on the map as an important link to regional industry.

The riverfront area attracted attention across the region as an ideal location for ship construction and fishing business. In the early 1900's the area prospered with the construction of oil refineries and the opening of several oil companies including Sun Company, BP Oil, and Union Petroleum Co.

Marcus Hook is a proud community. This small borough has produced famous sporting greats like legendary baseball batting champ Mickey Vernon and former football all-pro Billy "White Shoes" Johnson. Retired marine, Gen. Bob Haebel, a decorated military hero and war veteran, also hails from Marcus Hook.

As a former mayor of Marcus Hook, I look forward to this week's celebrations with great anticipation. I remember my years at Marcus Hook Elementary School, where I made friends I have kept for all my life. I began my firefighting career with the Viscose Fire Company in Marcus Hook, and I formed bonds with my fellow friends and neighbors that will last a lifetime. I look back fondly on my years as mayor of Marcus Hook, when I got my start in public life, when an entire borough came together in a shared effort of community renewal.

Marcus Hook is a close-knit community of families and friends. It is a borough rich in volunteer spirit and the American work ethic. I am proud of Marcus Hook. For me, it will always be home.

DAYTON AREA HEALTH PLAN

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation, along with many of my colleagues from Ohio, to allow the Dayton Area Health Plan [DAHP] to continue to serve over 43,000 low-income individuals. This innovative health plan was started in Dayton, OH, in my district, in 1989 to bring high quality, preventive health care to Medicaid recipients in a cost-effective and efficient way.

Mr. Speaker, in its short life, the DAHP has improved the delivery of health care to thousands of low-income individuals, and their children, in Dayton. By emphasizing prevention, the plan has been successful in bringing down emergency room use. By offering choice, the plan has successfully involved the poor in their health care decisions.

The Dayton Area Health Plan is immunizing children at record rates, and has had a 63 percent increase in the number of primary care physicians since its inception. It has established liaisons to Head Start and community development leaders, and worked with the local Dayton Board of Education to meet the vision and hearing needs of kindergarten students.

Unfortunately, because of a technical requirement involving the enrollment mixes of the three health maintenance organizations [HMOs] that participate in the plan, the future of DAHP is in jeopardy. The plan has received Federal waivers of these requirements from the Health Care Financing Administration for 3 years, the maximum allowed under Federal law. In order for the plan to survive, the law must be changed.

Mr. Speaker, our bill provides for a temporary waiver of current law to allow the plan to continue operating while Congress considers a permanent solution. In addition, our bill directs the State of Ohio to institute strong quality assurances and enforcement provisions. These will assure that the level of health care to the poor remains of a high quality.

Mr. Speaker, access to quality health care is top on our agenda this year. Let us not leave the poor behind. I am proud to have an example of an innovative plan, in my district, that is working. It is supported by community leaders, physicians, hospitals and social service workers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill to provide the necessary relief to the Dayton Area Health Plan to enable it to survive.

Recently, my local newspaper, the Dayton Daily News, took a strong stand in support of continuing the plan. I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

AREA HEALTH-CARE PLAN GETS EXCELLENT REVIEWS

It has not happened overnight, but the Dayton Area Health Plan is a success.

That's important to the low-income in Montgomery County who depend on the health plan for medical care. But it's also relevant to taxpayers, who are getting a break, and to doctors who serve the poor.

Five years ago Montgomery County set out to encourage Medicaid clients to hook up with a primary physician. The goal was to get the poor to stop using expensive emergency rooms for routine health care and see a doctor regularly who could try to keep them well.

If Medicaid clients could be persuaded to buy into these ideas, tax money would be saved. Emergency room visits are costly. Moreover, if a person is treated by a physician before he or she is really sick, that cuts down on hospital stays.

What evolved was the Dayton Area Health Plan. It has been operating for a little more than a year. Reviews so far are excellent.

The head of the county welfare department says he's amazed at how smoothly things are running and how few complaints Medicaid

clients have. (The director until recently was on the health plan board, so it's arguable that he can't be totally objective. He still, however, is in a position to know if the almost 40,000 women (mostly) receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children are satisfied their medical care.)

The health plan is an improvement for ADC moms mainly because they have more choice. They can join one of two health maintenance organizations, or choose from a long list of doctors and specialists for their care and their children's.

Historically, the list of doctors who are willing to take Medicaid patients has been short. A lot of physicians don't like dealing with the state or its paperwork. The list of physicians who will deal with the locally-run health plan, however, is extensive and growing.

Doctors also like the fact that the health plan—which gets its money from Montgomery County and the state—reimburses at five percent higher than the standard under Medicaid rules. There's money for this because hospitalizations and emergency room visits have decreased.

The hard part of this experiment was that Ohio wouldn't give Montgomery County as much as other counties get from the Medicaid pie. The state said it was all for the idea of improving health care for the needy, but it wasn't going to pay more to do that, and, in fact, it wanted to pay less.

It's impressive that the health plan has been able to meet that goal and please Medicaid patients at the same time.

H.R. —

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

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF 75-25 RULE FOR DAYTON AREA HEALTH PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), in the case of the Dayton Area Health Plan during quarters in calendar years 1992 and 1993, the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(1) with respect to the Health Plan Network operated by the Plan, shall waive the requirement described in section 1903(m)(2)(A)(ii) of the Social Security Act for quarters in a calendar year; and

(2) with respect to the Day-Med HMP and Health Power programs operated by the Plan, shall not treat any individuals enrolled in the Healthy Start program carried out by the Director of the Ohio Department of Human Services as individuals insured for benefits under part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act or for benefits under both parts A and B of such title, or eligible to receive benefits under title XIX of such Act, for purposes of determining the compliance of the programs with the requirement described in section 1903(m)(2)(A)(ii) of the Social Security Act during quarters in a calendar year.

(b) QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENFORCEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR PLAN.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to quarters in any calendar year unless the Secretary finds that, during the year, the State of Ohio has adopted and is enforcing enhanced quality assurance standards with respect to services provided by the Dayton Area Health Plan, including standards relating to—

(1) the timing and frequency and content of obstetric, gynecological, pre-natal, and well-child care;

(2) the provision of timely referrals to appropriate specialists for high-risk individuals receiving such care;

(3) methods to assure that individuals enrolled with the Plan have timely access to such care and receive any necessary care to which they are entitled;

(4) the provision of effective parenting and health education programs for women of child-bearing age and parents;

(5) the monitoring of services provided by the Plan to ensure the compliance of the Plan with quality assurance standards; and

(6) the enforcement of such standards against the Plan, including the application of appropriate sanctions for violation of the standards.

VA MEDICAL RESEARCH DESERVES INCREASED SUPPORT

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Affairs Committee, which I have the privilege of chairing, has long supported a vigorous medical and prosthetic research program within the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). Unfortunately, funding for this effort has not kept pace during the past 10 years or so. For instance, while the National Institutes of Health has enjoyed a research funding increase of more than 110 percent during this period, VA's research budget has increased only about 51 percent. We must do something about that.

For those who fail to understand and fully appreciate the outstanding research that is conducted in the VA year after year, let me cite a few of its results. VA researchers played key roles in eradicating tuberculosis, developing the pacemaker and the CT scan, and improving artificial limbs for amputees. VA is a world leader in the care and treatment of the elderly and is deeply involved in studies of the aging process, including Alzheimer's disease. And the VA is aggressively pursuing information about the AIDS virus, attempting to unlock the doors which could arrest and even cure this deadly disease. Other high priority VA research subjects include drug addiction, alcoholism, schizophrenia, and spinal-cord injury. Two Nobel Prize recipients have come from the ranks of VA researchers.

Mr. Speaker, the great success of the VA research program can be attributed to its people, the highly trained, talented, and dedicated professionals who, at this very moment, are addressing some of the most difficult challenges of medical science.

Recently, an impressive researcher with the San Francisco VA Medical Center, Dr. Michael Weiner, met with the committee staff and followed up with a letter to me in which he related his experiences as a VA staff physician.

I offer excerpts from Dr. Weiner's letter as confirmation of the exceptional caliber of medical investigators and other VA health care professionals who are working diligently to make life better not just for veterans, but for every-

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

SAN FRANCISCO,

San Francisco, CA, March 4, 1992.

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

DEAR CHAIRMAN MONTGOMERY: My first exposure to the DVA was as a medical student at SUNY Upstate Medical Center; about half of my training was at the VA, Syracuse, N.Y. As a medical resident and fellow in metabolism at Yale University, the bulk of my time was spent at the West Haven VA Medical Center. Subsequently I moved to the University of Wisconsin in Madison for advanced training at the Institute for Enzyme Research. In 1991, I was offered an Assistant Professorship in the Department of Medicine with a choice between the glamorous University Hospital or the Madison VA Medical Center where I was awarded a Research Education Fellowship, with research funds, space, and equipment. Therefore, I chose the VA and became Chief of Metabolism. After four highly productive and enjoyable years in Madison, I applied for a VA Clinical Investigator Award. After I received the Clinical Investigator Award, I moved to the Palo Alto VA Medical Center with an appointment on the faculty of Stanford University. I was Assistant Chief of the Dialysis Unit and performed research on kidney metabolism, supported by VA Merit Review funds and NIH grants. During that time, I became aware of magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS) and performed the first MRS studies of kidney metabolism in the rat.

In 1980, I became the Chief of Dialysis at the VA Medical Center in San Francisco, and I continued my MRS studies, supported by VA Merit Review funds. In 1983 Dr. Ralph Goldsmith, our Chief of Staff, and I visited Dr. Carl Hughes at VACO with a proposal to establish a pilot MRS center at the VA Medical Center in San Francisco. This was funded and was used to obtain an \$8 million gift from Phillips Medical Systems to establish the first clinical MRS center. We have been devoting new MR techniques and diagnosing various diseases in our veteran patients.

During the past 21 years, I've developed a great deal of loyalty to our veteran patients and the DVA medical care system. Our American servicemen and women, many of them indigent and seriously ill, deserve the best medical care that we can provide. As I make my medical rounds, I gain great satisfaction for helping these men and women who served when they were called. The DVA health care system has been very good to me. Although I've not chosen the high incomes of my friends and colleagues in private practice, I've had the stimulation of a research and teaching environment. Furthermore, my work with MRS is helping to develop new diagnostic techniques which I use in patient care and which will ultimately be used in many MRI systems in the VA and around the world. Most importantly, I'm part of an outstanding team devoted to providing excellent care to a group of needy and deserving individuals. Now that I'm past fifty, it's time for me to help pay the system back. Because of my good fortune and some academic successes, some have suggested that I enter the administrative arena. Although I recognize the importance of administration, I believe that my greatest impact will be to develop MRS as a clinical tool for the care of veteran and other patients.

The DVA medical care system often suffers from a poor image, which negatively affects the morale of the staff and our veteran patients. In my own way, I hope that our work

in San Francisco can help provide the DVA with a positive image. DVA Medical Center, San Francisco has worked out an excellent relationship with the University of California, San Francisco press office. An experienced public relations science writer is based full time at our hospital. Various aspects of our work with AIDS, schizophrenia, substance abuse, and heart disease have been featured on the Today Show, Good Morning America, and the CBS Evening News. Complimentary articles about our work have appeared in the New York Times, Discover Magazine, and on the various wire services, resulting in articles printed around the world. In every instance, I have insisted that the DVA be prominently cited as the source of this work. Further positive publicity about outstanding work done at our and other DVA medical centers will help improve the image of the VA * * *.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL W. WEINER, M.D.,

Professor of Medicine and Radiology.

HOUSE MUST BE REFORMED TO REGAIN CONFIDENCE OF THE PEOPLE

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it brings me no pleasure to place the following two letters into the RECORD, both of which indicate that I did not write any checks on my House bank account against insufficient funds.

The entire House bank debacle is an institutional and human tragedy, the full dimensions of which have not yet emerged. The one positive aspect of this sad situation is that it has spurred fundamental reform in the way the House and the institution of Congress function.

Without detailing all reforms here, they range from the establishment of a House administrator to oversee the operations of the House, to the stem-to-stern reform of the campaign finance laws.

Suffice it to say that people across the Nation have lost their sense of esteem and respect for Congress and the House. If ever we hope to regain that esteem, respect, and honor, our task is clear. We must reform this place and how it does its work. And, we must do it now.

The letters follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, DC, September 23, 1991.

Hon. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAZZOLI: After an extensive search of the Sergeant At Arms Daily Settlement Statements, I am pleased to confirm your understanding that you have never placed this office in a position that would require us to obtain additional funding to your account.

If I can be of further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

JACK RUSS,

Sergeant at Arms.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,

Washington, DC, March 24, 1992.

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The following information is provided in response to your letter of March 23, 1992.

The records available to the Committee indicate that between July 1, 1988, and October 3, 1991, the 39 month period covered by House Resolution 236, all checks written on your House Bank account were covered by sufficient funds in the account.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. HANSEN,
Ranking Republican Member.

MATTHEW F. MCHUGH,
Acting Chairman.

RABBI ABRAHAM COOPER IS AWARDED THE AMERICA-ISRAEL FRIENDSHIP MEDIA AWARD

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate Rabbi Abraham Cooper, who, on March 29, 1992, will receive the Bnai Zion America-Israel Friendship Media Award for 1992. Rabbi Cooper's years of work as co-founder and associate dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, and on behalf of Israel and the Jewish cause make this honor well deserved and long overdue.

In 1977, Rabbi Cooper helped to found the Simon Wiesenthal Center of Los Angeles for the preservation of the memory of the Holocaust through education and awareness, as well as the Los Angeles branch of Yeshiva University. Rabbi Cooper is himself a graduate of and was ordained by Yeshiva University and has long been active in the movement for Soviet Jews' rights and emigration.

Rabbi Cooper is an articulately powerful and renowned spokesperson in the media on behalf of the Jewish cause and Israel through his writings, radio and television news broadcasts, and personal appearances. He has authored articles in major newspapers both here in the United States and abroad, including the Los Angeles Times, the New York Times, Le Monde, and Japan Times. He has edited two major works on Raoul Wallenberg, and his work "Portraits of Infamy: A Study of Soviet Anti-Semitism and its Roots," published in 1986, served as the basis for the Wiesenthal Center's traveling exhibit of the same title. Rabbi Cooper has also served as consultant to the NBC miniseries on Raoul Wallenberg, as well as for the ABC miniseries based on Herman Wouk's epic, "War and Remembrance."

In view of Rabbi Abraham Cooper's years of excellent work on behalf of the worldwide Jewish community, it is my honor to ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to stand and join me in extending my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to Rabbi Cooper on this joyous occasion.

CARMEN DELGADO VOTAW ELECTED TO MARYLAND WOMEN'S HALL OF FAME

HON. ANTONIO J. COLORADO

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. COLORADO. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was sworn in on March 4 as the new Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, replacing Jaime B. Fuster, who is now an associate justice of the Puerto Rico Supreme Court. During most of Mr. Fuster's 7-year tenure as the only Congressman from Puerto Rico, representing some 3.6 million American citizens on the island, he had an administrative assistant on his staff who has just been honored as one of 5 persons inducted into the 1992 Maryland Women's Hall of Fame.

She is Carmen Delgado Votaw, and I am sure many of my colleagues—especially on the Foreign Affairs and Interior Committees—remember her as a hard-working administrative assistant who labored diligently in Washington on behalf of Puerto Rico. A year ago she left the Office of Resident Commissioner to become Washington representative of the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., of which she was long been associated.

Mr. Speaker, Carmen Delgado Votaw has a lengthy record of public service and has been an enthusiastic leader in working for civil rights, especially in equal opportunities for Hispanics and women. She was involved for many years in the Overseas Education Fund of the League of Women Voters. In the early 1970's she was elected president of the National Conference of Puerto Rican Women. In the mid-1970s she was appointed to the Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year.

Then, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Votaw received two Presidential appointments—first, to the International Women's Year Commission, and second, as a co-chair of the National Advisory Committee for Women. Subsequently, she was appointed as the U.S. delegate to the Inter-America Commission of Women and was later president of the Commission in 1978. She is also an elected member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Carmen Delgado Votaw was born in Puerto Rico, and is the first Hispanic woman to be inducted into the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame. This is a signal honor not only for Carmen Delgado Votaw but also for all Puerto Ricans, men and women. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will join me in saluting Carmen Delgado Votaw for her recognition by the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame.

WILLIAM BRIAN NEWSOME WINS VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS' ESSAY CONTEST

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and privilege to rise today to ex-

tend congratulations to William Brian Newsome, a young man from my home town of Augusta, GA.

Brian was the winner from the State of Georgia in the annual Veterans of Foreign Wars', essay contest. As the winner from Georgia, he competed with 53 other winners from each of our 50 States, District of Columbia, Pacific Areas, Panama Canal, and Europe. This year's contest theme was "Meeting America's Challenge."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to enter Mr. Newsome's essay into the RECORD, as it offers an insightful and inspirational look at education today from one who has firsthand knowledge:

MEETING AMERICA'S CHALLENGE

(By William Brian Newsome)

America must meet its educational challenge, for without improving the U.S. system of learning, this great country may soon fall behind the other industrialized nations of the world. America is one of the most intelligent and productive countries in all of history, and this great nation must meet the challenge of stimulating the minds of its young people to really think for themselves and to achieve bigger and better things. Quality education is a must.

In many of America's metropolitan areas, pupils attend high schools with as many as 2,000 other students. A great deal of the instructors teach classes of at least 30 students, a number too exorbitant to allow teachers to relate to students on an individual level. First, America's schools need smaller classroom settings where teachers can better know their pupils. This is not only for the senior high schools but for the elementary and middle schools, as well. A teacher must have the opportunity to interact with each person in his or her school-room!

Secondly, our nations' school systems must present a challenging curriculum in the classroom. We have become a nation of matching, multiple choice, and memorization. These 3 M's are too much a part of the learning system. A great deal of today's students simply memorize material for multiple choice and matching tests. A day or two later, the pupil has forgotten nearly everything that was on the test. America's students must be challenged to learn, not memorize, important information; and they need to know how to think independently, as well. In courses such as history and English, this can be accomplished through essay writing. A student has to know the subject matter and must be able to express his or her own ideas in order to write an essay. In math and science courses, pupils need to be confronted with tough problems that they must solve. Only in this way can they learn the problem-solving skills that must be used in the real world. Our students need to be taught how to think, not what to think.

Thirdly, our educational forum must learn to better handle taxpayers' money. Many of America's school systems spend more money on football stadiums and athletic equipment than they do on basic educational needs such as books and paper. The United States is historically a nation of thrift and frugality, but many school systems use money in frivolous and wasteful manners. America must take proper charge of its educational finances!

We hear the expression—"Our children are America's future." If this is true, then America must be whatever its people are. Therefore, in order for America to remain the great nation that it is, we must properly

educate our people! Our country has always been one to meet its problems head on; and this is exactly what must be done with the educational dilemma. This challenge can be met, and it must be met if America is to maintain its role as a world leader!

**TRIBUTE TO THE READING
DEMOLAY CHAPTER**

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of International DeMolay Month, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished group of young men from Reading, PA. I speak of the Reading Chapter of the International DeMolay. For 62 years, the chapter has prepared its young men to become outstanding people, providing the city of Reading with exemplary citizens. Indeed, I am proud to come here before the House and tell you about this unique organization.

Now, in its 73d year, the International DeMolay is the largest fraternal youth organization in the world. It is an organization that builds character in young men who seek to prepare themselves to become better citizens and leaders for tomorrow. By encouraging participation in community events, charitable projects, and social activities, the DeMolay organization successfully prepares its members to be adult leaders.

The Reading DeMolay Chapter is the largest DeMolay chapter in Pennsylvania and is active 12 months a year. It promotes civic, fundraising, and personal growth activities among its members. DeMolays have participated in Pennsylvania's Adopt-A-Highway Program and volunteered at the Annual Rajah Shrine Circus in Reading. The chapter also excels in its programs of athletic competition, winning first place in the statewide DeMolay basketball tournament.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that my colleagues will agree that the Reading Chapter of the International DeMolay deserves our commendation on the floor of the House for its diligent service to the Reading community. As the Reading DeMolays celebrate International DeMolay Month, I would like to extend my appreciation for all they have done, and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

**GETTING MORE HELP IN DEALING
WITH PAIN**

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, patients are often getting the short- and painful-end of the stick when it comes to dealing with pain. A new Federal agency that many of us in Congress helped set up has just issued a report showing that many American doctors and hospitals underprescribe painkillers when treating patients sustaining serious wounds, illness, or recovering from surgery. The report shows that

due to an unjustified fear of causing addiction to painkillers, many patients have been adequately treated when suffering prolonged, severe pain. Such pain, contrary to common belief, is unhealthy and can cause delayed healing and prolonged hospital stays.

The Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, set up in 1989 to help figure out the best way to treat various illnesses, has developed new Federal guidelines to protect patients and help doctors by giving them proper and accepted procedures in the administration of drugs. These guidelines are a welcome antidote to the patients who have, until now, had to endure excessive pain due to underprescription. In short, if you're in pain following surgery or because of an illness, it's good for you to ask for help.

I've proposed legislation to help identify areas of the country and doctors who may be dangerously underprescribing painkillers. As the Los Angeles Daily News editorialized, "It would also be helpful if Federal and State lawmakers make sure that no legislation impedes the use of painkillers in necessary situations. In that sense, they could follow the example set by Representative PETE STARK * * * in seeking to control the improper dispensing of prescription medication without depriving the patients of the help they need."

I commend the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research guidelines.

TRIBUTE TO ROSEMARY HOWEY

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, when someone makes an outstanding contribution to the community I represent, it is a great privilege for me to recognize his or her achievements. Rosemary Howey of Independence Township is one of those outstanding people.

Rosemary is retiring on March 26, after 20 years of service to the citizens of Independence Township. Her job has not been easy. Civil service is often a thankless profession; there are many hardships and little glamor. But her role has been crucial to this community.

She was hired as an elections clerk in 1972. Then, as the area grew, her involvement grew as well. This week, 20 years later, Rosemary Howey will retire from her post as director of elections.

Rosemary has shown an unsurpassed commitment to voting, knowing that in local elections, one vote can make all the difference. In addition to her official capacity with elections, she also was a member of many local organizations such as the Oakland County Treasurers Association, the Oakland County Clerks Association, and the Waterford/Clarkston Business and Professional Women's Association. Both friends and colleagues recognize that her role in Oakland County should not be overlooked.

In her years of elections work, Rosemary Howey has certainly shown her commitment to the township of Independence. But she had another important commitment as well—her

family. Her 20 years working for Independence Township were balanced by 20 years she spent focused on her family. She has three children, Lynn, Mike, and Lon, and three grandchildren; in May, she and her husband Bob Howey will celebrate their 49th year of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure and extreme pride to join with Rosemary's family, friends, and all of Independence Township in thanking her for her steadfast and devoted years of public service. I wish her the best of life and health in her retirement.

**CARNEGIE COMMISSION HONORS
JACKSONVILLE HERO**

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Florida Times-Union of March 16 carried the following account of Michael Stewart and his heroic deed on Amelia Island September 15, 1990. Knowing that all of Congress and certainly I feel gratitude to this fine young man for what he did to save the life of another under very dangerous circumstances to himself. He deserves our warm congratulations and it is my honor to put the following account of these events in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as they were originally carried in the Florida Times-Union article.

CARNEGIE COMMISSION HONORS JACKSONVILLE HERO—RESCUER OF DROWNING MAN RECOGNIZED

(By Seth Feldman)

Michael Stewart of Jacksonville says he doesn't understand all the fuss. He did what he had to do to save a drowning man.

"From my perspective, it's not something you should be rewarded for," said Stewart, who rescued Samuel Tyson off the coast of Fernandina Beach on Sept. 15, 1990. "I never really looked at it as a heroic event."

The man whom Stewart saved respectfully disagrees. So does the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, which honored Stewart with a medal and a \$2,500 reward last week.

"I can't thank Mike enough, nor do I think he can be recognized enough for the great deed he did," said Tyson, who was pulled from shore by a strong current. "He gave me the gift of life."

Consider it a birthday gift for both men. Stewart, who was celebrating his birthday that day, made sure Tyson would be around to celebrate his the next day.

Stewart, 42, is one of 17 heroes in the United States and Canada recognized last week for risking their own lives to save somebody else's. Since 1904, 7,621 people have received the award from the commission, set up in 1904 by industrial magnate Andrew Carnegie to honor civilians who performed heroic deeds and to provide financial assistance to deserving people.

It never occurred to Stewart that he was about to do something heroic when a party he was hosting was interrupted by screams that someone was drowning.

He stripped to his underwear and followed another friend into the water. The friend turned back, but Stewart kept going.

"It's amazing how quickly it happened," he said. "One minute I was standing there,

and the next thing I knew, I looked back and saw how far out from shore we were. Then I realized this is serious stuff.

"If I would have thought about it for a while, he [Tyson] might have been in trouble."

"I was totally exhausted and hyper-ventilating," said Tyson, 53, of Atlanta. "I just laid back and started drifting farther out."

When Stewart caught up to Tyson, he used the skills he learned as an Eagle Scout to carry Tyson back to shore.

Since then, Stewart has been lauded by his employers at Southern Bell, the Boy Scouts and the Carnegie commission.

"All the attention is kind of embarrassing," the Northside man said. "I happened to be there, and I happened to have the skills. It was something you don't think about—you just do it."

SOJOURNER TRUTH CHURCH: 20 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 20th anniversary of Sojourner Truth Presbyterian Church of Richmond, CA.

The pride and clearness of focus exhibited by this predominantly African-American congregation fully lives up to the ideals of its namesake, Sojourner Truth. Born in 1797, and freed from slavery in 1828, Sojourner Truth dedicated her life to the liberation of the black people from the inhumanities inflicted upon them in the name of slavery. Today, Sojourner Truth Church carries on in this tradition.

As leaders in their community, the members of Sojourner Truth Church, under the direction of Rev. Eugene Farlough, actively work toward the betterment of the entire community. Their participation and support of any number of community service programs has had a direct impact on the lives of countless individuals, and their guidance has helped many stay on a safe and progressive course.

I feel fortunate to have the opportunity to work with Sojourner Truth Church, and look forward to continuing this special relationship for many years to come.

THE AUDIO HOME RECORDING ACT OF 1992

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation entitled the "Audio Home Recording Act of 1992." The bill provides for the incorporation of the serial copy management system in all digital audio recorders and interface devices, prohibits on certain copyright infringement actions, and establishes a royalty payment system.

Digital audio technology has been around for several years. Compact discs are exam-

ples of digital technology. In the mideighties, consumer electronics companies decided to market a new wave of digital audio technology to American consumers—the digital audio recorder. Unlike the familiar analog audio recorder, the digital audio recorder is capable of making virtually perfect copies of source music. With analog recorders, as one continues to make copies from copies, the sound quality deteriorates. With digital audio recorders, on the other hand, multigenerational copies—from the 1st generation to the 15th generation—maintain virtually perfect sound quality.

Due to the precision of digital audio recording technology, the recording companies, music publishers, artists, musicians and others in the recording industry have been afraid that the digital audio recorders will increase copying by consumers and illegal bootleg companies, thereby reduce sales and royalties. For this reason, the recording industry threatened lawsuits against manufacturers that considered making digital audio recorders available to American consumers. The music publishers and songwriters eventually did sue a manufacturer. This has had a chilling effect on the manufacturers, who to this date have not made digital audio recording technology widely available to American consumers.

The Audio Home Recording Act of 1992, breaks the deadlock. It will make this innovative technology widely available to American consumers. This significant legislation has three principal provisions.

First, the Audio Home Recording Act of 1992 requires consumer electronics manufacturers, importers, and distributors to incorporate the serial copy management system into all digital audio recorders and interface devices. The serial copy management system allows consumers to make unlimited copies of original source music, yet it prohibits multigenerational copying of copyrighted music.

Second, the legislation prohibits certain infringement actions. A copyright holder cannot sue for infringement based on the manufacture, importation, or distribution of digital or analog audio recorders or media. In addition, consumers are protected from infringement suits based on the use of these items.

Third, manufacturers and importers must pay a small royalty fee on each digital audio recorder and medium ultimately made available to consumers. The money paid into the royalty fund will be distributed to interested copyright parties to compensate for any loss of royalties due to home copying by consumers. There will continue to be no royalties on analog tape recorders or tapes used by these recorders. The fees are very modest—2 percent of the transfer price for recorders and 3 percent of the transfer price for media—and will have little impact upon consumer prices.

Mr. Speaker, the Audio Home Recording Act of 1992 is a model compromise, agreed to through difficult negotiation by the recording industry, electronic industry, and the copyright coalition of songwriters and music publishers.

It will ensure that American consumers have access to the newest and best technology.

It will provide an incentive for consumer electronics manufacturers to continue to produce innovative technology and for record-

ing companies to develop prerecorded music to support that technology.

It will once and for all resolve a multitude of lawsuits surrounding the recording of copyrighted materials, and will clearly establish the right of consumers to make copies for their own use and noncommercial use.

It should have a beneficial effect on trade relations by allowing American artists to receive reciprocity royalties from foreign countries that already have royalty protection from home taping. Currently, many countries have such systems in place, but will not allow American artists to get their share of royalties, because the United States does not have a royalty system in place from which the foreign artists could benefit.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Audio Home Recording Act of 1992, will make sure that copyright holders are compensated for the use of their work.

Mr. Speaker, the Audio Home Recording Act of 1992 is legislation that is long overdue.

HONORING THE PRINCEMEN'S CHORUS

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highly commend the Lt. Norman Prince Senior Drum and Bugle Corps of the Veterans of Foreign Wars post in Melrose, MA for their outstanding service to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the United States. The members of the Princemen's Chorus have contributed greatly to our Nation through bravery in war and community service at home. I salute them.

The Princemen of the Veteran of Foreign Wars Post No. 1506 in Melrose, MA takes its name from Lt. Norman Prince of Massachusetts who exemplified the spirit of heroism and courage during World War I—in fact, this tradition is also being carried out by many of the Princemen sons who served our country in the recent Persian Gulf crisis.

Originally founded as the Sacred Hearts Crusaders from Sacred Hearts Church in Malden, MA almost 50 years ago, the Princemen's Chorus has preserved the spirit of Lt. Norman Prince through military service in World War II, Korea, and Vietnam and civic service in the community. The Princemen's Chorus represents unity in the truest form—they grew up together in Massachusetts, fought as comrades in arms, raised their families together, and worked to build their community together.

The Princemen's Chorus are National World Champions recognized in the Allentown, PA Hall of Fame. The chorus' performances bring hope, patriotism and entertainment to the veterans, elderly and other groups in Massachusetts and I am extremely honored to recognize them for their continuing service to America. I personally thank them for the outstanding service to the United States and especially Massachusetts.

HAITIAN REFUGEES

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, despite reports of torture, of shootings, of beatings, of harassment, even of murder, our Government has forcibly repatriated thousands of Haitians fleeing the political chaos that envelops their beleaguered island nation.

And despite the mandate of the House of Representatives, the Bush administration continues to advocate a policy which sends those fleeing the turmoil and bloodshed back to an uncertain, and perhaps catastrophic, fate.

Mr. Speaker, this refusal to recognize repression and to support its victims is not in the great tradition of American compassion as noted in a recent letter to the editor of one of my local newspapers. F. Russell Millin of Kansas City adapts the classic poem of Emma Lazarus to read:

Give me your tired, your poor, your
Huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to
me.

But not the Haitian or the dark-skinned refugees

'Tis not for them I lift the lamp beside the
golden door.

This update of a quintessentially American poem was made necessary by recent actions of the executive and judicial branches of government.

NATIONAL DIABETES AWARENESS DAY

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize National Diabetes Awareness Day, March 24, 1992. Millions of Americans are afflicted with diabetes, and this national day of recognition can help raise awareness of this major health issue. In central Illinois alone, which includes my congressional district, there are about 200,000 diabetes sufferers.

I want to commend the fine work of those who serve diabetes victims, including the nurses, physicians, nonphysician practitioners and health professionals, researchers, educators, and families. They are working diligently to help diabetes victims cope with their affliction, and play a crucial role in battling diabetes. I applaud their efforts.

I urge my colleagues and the American people to recognize the victims of diabetes and those who serve them on Diabetes Awareness Day, and throughout the year.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUPPORT A REAL NATIONAL ENERGY STRATEGY: COSPONSOR HR. 4488, NUCLEAR REACTOR LICENSING ACT OF 1992

HON. JOE BARTON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to H.R. 4488, the Nuclear Reactor Licensing Act of 1992, a bill introduced last week by Mr. CLEMENT and myself to reform procedures and remove burdensome barriers in current law that are unnecessarily prohibiting any nuclear power plants from coming on line. The legislation is identical to language in S. 2166, the Senate national energy strategy [NES] bill, which passed the other body 94-4.

H.R. 4488 represents an integral pillar of President Bush's NES. Nuclear power currently makes up 20 percent of our Nation's electricity mix, second only to coal. All of the studies point to the fact that the United States will experience a tremendous increase for electricity capacity as we approach the 21st century. The type of electricity that will be needed is base load capacity—or power that is available for continuous distribution. After the capital costs are absorbed, nuclear power is the cheapest, environmentally safest, and most reliable form of energy available.

During last summer's record heat wave, officials at the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland power pool [PJM], which delivers electricity to almost 10 percent of the Nation, admitted that the power they got from the nuclear plants in their power pool was the most reliable and cheapest source of energy. This was when the system was experiencing unprecedented demand for power. Without the current supply of nuclear energy, there would have most likely been several disruptions of service.

However, despite America's leadership in safely and efficiently generating large scale nuclear power, the NES states that orders for over 100 nuclear power plants have been abandoned or indefinitely delayed since the early 1970's. Unless the Nation's existing plants are allowed expedited license renewal, a large source of the U.S. energy supply will be eliminated. Because of unfounded concerns over the safety of nuclear power, no commercial nuclear power plants have been ordered since 1978.

It is my goal to revitalize the nuclear option. In order to do this, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission licensing process needs to be reformed. Currently, the process involved in getting a nuclear plant from blueprint to generation allows opponents of nuclear power to indefinitely delay and virtually prevent any new construction of nuclear power plants. Under this regulatory system, utilities are not willing to take the risk of investing their stockholders' capital in a venture that will assuredly be drawn out and eventually canceled.

The legislation Mr. CLEMENT and I have introduced will establish an equitable and constructive licensing process where concerns of all parties are addressed. Under H.R. 4488, the public will be given three opportunities to

March 25, 1992

discuss and debate safety issues before construction on the plant begins. The bill will allow license applicants to receive a combined license to operate and construct a nuclear plant if they can prove it will be operated safely and meet the testing and safety requirements under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. During the process, the NRC's decision to issue a combined license is subject to judicial review.

Most importantly, H.R. 4488 would allow the continued construction of nuclear power plants if a post-construction hearing was granted. As elsewhere in the bill, the NRC would only allow for continued construction if it could be done safely. Of course, the whole process described is subject to judicial review.

I am very determined, as is Mr. CLEMENT, to reform the nuclear regulatory process that has prevented even one nuclear plant from being ordered in the last 14 years. Enacting comprehensive energy strategy without the consideration of making nuclear power a viable option would be irresponsible. A little over 1½ years ago, Congress passed the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. If we learned anything out of that process, it should be that nuclear power must maintain and increase its role in our Nation's energy policy.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 4488, and bring Congress closer to implementing a real national energy strategy.

I AM ANGRY

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, we need a national health insurance ensuring health care for everyone, regardless of employer or employment status.

The following letter from a woman from Virginia describes, in better words than I can, what is wrong with the current system.

She says she is angry. She should be—she lives in a nation where the President keeps talking about how wonderful the health care system is, but in truth it is the only industrialized nation that does not guarantee health care for all its citizens. She should be more than angry—she should be furious.

The letter follows:

I am writing to you to express my concern over the deterioration of access to health care and my support for federal government leadership in implementation of major reform of the health care delivery system in the United States.

I am sharing my story with you only as evidence of the erosion of the ability of an average American to receive medical care. The details may be unique to me but my situation is becoming increasingly common.

I recently had to change jobs because my former employer was in financial trouble, and involved in a merger. I was in a race to find a job before I was let go. Adding to the stress of the situation was the concern over my ability to continue to receive medical insurance coverage. I had to have neurosurgery in November 1990 to remove a cranial tumor and have to be monitored because it is likely to recur.

I was very fortunate to find another job, but my fear of losing medical insurance cov-

erage came true. My new employer's insurance carrier will give me only limited coverage, excluding permanent treatment for any condition arising from or related to the tumor that was removed and the procedure that was performed. For good measure I was even excluded from treatment for accidental injury to that part of my head.

With no choice because I need major follow-up tests to be sure that everything's healed properly, I have had to COBRA with my former employer's insurance carrier at my expense. This is a severe financial hardship but without the COBRA coverage I can't afford either the tests or follow-up surgery if needed.

At the end of the eighteen-month COBRA period I am left with no access to medical care for my condition. Sure I can apply for coverage to my old COBRA carrier, but realistically what are the chances of being accepted for full coverage at a rate that I can pay? And on my own I can't pay the astronomical costs for tests or surgery. I am an Administrative Assistant not a high-salaried executive.

I am angry. Working Americans have no health care support system outside of the private medical insurance our employers are willing or able to provide and the coverage these private insurance carriers are willing to give. If I were unemployed I could at least get the coverage I need from Medicaid. Since I have a job and am actually paying taxes to support the Medicaid system, I'm ineligible to use it.

If I become unable to work because I can't get care for a treatable health condition, I become a drag on the economy. A productive asset will be lost. The multiplier effects of my income will be lost. My tax revenue will be lost and I will become a drain on the decreased tax revenue base. Multiply that times the growth number of Americans shut out of the health care system because the safety net for working Americans is unraveling and consider the economic impact.

America has the best medical care in the world, with procedures that are state of the art and bordering on the miraculous. But the process of delivering that care is antiquated and inefficient.

Today medical costs are increasing almost exponentially, with doctors, hospitals, insurance companies, and lawyers all assigning blame to each other while more and more Americans are cut off from something as basic as food, shelter and health care. It's obvious that those inside the health care system are unable or unwilling to provide services at reasonable costs and because of that the private sector is unable or unwilling to continue supporting a needed social good. The time has past when the problem can be ignored or left to some wishful free-market solution. We need action at the national level.

SALUTE TO TIMOTHY HENRICK

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Timothy Henrick, a police officer from Methuen, MA who had lost more than two-thirds of his blood after being shot during a scuffle with a burglar last Christmas. I am proud to report, Mr. Speaker, that this week Timothy Henrick will be leaving the Northeast

Rehabilitation Hospital in Salem, NH on his own two feet.

Mr. Henrick is a brave public servant and an inspiration to us all. Three months ago, his right femoral artery was served by a bullet during the course of duty. Doctors have called his recovery "miraculous." And, given the fact that he suffered from at least 10 different afflictions which could have killed him, his swift recovery is indeed nothing short of a miracle.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also take this moment to salute Mr. Henrick's family, whose faith and love must have had something to do with his recovery. His mother prayed daily on the rosary. His brother, Brian, vowed to give Timothy his baseball card collection if he recovered. And his father spoke to Timothy daily even when he was in a coma. While we are bombarded daily with negative information about the demise of family values, the Henrick family is truly an inspiration.

I salute Timothy Henrick and his family and wish them all well as he continues his miraculous recovery.

NUCLEAR TESTING

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that today the United States conducted a nuclear weapons test at the Nevada Test Site. The test, code named Junction, is the first one of the new year. It is also one too many.

We have known for years that our nuclear testing program no longer serves any meaningful national security objectives. Both the Reagan and Bush administrations have consistently warned us that nuclear testing must be continued if we are to insure the safety and reliability of our warheads and develop new weapon designs. These arguments never quite held up to scrutiny. Operational concerns about nuclear weapons, such as those regarding safety and reliability, can be clearly addressed through non-nuclear testing. And new weapons development should not even be a consideration. With the arms race now in complete reverse it is clear that there is no place in this world for new weapons with such exotic titles as earth penetrators and microwave weapons. What is obvious is that there is no reason to continue testing period.

At this moment in history, when we are working to prevent nuclear proliferation in the Commonwealth of Independent States, in the Middle East and in Asia, it is simply reckless and irresponsible that we continue a testing program that is being used to develop new and more sophisticated nuclear weapons. I urge my colleagues to support efforts to reduce the nuclear testing budget and consider a total moratorium on nuclear tests.

HONORING THE HUTCHINSON RIVER BOYS & GIRLS CLUB

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly difficult for our Nation's youth to avoid temptations and reach for their true potential, especially in many of our urban areas. It often takes the encouragement and support of the community to ensure that our young people are given outlets where they can grow and prosper. In my district, the youth activities committee of the Hutchinson River Boys & Girls Club provides this valuable service to the community.

For 16 years, YAC has developed a series of impressive programs that keep our children off the streets and focused on the future. From the evening teen lounge to the job readiness program to the stop the violence teen club, YAC continues to add to the variety and quality of its programs. What is most amazing about YAC is that all the programs are run by a small part-time staff supplemented by volunteers from the community. Executive director Gloria Wise does a masterful job of channeling this positive spirit into a well-organized group.

On behalf of the more than 700 children served by YAC, and for the entire community which benefits from the program, I offer congratulations and thanks to all those who make the Hutchinson River Boys & Girls Club work.

TRIBUTE TO LUCILE POWELL SINGLETON

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I was recently made aware of the untimely passing of one of America's radio pioneers, Miss Lucile Powell Singleton of Union Springs, AL.

On January 8, Miss Singleton passed away of influenza at the age of 98 in Roanoke, VA. She was buried in Oak Hill Cemetery, Union Springs on January 25.

Miss Singleton was hired by the newly formed Columbia Broadcasting System in 1929, and over the 30 years that made her career became an influential executive in the radio network's music department.

A CBS press release dating back to 1937 says Miss Singleton graduated with a B.A. from Randolph Macon College in Lynchburg, VA and went on to receive her M.A. in music from Wesleyan College in Macon, GA.

Upon graduation, Miss Singleton traveled to Washington, DC where she worked under a Harvard professor who was given government charge of closing down the Railroad Administration after the end of World War I. In 1923, she was employed by Harvard University to assist the professor in the field of railroad statistics.

The 1937 release notes that Miss Singleton traveled to New York a few years later to

study voice, theory, harmony, and piano. It was during her musical studies that she came into contact with CBS Radio's program department. It so happens the network was in need of someone who possessed her unique mixture of business sense and musical training. She was hired.

As radio quickly advanced into what we now call its "Golden Age," Miss Singleton played a key role in managing CBS musical talent. She began her broadcast career auditioning singers and arranging their contracts, and later expanded into managing the network's cast of singers, determining which artists should appear on a particular program.

According to a recent Birmingham Post-Herald story, Miss Singleton introduced a variety of stars to network broadcasting, including legends Arthur Godfrey, opera singer Ilene Farrell, Perry Como, and Bert Parks.

The news story also noted that Miss Singleton gained national prominence in the late 1930's when she placed the first black performers on national radio. Reportedly, she insisted to CBS president William Paley that Tuskegee University's Jubilee Gospel Singers be allowed to perform. Paley consented, and the rest is history.

The Singleton family notes that Lucile was a very modest individual who shunned recognition and fanfare. Her life was a true testament to the dedication to excellence and traditional values that made this country great. For Alabamians, Miss Singleton was a legend in her own right.

A BILL TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE OF FEDERAL WORKERS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, over the last several months this Congress and the American public have been involved in an intense debate about the health care situation in this country. With 37 million Americans without health insurance and 60 million more who are underinsured, no one argues that the state of health care in America has reached a crisis level.

While we debate the best solution to this problem, whether its single payer, pay-or-play, expanded Medicare or whatever the ultimate solution, we must not overlook some of the loopholes in current law that have allowed employers, including the Federal Government to deny health care coverage to its employees.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, some of those 37 million Americans who are uninsured are Federal workers. Under current law the Federal employees who are categorized as temporary or seasonal workers qualify for health insurance only after they have worked for 1 consecutive year. After a temporary employee has worked at the same job for 1 consecutive year they become eligible for health insurance, however they must pay the employer contribution as well as the employee contribution.

Although this seems to be reasonable, many agencies within our own Government

have abused this provision in order to save a few dollars. Agencies hire temporary personnel, lay them off a few days short of their 1-year tenure, then rehire them several days later. All of this just to avoid having to provide health insurance and other employee benefits. This kind of abuse cannot be allowed to exist.

I have Federal workers in my district who have worked for the Federal Government for 15 years on a temporary basis. I fail to see how the Government can consider a 15-year job a temporary job. This is absurd. These people work the same hours as full-time employees, have the same responsibilities as full-time employees, and yet they are denied health care coverage to save the Government a few bucks.

The bill I have introduced today would close this loophole and require Federal employees categorized as "temporary" or "seasonal" receive the health benefits of a full-time employee if they have worked in the same agency and same job for a total of 1 year. Unlike current law, this service would not have to be consecutive, which has allowed Federal employers to lay these individuals off just before a full year's employment and escape medical coverage requirements. Also, my bill would only require temporary and seasonal workers to pay the employee portion of the health premium.

Under this legislation, if a temporary employee is rehired by the same agency to fulfill the same job, his/her previous Federal service at that job within the preceding 2 years will be used to determine eligibility for medical coverage. If an employee had 11 months of previous service they would only need to complete 1 more month of Federal service in order to qualify for health coverage.

We must take this first step in providing for the workers of our Nation. As we continue to search for a solution to the health care crisis, how can we mandate that employers provide coverage or that States provide coverage if we do not provide health insurance for our own workers?

Unfortunately, this type of abuse and side-stepping of responsibility to workers is pervasive not only in the Federal Government but permeates the State and local level as well. Although my bill does not cover these workers, I believe that it is the responsibility of this Congress to see that all employees, full-time, temporary, contract workers are offered some kind of health care coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleague to join me in taking the first step toward universal health care coverage in our Nation. Let's take care of our Federal workers and support this legislation.

PRESIDENT BUSH IS ON A COLLISION COURSE WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, President Bush is on a collision course with the American people. And I believe he's going to find out that

Oklahomans, like Americans across the country, will know the difference between false promises and real action.

In one direction, there's the President, protector of privilege, defender of the status quo. In the other, the Democrats, the party of change and champion of the working people of this country.

Insensitive to the crushing realities of this current recession, the President voiced his veto of the middle-class tax cut even before the bill was voted on in Congress.

This country, the working men and women struggling to make ends meet, needs a middle-class tax cut. Those who say we don't are simply out of touch with the harsh realities of this Republican-driven recession. Anyone in Oklahoma trying to stretch a budget to pay for groceries, meet medical expenses, and make rent or mortgage payments on a home knows the true value of an extra week's take-home pay.

The Democratic tax cut does just that. While not increasing the Federal budget deficit, the middle-class tax cut will spur the economy, help create jobs, and boost consumer confidence.

The people want action. Congress responded. The President set deadlines, and Congress met them. The ball is now in the President's court. The American people are tired of excuses, tired of blaming others.

Actions speak louder than words. If the President is truly serious about helping the forgotten middle class, he must demonstrate leadership and the conviction to stand up for what we all know is right.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD ABESS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, March 28, 1992, marks the 88th birthday anniversary of an amazing man. Miami has a first citizen and that person is Leonard Abess.

The economic viability of south Florida is in great part due to Leonard Abess' efforts. Starting from scratch in the depth of the 1920's Depression he worked to recreate a revitalized Miami. Though he has accumulated substantial wealth his greatest effort has been to help the less fortunate. Long before there was United Way, there was a Community Chest. When Community Chest was short of funds, Leonard Abess went to the bank and signed personally for the money Community Chest needed.

When Jewish doctors on Miami Beach had trouble with permission to use hospitals there, Leonard, with some of his friends, created Mount Sinai Medical, a leading hospital in medical care, research, and teaching.

Leonard is a former president of Mount Sinai, and now his son, Leonard, Jr., is the president. Likewise, as Leonard was the City National Bank of Miami's longtime president, Leonard, Jr. is now its president.

He is still very active, playing golf and enjoying his family, including his grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Leonard has already created a great legacy and he's not done yet; 88 years

and still going strong. We in Miami love Leonard Abess, and he deserves every bit of it.

TRIBUTE TO PERCELLUS JONES

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Percellus Jones, Jr., as he retires from 26 years of dedication to the East Side House Settlement in the South Bronx. Mr. Jones has devoted nearly four decades of his life to community service, committing himself wholeheartedly to serving our people and responding to their needs.

A native New Yorker, Mr. Jones P.S. 5, Frederick Douglass Junior High School 139 and DeWitt Clinton High School. He obtained his BA degree from the City College of New York, working in the garment industry during the day and attending classes at night. Mr. Jones then joined the Children's Village in Dobbs Ferry, NY, as head counselor for emotionally disturbed youth. Two years later, in 1957, Mr. Jones began his career with the social and community services division of the New York City Housing Authority as a housing community activities coordinator at the Bronx River Neighborhood Center. Then, while pursuing a graduate degree in social work, Mr. Jones carried out field work at the Patterson Center Y.W.C.A.

After receiving his masters degree in social work from the Hunter College School of Social Work, Mr. Jones joined the Manhattanville Community Center as program supervisor. Two years later, in 1965, Mr. Jones began his association with the East Side House Settlement, working first as center director of the Patterson Community Center, then as program director of the settlement and finally as associate director, the position from which he is now retiring.

And Mr. Jones' involvement with the community has not been limited to his work with the East Side House Settlement. He has been actively involved with the Bronx Board of the New York Urban League; the South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors; the Melrose-Mott Haven Senior Citizen Centers; and the social service study group of New Directions—the Bronx Borough President's Regional Planning Committee. He has also been a contract supervisor for the Protestant Council of New York; a field work instructor at the Hunter School of Social Work; a training instructor for the Institute for Mediation and Conflict Resolution; and a member of various United Neighborhood Houses committees.

Throughout his life, Mr. Jones has demonstrated an exemplary commitment to his fellow people and his dedication has not gone unrecognized. In 1990, Mr. Jones received a papal blessing from His Holiness Pope Paul II for his work with the homeless. That same year he was also honored as "Man of the Year" by St. Benedict the Moor Service Center for his work with the center. Last year Mr. Jones was awarded the Centennial Distinguished Service Award by the East Side

House Settlement Board for his invaluable years of service. Today, on behalf of the entire south Bronx community, I would like to express to Mr. Jones our deep gratitude for his invaluable contributions to our community and wish him good health, long life, and all the best in the years ahead.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF REV. PERRY EVANS

HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the retirement of a truly remarkable man. A man whose dedication and love have pushed him to achieve lofty goals in his personal life and in the community. A man who has given of himself freely to those who ask for his assistance. Today, I have the pleasure to speak to my distinguished colleagues of the House about Rev. Perry E. Evans who, after 55 years, is retiring from the Faith Baptist Church.

Pastor Evans is a unique individual who has shown leadership in the community and in the church. He has served in various leadership positions in local, State, and national levels in the Baptist organizations, among them the former treasurer of the foreign mission board of the National Baptist Convention. Pastor Evans has dedicated his life to helping others and spreading the word of God throughout our great Nation and the world. His dedication can truly be seen in his term of service at Faith Baptist Church, a period of 55 years. In light of this fact, it can be seen that Pastor Evans is a man with strong convictions and the desire to see them through. It was not uncommon for Reverend Evans to be working 7 days a week at all hours of the day and night. This dedication is an example to all of us as we strive to achieve our best.

In June of this year, Reverend Evans will turn 96 years old. He has been married for 75 years to Mary Julia Evans. His commitment to God and his teachings can be seen in the blessing he has received from God. Reverend Evans has been rewarded for his good honest work with a long, memorable life and a lovely and caring wife, should we all be so lucky.

Reverend Evans is a testament to all of us and an example of what hard work, dedication and faith can accomplish. It is my honor to bring Reverend Evans to the attention of this institution so that all will know of this final human being and of his accomplishments.

SALUTE TO CHARLES F. WAGNER

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has spent 39 years of his life in public service, the last 31 of those in Santa Barbara County. My constituent, Mr. Charles F. Wagner, will retire on

March 27 from his post as administrative officer of Santa Barbara County.

Chuck started his career in Santa Barbara in 1961 as a civil engineer with the county road commissioner, and in 1976, he was appointed public works director. His appointment in 1989 to be county administrative officer capped a long career of public service. His professional demeanor and personal style have always been appreciated and will be missed by all.

Chuck's life in Santa Barbara has always been more than just professional. He has taken a keen interest in many aspects of community and family development. Chuck has devoted much of his time to coaching sports for local organizations, including the Goleta Boys Club, the Goleta Valley Girls Club, and the Youth Football League. He is also the recipient of numerous community awards, including the United Way Campaigner of the Year, Santa Barbara County Management Association's Executive of the Year, the County Supervisor's Circle of Service Award, and the Honorary Service Award from the Goleta Council of PTA's.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Santa Barbara County Administrative Officer Chuck Wagner on the completion of a 39-year career in public service. I wish him and his wife of 38 years, Jean, a wonderful retirement and all the best.

TRIBUTE TO NEW HAMPSHIRE'S SALEM HIGH SCHOOL

HON. DICK SWETT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding school in my home State—Salem High School. In recognition of the achievements of its students, this school was recently selected by the national magazine Red Book as the best high school in New Hampshire.

At a time when the shortcomings and failures which plague our Nation's educational system are all too evident, it is particularly encouraging to learn of the tremendous success of this school.

Located in a southern New Hampshire community of approximately 26,000, Salem High's growing academic accomplishments are truly remarkable. In 1986 its percentage of college-bound graduates was only 48 percent. Today that number is up to 72 percent, with an impressive 99 percent graduation rate.

Mr. Speaker, the students of Salem High shine, not just in academics, but also in community service, athletics, and artistic achievement. They were leaders in organizing the Eighteenth Annual Model United Nations which is taking place this week in New Hampshire. Every year the students organize this event, doing everything from designing and printing programs to arranging for the participation of other high schools from surrounding communities.

Salem High's students are also active in their community. When my office recently received a letter from a local food pantry in need

of assistance, the students of Salem High and Woodbury Junior High eagerly responded by organizing food drives.

Whether it is organizing events, caring for the needy, or striving for the academic gold, the students of Salem High are truly a success story.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting these fine young students and the dedicated faculty and staff of this outstanding school.

A TRIBUTE TO ADEM DEMACI,
PATRIOT OF KOSOVA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, Adem Demaci, the peaceful patriot of Kosova who spent 28 years of his life behind bars in Communist Yugoslavia because of his political beliefs, is an inspiring symbol of democracy's victory over communism. A free man today, Mr. Demaci is visiting the United States for the first time. Today he will be meeting Members of Congress and human rights leaders in Washington. On the occasion of his visit, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming him to our Nation's capital and in paying tribute to him today.

Mr. Demaci was born in 1936 to a family in Prishtina, Kosova. As a young man, he went to Belgrade as a student of literature and began to write on the many social evils confronting his society. He achieved a reputation as an extremely promising writer, and in 1958 wrote his first novel "The Serpents of Blood," a compelling indictment of the vendetta custom. A celebrated work, his novel made him famous overnight.

Addressing social issues such as poverty disease, illiteracy, and discrimination, Mr. Demaci became politicized. He was a young man of ideas, and his writings on social injustice and discrimination, particularly against ethnic Albanians, were explosive. As an intellectual force behind the movement for self-determination for Kosova, he was seen by the Communists in Yugoslavia as a threat to the regime. For this he paid a dear price.

He was arrested in 1958 and accused of "agitation and propaganda against the State". After serving 3 years in a Belgrade prison, he was rearrested in 1964 for "irredentism" and he spent 10 more years behind bars. He was released in 1974. After only a few months of freedom, he was arrested again and charged with calling for a popular referendum in Kosova in which the people of Kosova would vote on self-determination. He was tried and sentenced to 15 years imprisonment.

During his incarceration, Mr. Demaci was adopted as a prisoner of conscience by Amnesty International, and supported by many international organizations as a person who had not used, nor advocated, the use of violence.

Adem Demaci was released from prison in 1990, and today he is free of Communist tyranny. Aged and wise, he is not a bitter man. To the contrary, he strives for reconciliation and friendship between peoples.

As a missionary of good will, he received the European Parliament's prestigious Andrea Sakharov Prize. He is also the chairman of the Council for the Defense of Human Rights and Freedoms of the People of Kosova.

Mr. Speaker, Adem Demaci stood in proud and just defiance against the illegitimate Communist government of Yugoslavia. Indeed, his courage is inspiring. He has paid a great price for his ideas, having spent half of his life in prison for them. But he and his ideas have truly prevailed. On the occasion of his first visit to the Land of the Free, I extend my best wishes to this great champion of democracy and I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring him today.

PROPOSED DUTY RECLASSIFICATION FOR 1,6-HEXAMETHYLENE DIISOCYANATE [HDI]

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. DELAY and I introduced a miscellaneous tariff bill, H.R. 4232, on behalf of Rhone Poulenc, Inc. [RPI]. RPI manufactures polyisocyanate resins at a facility in Freeport, TX, for use by the U.S. paint manufacturing industry in the production of polyurethane coatings. These laminates are complex chemical structures which demonstrate extraordinary durability. Due to their exceptional strength and stability, they have become the coating of choice among manufacturers of various types of military equipment, as well as among automobile manufacturers. In connection with its formulation of such advanced resins, RPI imports a key raw material known as 1,6-hexamethylene diisocyanate, or HDI.

Effective January 1, 1989, the United States converted its system of commodity classification for tariff purposes to the Harmonized Tariff System, developed pursuant to the Tokyo round of GATT negotiations, which is widely used throughout the world today. At the time of conversion, the administrative reclassification of HDI caused its duty to increase more than 100 percent, from 7.9 percent ad valorem to 16.2 percent ad valorem plus \$.029 per kilogram. This increase resulted entirely from the technical process by which conversion to HTS was implemented and did not reflect any affirmative determination that a higher duty on HDI was either warranted or appropriate.

The Customs and Trade Act of 1990 provided a temporary duty reduction on HDI to the level predating U.S. conversion to HTS. That reduction, imposed for a 4-year period beginning January 1, 1989, remains in effect until 1993. This legislative tariff reduction substantiates the legislative intent underlying the conversion to HTS that conversion should be revenue neutral with respect to reclassified commodities. Inasmuch as that rationale shall maintain after the scheduled expiration of the existing duty reduction applicable to HDI, RPI now seeks to have HDI reclassified in a manner that will impose a 7.9-percent duty rate on a permanent basis.

Such action will assure that RPI remains a reliable source of polyurethane resins for its

downstream customers in the automotive and aerospace industries. Moreover, the establishment of a 7.9-percent ad valorem duty will preclude the need to increase prices in order to absorb the presently scheduled duty increase and will eliminate the attraction of implementing a strategy of exporting manufactured resins in order to obtain duty drawbacks, both actions which will be harmful to U.S. consumers. Finally, in light of past market conditions, such action should not be expected to harm any domestic manufacturer of HDI because supplies of domestically produced HDI have been consumed entirely in-house. That market condition, combined with the fact that such domestic manufacturers compete directly with RPI in downstream product lines, suggests that domestic producers of HDI could not be considered a reliable source of RPI. On this basis, the reclassification of HDI represents sound economic policy as well as sound trade policy.

IN HONOR OF DR. LORETTA E. SCUDERI

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor an extraordinary educator and civic leader from Philadelphia, Dr. Loretta E. Scuderi, and congratulate her on her recent retirement.

Dr. Scuderi has served the Philadelphia public school system for over 34 years as a teacher, a principal, and, for the past 18 years, a district superintendent. She has devoted her life to the education of Philadelphia's youth, and she knows the educational process inside and out.

She began her career as a teacher at an elementary school in Philadelphia in 1958, and within just a few years' time she had moved on to lead a school as principal. Dr. Scuderi later went on to head, with dedication and distinction, three school districts in Philadelphia as superintendent. During this period, she somehow found the time to earn her doctorate in education from the University of Pennsylvania, which she received in 1977.

Dr. Scuderi has authored education texts, produced and taught an educational television series, lectured at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, and represented the district superintendents on several planning and policy committees in Philadelphia.

Her achievements in education are matched by her involvement in the community. She is a member of countless civic and professional organizations. Dr. Scuderi served as president of the education alumni association at the University of Pennsylvania and vice president of the Philadelphia Council of Administrative Women in Education.

Dr. Scuderi has received numerous honors and awards, including Woman of the Year from the Order Sons of Italy in America in 1975, the Legion of Honor from the Chapel of Four Chaplains, and a distinguished service award from the Black Educational Forum, just to name a few.

I have know Dr. Scuderi and her husband, Judge Peter Scuderi, for many years. They both love the city of Philadelphia, and their contributions to our community are invaluable. If her past record in any indication, Dr. Scuderi will be an active and essential part of Philadelphia for a long time to come. I wish her the best in her retirement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION ACT OF 1992

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Representatives DON EDWARDS, BUD CRAMER, MICHAEL KOPETSKI, and JIM RAMSTAD, in introducing the National Child Protection Act of 1992. This bill will help prevent children from being abused and victimized when they receive care outside their homes.

I want to thank the cosponsors of this legislation, especially Congressman EDWARDS and his staff, for their hard work in putting this legislation together.

Past and ongoing investigations of child abuse conducted by the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families have found that abuse of children in child care settings requires serious attention. In 1990, there were more than 2.5 million reports of child abuse and neglect, which represents a 100 percent jump since 1980. While most abuse occurs in the child's home or by someone well known to the child, an alarming number of abusive situations occur while children are in care outside of their homes or participating in organized youth activities.

As a Nation, we must take every precaution that we can to protect our children from this inexcusable harm. This measure will provide needed safeguards to ensure that children are not unnecessarily exposed to potentially harmful situations.

Our bill will establish a national repository of Federal and State child abuse criminal records for States to access to do criminal background checks on potential and current child care providers and volunteers with youth service organizations. This act will help build the State and national systems necessary to prevent convicted criminals from being hired in these settings. It will provide \$20 million in direct Federal assistance to help States to improve their criminal justice records. The legislation includes specific timetables so that accurate, up-to-date information on child abuse convictions will be available on a national basis within 3 years. The bill includes safeguards to ensure that information provided is accurate and up-to-date, and includes only convictions of abuse.

The National Child Protection Act of 1992 will enable States to respond to requests from employers and youth service organizations who want criminal background checks conducted on any current or prospective employee or volunteer who will be working with children.

The impetus for this legislation comes from the well-known child activist and television

personality Ms. Oprah Winfrey. A few months ago, several of my colleagues and I met with Ms. Winfrey. She expressed her genuine concern for the countless children who are needlessly victimized in this country and sought to enlist our support in introducing this legislation to protect them.

This legislation represents a first step to extend a measure of protection to children and their families. I ask my colleagues to join with us in cosponsoring this important legislation and to work with us as we try to develop other measures to ensure that our children are safe from abusive situations, be they in their own homes, in child care, or participating in recreational activities. Surely we owe our children this much.

IN HONOR OF PEARLE LANE

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to be able to recognize this year's East Longmeadow Lions Club 1992 Distinguished Citizen of the Year, Pearle Lane.

Mrs. Lane has lived in East Longmeadow, MA, for 32 years with her husband Paul. Since moving there, Mrs. Lane has been involved with numerous town organizations and activities. For example, during the past 26 years she has been an active member in the Women's Community Club of East Longmeadow. She has displayed her dedication not only by being involved as a member, but by also taking the initiative to become an officer. Presently, she is the secretary, but from 1975-77 she served as president, during which time she was a key player in the organizing of the town's bicentennial celebration.

She is also actively involved in the Garden Club, an organization which she presently serves as publicity chairman. With all of her projects, her most visible contribution is the assistance of local businesses to support the club's effort. Currently, and for the past 3 years, Mrs. Lane has been serving on the town's centennial committee, helping to plan the events for the town's 100th birthday in 1994.

Not only has Mrs. Lane contributed to the town, she has also contributed to the education of our Nation's children. She was a former teacher at the Talmadge School in Springfield, MA and presently she is a tutor for the blind in East Longmeadow as well as a substitute teacher in the public school system. She has also served as a Sunday School teacher for 13 years at the First Congregational Church in East Longmeadow.

Her dedication to children extends beyond the realm of the classroom. Mrs. Lane has also been a girl's basketball coach in the town's recreational league and a Girl Scout leader. In an unique effort, Mrs. Lane has been able to create ties with the elderly of the town through her involvement with children.

In her Sunday School classes and when she substitute teaches, Mrs. Lane encourages her students to make cards and pictures for

the elderly in the local nursing home, but only when they are done with their lessons. Also, she used to take her Girl Scout troop to visit the elderly and sing songs that she taught the girls from "the good old days" with the elderly.

In addition to these numerous town activities, Mrs. Lane still finds time to volunteer at the local PBS station, Channel 57 and also in Mercy Hospital in Springfield in the holding area for patients awaiting surgery.

Mrs. Lane's dedication to the town and to people of all ages is extraordinary. I especially applaud her dedication to teaching, for I was once a teacher myself and I understand how much effort it takes to teach a regular class, let alone specialized students. Congratulations on being chosen the East Longmeadow Lion's Club Distinguished Citizen of the Year 1992.

READ ME DAY

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mrs. Frankie DeWees, sent the following statement to me about "Read Me Day." I agree with the emphasis these concerned citizens have placed on the value of reading, and I would like to enter their statement into the RECORD:

READ ME DAY

Reading is important! Reading is fun! Reading is everywhere! This is the emphasis for a special reading celebration which culminates a month of reading activities at East Hickman School in Lyles, Tennessee.

Read Me day began in 1986 after classroom teacher Frankie DeWees saw an article in "Early Years Magazine" telling about teacher Suzanne Lampert of New Jersey and how her class wore printed shirts to school emphasizing that reading is everywhere.

Over the next 6 years the idea blossomed into a month long celebration of reading where community, businesses, celebrities and children all worked toward a common theme promoting the fun of reading.

Each year a theme is chosen that involves all 900 students grades K-8. Last year's theme was "Color Our World With Reading."

The month began last year with a special assembly. The guest speaker was singer, songwriter, storyteller and author, Mr. Tom T. Hall. Mr. Hall shared an original story that he had written called "A Human Being Visits Class." The story had a wonderful message for the children. The message was that regardless of class, creed, color, clothing or circumstance, that each person should ask of himself or herself each day: is there anybody in there? He was teaching the children to develop selfworth. He sang two songs he had written, "I Love Baby Ducks" and "Sneaky Snake."

Grades 3, 4 and 5 participated in a Create-a-Story contest where imaginations were allowed the freedom of fantasy.

All grades were involved in a poster contest where each student depicted a scene from his/her favorite book using any art medium.

Read-alerts were announced during the month for 5 minutes of uninterrupted reading.

In the library were two containers of M&M's—a large one for the upper grades and

a smaller one for the primary grades—with the legend "Reading Melts in your Mind." As children checked out books, they were given an opportunity to guess the number of M&M's in the appropriate container.

As books were turned in, the child was given an opportunity to add to the growing graphic running throughout the hallways of the school. Last year it was different colored books. In the past we have formed the world's longest worm, a train with hundreds of cars, trails of tennis shoes and rows of racing cars that went all the around the school.

This school year plans are being made to develop a graphic to go along with the theme "Explore and Discover Reading."

"Color Our World With Reading" proved to be a very exciting theme in 1991. Many classes read and studied about different countries. The halls of the school were filled with works of art and educational materials from the countries. There were guests who visited in classrooms throughout the month. They shared their knowledge and experiences about life in different countries with the children.

Individual teachers developed activities to promote reading within their classrooms. Many classrooms wrote letters to local and well known celebrities inviting them to come read with them on Read Me Day. Two special celebrities that the children have written to each year for the past 3 years are President and Mrs. George Bush. Although most celebrities could not come, many responded with letters and pictures. Other classrooms developed projects that resulted in each child's creating his/her own shirt to wear on Read Me Day. Three years ago the children in first grade created a special shirt for Mrs. Bush to wear on Read Me Day. The shirt is still at East Hickman and the children are in the third grade, but they are hoping that one day they will get to present it to Mrs. Bush. A few classrooms developed plays, readings and recitations to share with guests and other classes.

On Read Me Day, all faculty, students, and staff wore shirts with school appropriate messages on them. Parent participation was evident by the large number of personalized shirts that they had helped their children make. Even Superintendent Wayne Qualls got into the spirit of the day with his shirt declaring "The Boss."

Many classrooms had a guest who shared a favorite story, poem or essay. Many of the guests were from the community. Celebrities from the Grand Ole Opry, TV, radio, sports, and the press have been part of the classroom celebrations since the month long celebration began in 1987.

The reading of a proclamation from Governor McWhorter officially declaring the last Friday in April as Read Me Day in the State of Tennessee was the first order of business during a school wide assembly culminating Read Me Day activities. Our guest reader for the 1991 Read Me Day assembly was Superintendent of Hickman County Schools, Mr. Wayne Qualls. He read "Pierre," a cautionary tale about a boy who didn't care.

"Book 'Em," a group in Nashville, Tennessee with a goal to promote reading, has adopted Read Me Day as a culminating activity. Book 'Em is spreading the idea of Read Me Day with the hopes that it will someday be a national celebration.

April 24, 1992, has already been declared Read Me Day in several mid-State systems.

School systems across the United States are encouraged to join with us in celebration of reading. Wear something with a "school appropriate" message on it and allow some-

one to read to you! Reading is fun! Reading is important! Reading is everywhere!

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL TAX INCREASES

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, President Bush recently acknowledged that the tax increase provisions of the 1990 budget agreement were a mistake. The engineer of that controversial budget deal, Dick Darman, made a similar statement on Sunday.

Given the overwhelming consensus that those tax increases were indeed a mistake, I am today introducing, along with many of my colleagues, H.R. 4565. This legislation repeals \$154 billion of the income tax and excise tax increases enacted as part of the 1990 budget agreement.

Specifically, H.R. 4565 repeals the increase in the top tax rate to 31 percent; the increase in the alternative minimum tax; limits on itemized deductions; the phaseout of the personal exemption; excise tax increases; increases in highway, aviation, and gasoline taxes; new taxes on luxury items; new life insurance taxes; corporate tax increases; and Medicare, Social Security and unemployment payroll tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, the 1990 tax increases have seriously hampered our efforts to get the economy moving and people back to work. Studies show that we lost 400,000 jobs as a result of these tax increases, and most of the deficit reduction projected in the 1990 budget summit agreement has vanished as a result of the adverse impact of those new taxes on our economy.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider the Budget Process Reform Act, which would repeal the fiscal year 1993 discretionary spending caps. This would enable Congress to use defense savings to pay for increases in domestic spending rather than for deficit reduction.

Last year, House Democrats voted to break the budget agreement when it comes to scorekeeping. The only major provision that would remain is the largest tax increase in American history. It's only fair, then, that we should repeal the tax increases as well. If we're not going to use future defense savings to reduce the deficit, then the taxpayer, not special interest groups, should reap the benefits.

In light of the President's veto of the class warfare manifesto enacted by Congress last week, and the desire of many of my colleagues and I to continue pursuing a tax relief and economic growth package, I can think of no better medicine than to repeal the 1990 tax increases and require across-the-board spending cuts. In addition to stimulating the economy, H.R. 4565 will accomplish the original objectives of that budget agreement, which were to control the growth of Government spending, reduce the Federal deficit, and prevent a recession.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4565 is consistent with the President's position. I urge the rest of my

colleagues to join us in support of this legislation to repeal the misguided and counterproductive 1990 tax increases.

STUDENTS OF ADVANCED TRAINING INSTITUTE OF AMERICA TRAVEL TO MOSCOW

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to present before this assembly the following young people studying in the Advanced Training Institute of America. They were invited by the Government of the Republic of Russia to travel to Moscow last November and initiate a restructuring of the Moscow education system around character and Biblical principles.

These young people traveled to Moscow November 7-21 on an airliner chartered by the Soviet General Department of International Air Services specifically for them. During their time in the Russian capital, the students visited schools, churches, orphanages, and homes. The American youth were also involved in special meetings with business professionals, church leaders, and high level government officials of the Kremlin, the federation building, and the Moscow City Supreme Soviet.

Among those leaders with whom they met were four officials in education who flew to America January 18-26, 1992, in order to discuss further the implementation of a character training program in the Moscow school system. These officials include the deputy minister of education in Russia—also the head of the Moscow Public Education Department—the chairman of the Moscow City Council Education Committee of the Moscow City Parliament, the senior superintendent of Moscow schools, and the superintendent of the southwestern district of Moscow.

The following young people represent those of whom one of these officials said, "In fifteen years, Russia will be a different country, and I believe my people will remember these young people as the ones responsible for that change."

Shannon Afentul (OK), Stephen Alexander (CA), Danielle Allison (PA), Jonathan Allison (PA), Sean Allison (PA), Tiffany Allen (TX), Carolyn Andersen (MN), Lee Ann Andersen (MN), Laura Armitage (IL), Christina Armstrong (WA), Jonathan Arn (FL), Matthew Austin (IA), Melissa Austin (IA), Bambi Baer (KY), Samuel Baer (KY).

Trevor Balman (IL), Wendy Balman (IL), Kristine Banker (GA), Brock Banks (IA), Kimberly Barber (GA), Jeff Barnett (ID), Timothy Barringer (TN), Michael Behmer (AL), Angela Bender (OK), Shawna Bethune (IL), Robert Blair (FL), Kyler Boudreau (IL), Dawn Bovey (MO), Jonathan Boyd (TX), Candace Boyle (CT), Thomas Boyle (CT).

Brandi Brace (KS), Holly Brace (KS), Angela Brandel (ID), Melissa Brown (TX), Dixie Brown (TX), Pamela Brown (TX), Kitri Bultman (MI), Bert Bunn (VA), Adrian Burwell (TX), Holly Cannon (OK), Laura Caproni (WA), Lisa Cave (TX), Tracey Ann Collins (OH), Joel Conwell (KS), Corin Cooper (WA).

Kristi Copper (WA), Shawna Corley (TX), Yolanda Cowley (ID), David Cummings (WA), Jeff Cummings (WA), Grace Damen (OR), Karee Daniel (CA), Ashley Davis (GA), Matthew Davis (GA), Heiko Deifter (BC), Kirsten Deiter (BC), Teresa de la Garza (NC), Kevin Dennis (TX), Mandy Dennis (TX), Janna DePuc (SC), John Derr (OR).

Patricia Derr (OR), Ethan DeSota (MI), Todd Dixon (CA), Scott Domont (MI), Tiffany Donaldson (MT), Tracy Donaldson (MT), Kevin Douglass (NY), Katy Downhour (OH), Stephen Drake (OH), Tiffany Drake (CA), Susanna Dressler (IN), Annie DuBreuil (IL), Brian Duysings (WA), Philip Elie (MI), Timothy Elie (MI), Terri Ellison (TX).

Loren Elms (MI), Nils Engen (WA), David Evans (OK), Andrew Falk (IN), James Ferguson (OR), Michael Fessendoen (MO), Ashley Fitzgerald (GA), Christopher Fleming (GA), Todd Fluegge (MD), Quinn Ford (IN), Stephanie Flynn (IL), Lincoln Frakes (TX), David Frederick (OK), Jennifer Freeman (CA), Ruth Fritsch (WA).

Chad Fryer (GA), Ryan Fryman (OH), April Futhey (KS), Christian Gawin (WI), Craig Gendron (WI), Neil Gertner (CA), Mark Getz (IL), Stephanie Goranson (MN), Rebekah Greenlaw (TX), David Guy (TX), Shari Hallett (WI), Sharla Hallett (WI), Darren Hansen (BC), Laila Hansen (BC), Stephanie Hardwick (OH), Ellen Harmon (MI).

Nathan Hawkins (OR), Steven Hayes (OK), Titus Heard (OK), David Hill (OK), Karen Hill (OK), Tamara Hoaglund (IL), Clifford Holifield (MS), Matthew Hoopes (CA), Julie Hovey (TX), Rod Hovey (TX), Hope Howell (KS), Clay Hunt (TX), Craig Hunt (TX), Paul Hurt (WA), Beth Hurley (GA), Mark Ingham (CO), Prem Jacob (IL), Danielle Jensen (IL), Rochelle Jensen (CA), Kristen Johansson (CA), Daniel Johnson (AL), David Johnson (IL), Edward Johnson (CA), Thomas Johnson (CA), Jeffrey Jones (TX), Julie Jones (TX), Timothy Jones (IL), Trinnica Jones (OK), Angela Kellen (MI), Laura Killingsworth (GA), Anique Kinchen (TX), Nicole Kinchen (TX), Kirsten Kinzer (MN), Stacy Kirk (FL), Shellie Klein (OK), Michelle Krabill (OR), Kirstine Kristensen (ID), Jennifer Kuney (OK), David Lambert (IL), Jennifer Lamp (KS).

Wendy Lamp (KS), Nicholas Lancette (MT), Stacy Lawhorne (GA), Kathy Lawrence (CA), Karen Leddy (VA), Michael LeFebvre (OH), Deena Lent (GA), Erin Lester (KY), James Linn (TX), Timothy Love (WA), Dawn Marshall (MI), Joel Mattix (ID), Chad Max (MN), April May (TX), Jeremy McAllister (OR).

Leah McCann (TX), Nathan McCann (TX), Janie McFadin (TX), Sarah McFee (OR), Alan McKeen (MN), Nancy Ann McMillan (MS), Craig McNair (NZ), Mark McNair (NZ), Kristyn Meade (TX), Matthew Mears (IL), David Meeks (FL), Bruce Merrick (TX), Matthew Mitchell (MO), Laura Morgan (DE), Steven Nabors (GA), Ingrid Norman (NZ), Shelley Norman (NZ), Nathaniel O'Bryon (WI), Patrick Oja (MI), Robin Oja (MI).

Rebecca Olsen (VA), Kara Lee Olson (VA), Shannon O'Rourke (TN), Alexa Parmer (GA), Erica Panipinto (NY), Marc Perry (WA), Melissa Perry (WA), Karna Pickard (OK), Tamara Pierce (AL), Christina Pinkston (GA), Julie Popp (FL), Brian Pound (OR), Rebecca Pound (OR), Gregory Prescott (GA), Anthony Purkey (OR), Christiane Quick (NC), Kelly Quick (NC), Joshua Ramey (CA), Adam Randell (FL), Donna Reed (OH).

Sharon Reeder (TX), Joel Robbins (CA), Robert Robbins (CA), Kristin Roberson (IN), Candice Robinson (TX), Troy Robinson (MS), Dan Rosenquist (IL), Greg Rosenquist (IL), Stephen Ross (MI), Kieth Rumley (MI), Scott Rumley (MI), Cindy Sammons (TX), Scott Sammons (TX), Sandra Schmidt (IL), Phillip Schwind (CA), Michelle Sein (CO), Elizabeth Sharp (GA), Andy Shepherd (OK), Guy Sheperd (OK), Christy Shepley (NC), Michelle Shubin (OR).

Christopher Smith (NC), Joel Smythe (NY), Michelle Sommerfeld (MN), Rosalind Sommerfeld (MN), James Sorenson (WA), Monica Stahl (MI), Stephen Stahl (MI), Mark Stanley (MN), William Starks (FL), Joel Steege (OR), David Stockton (WA), Susan Stockton (TX), Michael Stolz (OH), Cherie Stubblefield (MO), Christie Stubblefield (MO), Tirikatene Sullivan (NZ), Brett Swank (MI), Jarrett Swank (MI), Brian Tenney (ID).

Tillery Timmons (TX), Raymond Tishenko (BC), Misty-Dawn Treadwell (CA), Eric True (CA), Heather True (CA), Pamela Tucker (TX), Jeffrey Ullrey (CO), Jerusha Umholz (FL), Susan Vaughn (TX), Victoria Vause (TX), Jeremy Von Ruden (OR), Kathleen Voyer (CA), Cynthia Voyer (CA), Amy Wall (GA), Bethany Wall (GA), Winston Walls (TX), Jennifer Walton (PA), Jill Walton (PA).

Jamie Ward (OK), Leah Watson (TX), Lucy Welch (AL), Robert Welch (AL), Deleese Weldon (TX), Julie Wilhite (CA), Christopher Wilkerson (MO), Lori Wilkerson (MO), Bret Williams (CA), David Winfrey (GA), Kelly Winfrey (GA), Crystal Winge (FL), Dawn Winge (FL), Page Winge (FL), Christina Yearden (WA), Steven Yoder (MN), Jason Young (MO), Lisa Youngberg (KS), Susan Youngberg (KS).

Jamie Ward (OK), Leah Watson (TX), Lucy Welch (AL), Robert Welch (AL), Deleese Weldon (TX), Julie Wilhite (CA), Christopher Wilkerson (MO), Lori Wilkerson (MO), Bret Williams (CA), David Winfrey (GA), Kelly Winfrey (GA), Crystal Winge (FL), Dawn Winge (FL), Page Winge (FL), Christina Yearden (WA), Steven Yoder (MN), Jason Young (MO), Lisa Youngberg (KS), Susan Youngberg (KS).

THE CRISIS IN UNITED STATES— ISRAEL RELATIONS

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today like no other time in recent memory, the United States-Israel relationship is in crisis. At a time when the close of the cold war presents the United States with an unparalleled opportunity to lead the world to a new era of peace and prosperity, the Bush administration has squandered its best chance to secure a comprehensive peace agreement in the Middle East.

It has done so both carelessly and needlessly.

How did we get to this point? The crisis we witness today is the direct result of the failure of the Bush administration to understand the region and its politics. It is a failure to differentiate between a peace process and real peace. And finally, the crisis results from the failure of both President Bush and Secretary Baker to appreciate the unique quality of the United States-Israel relationship which will be the foundation of any lasting peace agreement reached in this troubled region.

For me, it goes back to the March 1990 statements made by the President equating Israeli housing developments in Jerusalem to West Bank settlements. Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. Israelis don't settle there. They live there. On the eve of a crucial cabinet

meeting in Israel, the President's remark had the effect of putting Jerusalem on the negotiating table right from the start. While the Israeli body politic was deeply divided over how to achieve a peace settlement, they were entirely unified in their feelings about Jerusalem—it is and shall remain the capital of Israel.

From that point on, we have seen a President obsessed with every aspect of Israeli settlement policy. That policy is a controversial one. It is controversial in Israel. But it should not be the issue that determines whether or not the United States-Israel relationship flourishes or founders.

For Israel, the stakes for its existence have never been higher than over the course of the last year. If we look back at the Gulf War, we have an unprecedented example of a nation being asked to leave itself open to ballistic missile attacks. For Israel, restraint wasn't a tactical compromise. It was an unprecedented detour from Israel's strategic doctrine—namely that no attack against Israel can go unpunished. In order to prevent Arab defections from the anti-Iraq coalition, President Bush, in effect, asked Israel not to be Israel. Israel, against its instinct and its military doctrine, complied.

That same theme applies to recent debate over the loan guarantees. Since its creation, Israel's mission has been to provide a place for the in-gathering of Jews from around the world. Whether it was Soviet refugees or the Ethiopian Jews, the State of Israel provided not just housing and assistance, but a home in a new society. For five decades, the United States has assisted in that effort, providing bilateral assistance as well as important advocacy work on behalf of Soviet refuseniks who were literally held hostage by the capricious and inhumane immigration practices of the former Soviet Union.

It was the collapse of the Soviet Union and the opening of gates that has brought Israel to the brink of fulfilling its historic mission. The trickle of Soviet Jews coming to Israel in the early 1980s has turned into a flood, with nearly 1 million Soviet Jews expected to arrive over the next 5 years.

The task of absorbing these refugees falls to Israel. The magnitude of the job is stunning. To understand it better, we must imagine a country the size of the United States absorbing an entire nation the size of France. Naturally, Israel is looking to the United States for help. Not a free lunch. Not cash. Not even loans. Israel is asking the United States for loan guarantees which will allow them to borrow the money that otherwise would not be available. Given Israel's perfect repayment record on its current United States obligations, the risk to the United States is miniscule. The cost to the United States is zero since Israel has even agreed to pay for the United States costs of administering the program. At the same time, Israel will call on its own citizens as well as Jews from around the world to assist in the absorption process.

President Bush refuses to lend his support to this effort. During the gulf war last year, the

administration asked that Israel suspend its loan guarantee request until the fall. In the fall, the President asked for and got a 120-day pause for peace so as not to jeopardize the emerging round of peace talks. Now, when it comes time to sit down and talk about the loan guarantees, the President demands a settlement freeze as a condition of receiving the U.S. guarantees.

Once again, the President seems determined to insert himself into Israel's domestic political debate. The Likud-led government is committed to the settlements. The call for a freeze simply boxes Israel in, asking it to choose between the settlements and the loan guarantees needed to fulfill its mission. Many people believe the President is trying to bring down the Shamir government in the hopes that a Labor Government will show more flexibility. That is a high stakes strategy. For even if Prime Minister Shamir loses the election, President Bush will find Labor leader Yitzhak Rabin just as committed to Jerusalem and to those settlements—the majority of them—which are deemed necessary for Israel's security. Rabin would most likely suspend what he considers political or ideological settlements, but neither he nor Shamir will compromise Israel's security no matter how heavy-handed the pressure from Washington.

If the President's strategy is wrong, his tactics are worse. Last fall, he stunned Jewish leaders and pro-Israel lawmakers by his attack on a planned lobbying trip made by Jewish activists from around the country. The President's notion of claiming to be one lonely guy fighting against powerful political forces seemed a loose code for the canard of a Zionist conspiracy trying to control the government.

While the President quickly followed with an apology, damage was done to the President's already sinking credibility on Middle East issues. That credibility took an additional hit—an incredible one—in the form of a leaked slur reportedly uttered by his Secretary of State and campaign guru, James A. Baker. In a private meeting, when the discussion turned to how the loan guarantee issue would hurt the Presidential campaign among Jewish voters, Baker is alleged to have uttered an obscenity in dismissing American Jews and their voters.

I hope this story is false. If true, the slur calls into question the commitment of the Bush administration to leave behind the bigotry and racism that stains our society. At the very least, it would be a return to the Bush/Baker formula of government of the polls, by the polls and for the polls.

That's not a strategy for a credible foreign policy and it is certainly not a program for a lasting peace in the Middle East. Instead of baiting America's best friend and ally in the Middle East, the President and his Secretary of State should return to a path guided by some bedrock principles about the United States and Israel:

That we are both democracies. By definition, Israel is harder to work with than either Saudi Arabia or Syria—or China—because the Israeli leadership is ultimately responsible to the people for the decisions they make.

That Israel is our strongest and most reliable ally in the region and that a strong United

States-Israeli relationship is also in our best interests. Our commitment is to the State and people of Israel and not to a particular government in power.

That Israel deeply wants peace. But peace will only come when it feels its security can be guaranteed. Surrounded by hostile neighbors, Israel does not have the luxury to make a single mistake when it comes to questions of national security.

If the administration is concerned about the peace process, it must understand that the cornerstone of that peace hinges on the strength, the depth and the breadth of the United States-Israeli relationship. That relationship is in crisis. Our job now is to restore confidence, to help give Israel the strength it needs to make peace. Not by assenting to every policy of the Government of Israel, but by understanding that a strong United States-Israeli relationship is in our own best interests.

The United States is stronger because we have a strong, reliable ally in an area of strategic importance in the world. America's interests are advanced by supporting another vibrant democracy in a region where democracy is still not the order of the day. And United States policy is strengthened when we carry out the moral commitment we have as a Nation to the security of the Jewish state.

While the negotiations over loan guarantees have ended for the time being, both Israel and the United States face a choice over the future of the relationship. For Israel, all decisions seem to be on hold until the June elections. For the United States, the Bush administration would be well-advised to cease its verbal hostilities with Israel. Instead, our leaders should remember that every past episode of successful American diplomacy in the Middle East has been the outgrowth of our bedrock support of and close cooperation with the State of Israel.

If the Bush administration wants to move forward, it must first bring our policy back to these basics.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS PROVIDE THE FIRST LINE OF SUPPORT FOR MANY AMERICAN CHILDREN

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the increasing pressure our children are under as they grow and learn.

Society's problems of drugs, alcohol abuse, and pregnancy once were reserved for students in high school. It wasn't long before they found their way into our middle and junior high schools. Today, these problems, and many others, burden our elementary school students as they begin their school careers.

Wilma Norton of the St. Petersburg Times, my hometown newspaper, spent a day with Jan Johnston, a guidance counselor at the Rio Vista Elementary School in St. Petersburg, FL as she worked her way through a day full of

helping our youngest students with their problems while providing encouragement and support for many others. Following my remarks, I will include the full text of this story so that my colleagues can better understand the important role elementary school guidance counselors play in helping our children through the many problems that arise in their young lives, most of which are not even related to academic performance.

Wilma Norton, in her story, writes of the counselor's traditional roles of teaching classes on careers and values and getting students whatever help they may need. She writes, though, that,

Increasingly, their most important role is simply listening to children—few others have the time these days.

She reports that Jan Johnston regularly is confronted with situations where children,

Threaten suicide before they learn to ride a bike; who raise their hands in class to announce their parents aren't splitting up after all; who tell the teacher their crying makes Daddy stop hitting Mommy; who get no sleep because an older sibling threatens to burn the house down during the night; who are so desperately behind the other kids their age because they were exposed to crack in the womb and uttered no sounds until after age 2.

Legislation I have cosponsored, H.R. 840, the Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act, recognizes the increasingly important role elementary school guidance counselors play in helping our children deal with the pressures society has placed upon them. I commend my colleague from Michigan, CARL PURSELL, who sponsored this legislation which would enhance the availability and quality of counseling services for elementary school children by providing competitive grants of up to \$200,000 per year to local educational agencies to establish effective and innovative elementary school counseling programs that will serve as national models.

Linda Lee Schwartzkopf, a constituent and guidance counselor at the Pinellas Central Elementary School in Pinellas Park, Florida, first called to my attention the overwhelming need for support of these innovative types of services. The stories Linda, Jan, and other elementary school guidance counselors tell us about the problems facing our children at such an early age are disconcerting and emphasize the need to find innovative ways to provide support to these students. Elementary students are at the critical formative age and their future success in school is in most cases determined by their first few years in school.

Finding ways in which to help students adjust to problems at home and in school will better enable them to focus on their studies and prepare them for their advance to middle, junior, and senior high school.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Feb. 2, 1992]
COUNSELOR'S DAY SWINGS FROM FUN TIMES TO CRISES

(By Wilma Morton)

ST. PETERSBURG.—The party is in full swing. Fifty children, all with December birthdays, are slurping down vanilla ice cream with colored sprinkles and chocolate sauce.

Guidance counselor Jan Johnston is the eye of this hurricane. She's patting each

child on the head and is wishing them happy birthday as they walk in. She's moving between the tables, over-seeing the presentation of a small gift to each—a pencil, a tiny cellophane parachute, a superball, a glow-in-the-dark worm, a sparkly bracelet. She's leading the games.

This is fun.

The party winds down, and she sends the kiddos back to class. Four more minutes and another day at Rio Vista Elementary School will be over.

But there's one more item of business.

She reaches into her pocket. There is a penciled note on crumpled white paper, written by a second-grader.

No one likes me, the child writes. I don't like myself.

The child, the note says, wants to die tonight at 8.

Not every day is so dramatic for an elementary school guidance counselor like Johnston, swinging from pure fun to near panic. But enough of them are.

Elementary school should be about ice cream sprinkles, learning to read and hugs. And it still is.

Increasingly, though, it also is about children who threaten suicide before they learn to ride a bike; who raise their hands in class to announce their parents aren't splitting up after all; who tell the teacher their crying makes Daddy stop hitting Mommy; who get no sleep because an older sibling threatens to burn the house down during the night; who are so desperately behind the other kids their age because they were exposed to crack in the womb and uttered no sounds until after age 2.

"These kids come to school with so much more stuff," Johnston says. "Divorce, death in the family, a move, a big parental fight, their lights turned off, a parent going to jail. You can't expect them to do math and science and social studies with all that on their minds.

"Young children are so self-centered, they think everything that happens is somehow a reflection of them," she says. "A lot of kids have real self-esteem problems. They don't feel good. They don't know why. It's just an overall depressed kind of esteem."

The idea of a guidance counselor for children still nearly a decade from college may seem strange to some. Elementary guidance isn't new, by any means. Pinellas County, for example, began adding counselors to elementary in the late '70s.

Every state has guidance counselors in at least some of its elementary schools; they are mandatory in 12 states, although Florida isn't one of them.

Elementary guidance counselors teach classes on careers and on values, and they help children get whatever other help they need. But increasingly, their most important role is simply listening to children—few others have the time these days.

"They don't often have somebody to talk to," Johnston says. "The classroom teacher is the ideal person, but with the growing numbers (of students) they have, they don't have 30 minutes to sit down and talk to a child that's hurting."

Moreover, by middle school and high school, even guidance counselors don't have the time. They're academic advisers, spending most of their time devising class schedules, helping coordinate plans for post-high school education and keeping track of mountains of paperwork.

"The higher in education you go, the more impersonal it gets," says Jim Montgomery, who oversees counseling in Pinellas schools.

"If you don't identify problems very early on, at the elementary age, by the time they get to middle and high school, it's too late."

Those problems are becoming more complex. Across the country, child advocate groups are pushing the idea of guidance counselors in elementary school. The Children's Defense Fund cites these statistics as a primary reason:

Every day, 2,989 American children see their parents divorced.

Every 26 seconds, a child runs away from home.

Every 47 seconds, a child is abused or neglected.

Every day, 100,000 children are homeless.

Every school day, 135,000 children bring guns to school.

Every eight seconds of the school day, a child drops out.

And those are just the crisis situations, the report says. Without comprehensive elementary counseling, at a recommended ratio of one counselor for every 300 students, the report says too many children's problems will go undetected.

"Those who don't cause trouble, who pass tests but don't excel, may be at risk of not reaching their potential and may be suffering inside," the report says.

In Pinellas, most elementary schools have one counselor, although some of the small schools share a counselor. Each counselor may have from 460 to 1,000 children, depending on the size of the school, but the average is 1:697. Across the state, the average ratio of elementary counselors to children is difficult to pin down, but it appears to be in the neighborhood of 1:735.

For Johnston, a former P.E. teacher and 11-year veteran of elementary counseling, the job involves interspersing the crises with activities to head off disaster, with teaching and with fun.

She has regular group discussions with children whose parents are divorcing, who have had a death in the family, who have a poor opinion of themselves, who have trouble controlling their emotions.

She also talks with children individually about personal problems. She acts as the coordinator of all sorts of testing, social work and psychological evaluations.

In the time that's left, she throws birthday parties, puts on a weekly "Happy Room" for children designated by their teachers as deserving of praise and teaches classes about careers and positive self-esteem.

With the children, she is calm, loving and shows them she can be a real person, someone who likes to play football for fun. Between sessions with kids, she's in a perpetual state of near breathlessness, trying to keep up with all the things she has made mental and written notes to do.

Sometimes, she even sticks Post-It notes to her sleeves so she won't forget anything.

Her day is one of non-stop motion. Up and down stairs, room to room. "I don't wear tennis shoes, but sometimes I think I should," she says.

A TYPICAL DAY

A day with Jan Johnston shows how scary the world has become for children, even for children like those at Rio Vista Elementary, most of whom live in comfortable northeast St. Petersburg neighborhoods with an average household income that is near or above the county average and where two-thirds of the residents own their own homes.

A day with Jan Johnston also shows the truly amazing resilience of children and the adults who try to help them.

This morning begins at 7:30, only 24 minutes after sunrise on a cold, gray December

morning, one of those Florida mornings that makes 55 degrees feel like 25. Johnston is shivering beside Macoma Drive, taking her turn at helping children cross the street safely. She has an umbrella tucked under her arm; she clutches to her chest a book of self-esteem programs for children, open to the page titled "The Emotional Value of Positive Action."

Once she leaves this corner 30 minutes later, Johnston won't stop for several hours.

She oversees a skit broadcast during morning announcements, one that talks about the real value of money and possessions. She helps run interference between a teacher and a child who has pushed that teacher to her limit. She meets with the school social worker about a group of children who may be in physical danger at home and with the school psychologist to talk about what tests, treatments and therapy four children may need.

And she heads into the classroom to teach a group of fourth-graders about kindness, fairness, honesty, respect, courtesy and patience. Or as much about those subjects as she can in 15 minutes.

Sometimes it is in these classes that she sees the warning signs of a child who needs her help. Not long ago, while talking about conflict, she asked some children why they cry.

One boy who raised his hand said he cries, "so my Mom and Daddy will stop fighting. When I do, he doesn't hit her any more." The fighting is worse, the boy said, when they drink.

"In the back of my mind, I'm making a note to check on him later, while I'm trying to move on," she says.

On this day, as she leaves the class, she makes another mental note.

She wants to have a chat with one of the girls, "a perfect kid," who started crying uncontrollably a day or so ago after she was reprimanded by the teacher.

"Usually, when something like that happens, something is going on at home," Johnston says.

She moves on to four second-grade boys, who all have trouble controlling their anger. Johnston gathers them in a circle on the floor of her office, a small, closet-like room decorated with funny posters, pictures of her own three children and games that involve Velcro-covered balls and darts without sharp points.

For the next six weeks, she explains, this group is going to get together once a week to talk. "We don't put people down here," she says. "We don't crack on each other."

Johnston lays a sheet of red paper in the center of the circle. She asks them to tell her things you can do when you're angry. She writes down their answers:

Body slam. Throw things. Punch. Shove. Stab. Shoot.

She turns over the paper and asks them to try again, this time with positive things: Play basketball. Exercise. Walk away. Tell the person that they are saying hurtful things.

By the end of the six weeks, she hopes some of these things will help the children cope.

"In this office, it's one small step at a time, and you often don't get to see the end of the story."

If you stop long enough to think about this stuff, Johnston says, it will make you crazy.

To cope, you try to keep your emotions out of it, even though that's hard when the children seem like such babies. You try to leave it at school, even though a suicidal sec-

ond-grader keeps you awake at night. You try to stay within the legal and ethical boundaries set by the system, even though the solution may fall outside the rules.

Some of her salvation comes from going home to her own family, her husband and three sons, Zachary, 12, Colby, 9, and Tyler, 4. "You give your all all day, and then you go home, put on a smile and face your own children."

Her husband, William, is in sales, not education, which holds down the "shop talk" at home.

And, she says, the fevered pace she keeps all day helps, too. "I'm a very hyper person. I tend to use a lot of energy. I guess I burn it off as I go."

KEEP AN EYE ON THIS

As the morning wears on, it's time for a series of individual conferences with children having family problems.

If she meets with a child only once or twice, she doesn't necessarily call the parent. But if it's an ongoing communication, she lets the parents know. Rarely is that a problem; most are appreciative.

Still, there are those times when a parent tells Johnston to mind her own business. That can put her in a difficult position: Ethically, she is bound to honor the parent's wishes. Morally, she worries that something horrible can happen that she might have been able to prevent.

"All you can do is talk to the teacher and say, 'Keep an eye on this,'" she says. "Your gut instinct, at times, conflicts with the boundaries."

She takes time for a quick sandwich before she gathers a group of five little girls who have self-esteem problems, leading them down the hall to her office for one of those sessions on the floor. "I think this is how a mother duck feels with all the little ducks behind her," she says.

Then, it's time for a career lesson on mass production for a group of third-graders. In about 20 minutes, the class sets up an assembly line, produces a product (a construction paper bracelet with the word HOLIDAYS stamped on it), sells and distributes the bracelets. Some children are assigned to be bosses, others custodians, food service workers and accountants.

One more hour, and the day is done.

So, it's party time.

A volunteer mother is in the kitchen, scooping vanilla ice cream into 50 little bowls. Other volunteer teachers are setting up the ice cream, garnishing it with sprinkles and chocolate sauce.

Some people may think this birthday party stuff and the weekly Happy Room are just excuses for organized fun, but Johnston says she sees a deeper need, a need to make children feel good.

"In effect, you have 50 kids who are very special that day. Many of them may not spend much of their school life feeling good about themselves."

Which brings us to the note in her pocket, the one from the small child who wants to die.

When Johnston pulls the note from her pocket, just moments before the bell rings, she hurries to the child's classroom and calls the child outside. The two walk slowly down the hall to Johnston's office, the counselor's arm protectively around the child's shoulders. For the three minutes or so left in the day, Johnston and the child huddle inside the office door, talking quietly.

The child leaves smiling.

Johnston takes a deep breath and heads back out for safety duty on the corner, ex-

actly six hours after she left it this morning. As she stands in the street and motions cars to a halt, she's still thinking about the child who wrote the note.

She thinks tonight will pass uneventfully.

But tomorrow night and the night after?

She just doesn't know.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF ADVERTISING

HON. MICHAEL A. ANDREWS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. ANDREWS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, advertising is, of course, the economic engine that provides the resources necessary for the media to supply the information the public needs and wants. Without advertising, media would become a State-run enterprise with all the constraints and burdens that entails.

Advertising is, however, constantly under attack by one force we all know too well: the tax collector. There have been repeated attempts at both the legislative and executive branch levels to limit the deductibility of advertising. These attempts have all failed so far, but it is important to be vigilant in monitoring legislative and administrative efforts to cut back this deduction.

There are three ways in which this deduction has been under attack. First, legislation has been introduced that would limit the amount of the deduction. Second, a recent Supreme Court decision has opened the door for the Internal Revenue Service to require capitalization of some advertising expenses. Third, recent legislation creating a 14-year amortization of intangible assets will focus the spotlight on created intangibles in the future, thus raising the question of whether advertising expenses may be forced to be amortized.

Revenue raising has been the single biggest reason that legislation has been introduced to restrict the deductibility of advertising. For example, in 1983 the deduction for advertising cost \$72 billion in lost Federal revenues. The number has probably increased since then.

The debate over limits on the deduction of advertising costs began formally in the spring of 1986 when the Senate Finance Committee was searching for new sources of revenue to pay for the rate reduction in the 1986 Tax Reform Act. A list of 25 revenue-raising proposals sent by the Treasury Department to the Finance Committee Chairman BOB PACKWOOD included a proposal to disallow, as a deduction, 20 percent of all advertising costs. The proposal was never formally taken up by the committee.

It has been argued that the advertising deduction should be examined in relation to how competitive the deduction makes us in relation to the research and development tax credit or a targeted investment tax credit. This is a dangerous argument in that it ignores the important role that the media play in making our economy competitive. The United States enjoys a trade surplus in many forms of media, and reducing the deductibility of advertising could hinder the ability of U.S. media to compete in the world marketplace.

In 1987, the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Ways and Means staffs

issued a publication referred to as the "Options Book" that identified limits on the deduction of advertising costs as a prospective source of revenue. This book outlined four specific options, including a requirement for a 4-year amortization of 20 percent of advertising costs, denying the deduction for 20 percent of corporate advertising costs, and amortizing the remainder over 2 years for firms over \$5 million of gross receipts, and denying the advertising deduction and promotion expense deduction for tobacco products and alcohol products.

So far, legislative attempts to restrict the deductibility of advertising have been unsuccessful. However, there is activity at the executive branch level regarding the deductibility of advertising.

The Supreme Court decision in *Indopco versus Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, handed down on February 26 of this year, let stand an IRS decision to deny deductions for corporate takeover costs. Although this unanimous decision does not directly apply to advertising, it does create a broad precedent that would allow the IRS to require capitalization of advertising expenses in some circumstances.

A recent article in the *Wall Street Journal* reported that the decision "could embolden the IRS to deny deductions for expenditures on such things as factory repairs, employee training, environmental cleanups, and advertising."

The third issue concerning the deduction springs from the recent tax legislation passed by the Congress and vetoed by President Bush allowing a 14-year amortization of intangible assets, including goodwill. Committee on Ways and Means Chairman DAN ROSTENKOWSKI introduced this legislation to end the disputes between taxpayer and the IRS over the amortization of intangible assets acquired as part of the purchase of a trade or business.

The bill specifically exempts from 14-year amortization any costs that may create intangible assets, such as advertising. While Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI specifically stated at the first day of hearings on the bill that advertising is off the table, staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation have noted that the adoption of this legislation will focus the spotlight on created intangibles in the future.

Along this line, the General Accounting Office in August 1991 released a study that recommends that a broad range of intangible assets be permitted to be amortized for tax purposes when acquired as part of the purchase of a trade or business. While the GAO report did not directly address created intangibles, it suggests that because the cost of creating goodwill with advertising results in less favorable treatment of purchased goodwill than of other purchased assets, the costs of creating goodwill are treated more favorably under tax law than creation costs of other assets. This opens the door to additional future threats to the deductibility of advertising.

In the previous two Congresses, Senator BILL BRADLEY and Congressman PETE STARK have introduced legislation to eliminate the tax deduction for tobacco advertising. I have supported this legislation, but it has not been reintroduced in the 102d Congress.

Smoking is the No. 1 preventable cause of death in this country. The habit starts early in

life. Fifty percent of all smokers start by sixth grade. Ninety percent start by age 19.

Everyone here has seen the Old Joe Camel cartoon advertising. Children have, too. Six-year-olds now recognize Old Joe as readily as the Mickey Mouse logo used by the Disney channel.

Before the Old Joe advertising campaign began, less than 1 percent of Camel smokers were under age 18. Today, one-third of Camel smokers are under age 18.

The tobacco industry spends \$3 billion a year for advertising because they have to replace the 1,000 people who die from smoking each day and the 2,000 people who quit smoking each day.

An alternative approach to curbing tobacco advertising is a counter advertising program like California has. The California approach has been to increase tobacco taxes and run anti-tobacco ads. This approach has caused teenage cigarette sales to fall by 12 percent.

I have in the past introduced legislation to increase the tobacco tax and pay for counter-advertising, and I plan to do so in the future.

Our current tax policy is sound. The tax treatment of advertising costs is governed by the same general principles applicable to all other business expenses. The recurring nature of an expense in roughly the same amounts each year suggests that the benefits of the expense do not last beyond that year.

Restricting the deductibility of advertising would put an unfair, uneconomic burden on the media and would be unwise tax policy.

CLAYMONT MUSTANGS' WRESTLING TEAM

HON. DOUGLAS APPLIGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1992

Mr. APPLIGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the most outstanding wrestling teams in my eastern Ohio district. On March 14, 1992, the Claymont Mustangs took home the Division II State Championship title for the first time. Coach Eric Toukonen, who has been a wrestling coach at Claymont for the past 13 years and head coach for the past 9 years, was named Division II Ohio High School Coach of the Year. This is the first time any school in Tuscarawas County has ever won a wrestling championship and the first time Claymont has ever won a boys' championship in any sport.

Senior Rysin McDaniels won the State championship for his weight class division (140 lbs). Senior Scott McDaniels won second place for the 112-pound division, and Craig Shaw won second place for the 119-pound division. Qualifiers are senior Kirk Henry, and juniors Scott Shaw and Jeff Abel. Varsity letter winners for the team are as follows: Kurt Peters, Jason Shaw, Tim Zurcher, John Heavilin, Marc Vermillion, Demi Carrothers, Jason Johnson, Todd Johnson, Troy Beckley, Deric Vanderpool, Jason Freeman, Chad Mehok, and Eric Seibert.

Eric Toukonen, along with his assistant coach, Mel Peters, and his reserve coach, Bob Johnson, has much to be proud of. The

hard work and dedication of the coaches, varsity, and reserve teams made this impressive victory possible.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct privilege and honor to ask my colleagues to join with me in acclamation of the Claymont Mustangs' wrestling team for their championship title and well-deserved victory.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 26, 1992, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 27

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Animal and Plant Inspection Service, the Food Safety and Inspection Service, and the Agricultural Marketing Service.

SD-138

Armed Services
Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on nuclear weapons issues and activities of the Department of Energy Defense Laboratories, and to review recommendations made by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

SR-222

10:15 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine health risks associated with lead in ceramic tableware and leaded crystal.

SD-342

MARCH 30

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.
Small Business
Innovation, Technology and Productivity Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Small Business Innovation Research program of the Small Business Innovation Development Act.

SR-428A

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Department of Energy's civilian nuclear waste program mandated by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine U.S.-Indochina policy.

SD-419

APRIL 1

9:30 a.m.
Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to authorize funds for programs of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act.

SR-485

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Commerce.

S-146, Capitol

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

SD-192

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for energy and water development programs.

SD-192

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1174, to establish the Cache La Poudre River National Water Heritage Area in Colorado, S. 1537, to designate the American Discovery Trail for study to determine the feasibility and desirability of its designation as a national trail, and S. 1704, to improve the administration and management of public lands, National Forests, units of the National Park System, and related areas by improving the availability of adequate, appropriate, affordable, and cost effective housing for employees needed to effectively manage the public lands.

SD-366

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Resolution Trust Corporation.
SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 664, to require that health warnings be included in alcoholic beverage advertisements.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on manpower, personnel, and health programs.
SD-192

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the National Transportation Safety Board.
SD-138

APRIL 3

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Foreign Agricultural Service, the General Sales Manager, and the Soil Conservation Service.
SD-138

APRIL 6

10:00 a.m.

Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on cable compulsory licenses.
SD-628

APRIL 7

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Agriculture and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Food and Drug Administration, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Farm Credit System Assistance Board.
SD-138

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the For-

est Service, Department of Agriculture.
S-128, Capitol

2:30 p.m.

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1752, to provide for the development, enhancement, and recognition of Indian tribal courts.
SR-485

APRIL 8

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the AMVETS, American Ex-POWs, Jewish War Veterans, Non-Commissioned Officers Association, National Association for Uniformed Services, and Society of Military Widows.
SD-106

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold oversight hearings on the Department of Agriculture's field structure.
SR-332

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Office of Management and Budget, and the Executive Residence.
SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings in conjunction with the National Ocean Policy Study on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1993 for the U.S. Coast Guard.
SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on childhood vaccine research and development issues.
SD-192

Armed Services
Defense Industry and Technology Subcommittee
To hold hearings on national and defense technology policies and initiatives.
SR-222

Foreign Relations
European Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine U.S. assistance to the new independent states of the former Soviet Union.
SD-419

APRIL 9

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Defense, focusing on strategic programs.
SD-192

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Small Business Administration.
S-146, Capitol

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for Amtrak, and the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

Veterans' Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on proposed legislation on homeless veterans.
SR-418

APRIL 19

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Defense.
SD-192

APRIL 28

9:00 a.m.

Office of Technology Assessment Board meeting, to consider pending business.
Room to be announced

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Smithsonian Institution.
SD-116

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to the education and employment of veterans.
SR-418

APRIL 29

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the U.S. Information Agency, and the Board for International Broadcasting.
S-146, Capitol

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-G50

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Transit Agency, and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.
SD-138

MAY 5

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 6

9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee To hold hearings on S. 2297, to enable the United States to maintain its leadership in land remote sensing by providing data continuity for the Landsat program, by establishing a new national land remote sensing policy.

SR-253

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on S.J. Res. 221, providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray, of Illinois, as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution, and on other regent appointments.

SR-301

Select on Indian Affairs

To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA).

SR-485

10:00 a.m.

Rules and Administration

To hold oversight hearings on the Smithsonian Institution.

SR-301

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Court of Veterans Affairs.

SD-124

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Energy.

SD-116

MAY 13

9:30 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar and administrative business.

SR-301

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

SD-124

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-116

MAY 20

2:00 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the U.S.

Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

S-128, Capitol

MAY 21

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the National Community Service, and the Points of Light Foundation.

SD-116

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the General Accounting Office.

SD-138

MAY 22

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain related agencies.

SD-138

JUNE 9

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for the Department of the Interior.

S-128, Capitol

2:30 p.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1993 for the Department of the Interior.

S-128, Capitol